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WELCOME TO LUND!
We are thrilled to welcome you to Lund for the 5th European Conference for Critical Animal Studies! We have a full program planned for you over the course of the next three days and hope that you will have an interesting and rewarding conference experience.

In the spirit of the field of Critical Animal Studies, the aim of this conference is to display how scholarly work can contribute to eliminate the domination and oppression of all animals. We are hopeful that this event will bring together scholars and activists invested in exploring the opportunities to establish more just inter-species relations.

This year’s conference is truly an international event, with over 125 people attending from over 19 countries across 5 continents! We hope you’ll have an opportunity to get to know many of your fellow conference participants during your time here, and with that goal in mind we have designed the conference schedule with a number of coffee breaks (called “fika” in Swedish, these are an integral part of Swedish culture!) and opportunities to gather informally over meals in both Lund and Malmö. We especially hope many of you will join us on Friday evening at 19:00 for an optional self-pay dinner at one of the region’s most well-known and loved vegan restaurants, Kao’s. They will be serving a special buffet to conference attendees for 155 SEK / person. Kao’s is located at Föreningsgatan 37 in Malmö, which is 8 minutes by foot from the Triangeln Station.

This conference would not have been possible without our presenters, volunteers, sponsors, and all of you who have come together in Lund to make this a truly unforgettable event. Thank you!

If you should encounter any questions during your time here please don’t hesitate to ask anyone staffing the Registration table or to email us at animalsconferencelund@gmail.com.

Best wishes for a successful conference,

Jana Canavan  Tobias Linné  Iselin Gambert
Marie Leth-Espensen  Leonie Bossert  EvaMarie Lindahl

The 5th European Critical Animal Studies Conference Organizing Committee
KEYNOTE PRESENTATIONS

ANIMAL LIBERATION AND FEMINIST POLITICS IN THE AGE OF TRUMP:
POLITICIZING PRACTICES OF CARE IN INTERSPECIES COMMUNITIES

Zipporah Weisberg

Thursday, October 26, 9:30 – 10:30am, SOL Auditorium

In this talk, I will explore the merits of mobilizing a socialist ecofeminist theory and practice of care in the form of interspecies communities as a politically meaningful alternative and source of resistance to hegemonic masculinity - and the predatory economic system to which it is intimately tied - in the age of Trump. It goes without saying that by their very nature, animal sanctuaries - which practice gentleness, care, and compassion - present a profound challenge to a patriarchal society that thrives on aggression and violence against vulnerable beings, especially women, girls, and other animals. But the question of how a practice of care can be transformed into a robust feminist politics of care remains to be explored. I will suggest that, even more than sanctuaries, “intentional interspecies communities” (Donaldson and Kymlicka) can provide a helpful model of how relationships of care can be deployed in the service of wider political transformation. One way to politicize practices of care, I will suggest, would be if they were revalued as necessary to the social reproduction of the entire community (Fraser), human and more-than-human. Another transformative step could be if interspecies communities implemented a direct democracy model, in which women, people of colour, and members of the LGBTQ community were at the forefront of decision-making processes, alongside their animal co-citizens. A socialist ecofeminist interspecies community could also be a political force simply by offering an alternative to alienated labour on and with other animals and by providing opportunities meaningful self-reproducing labour in the form of mutually reinforcing interspecies care practices. Finally, interspecies communities could present a direct challenge to the dominant Performance Principle (Marcuse) by creating the conditions for both humans and other animals to engage in ‘aimless’ basking, frolicking, resting, and ‘doing nothing’ for extended periods of time at will, and other ‘non-productive’ but meaningful activities that are completely irrelevant to the logic of endless accumulation. How these internal transformations within interspecies communities can impact changes in the ‘real world’ is a difficult question to answer, but one crucial step towards achieving this goal is something already practiced by VINE sanctuary in Vermont, which is to reach out to farmers and citizens in the wider local community in which the interspecies community is based in the hopes of working towards developing sustainable plant-based agriculture. Perhaps this could be expanded into an ongoing discussion, at town hall meetings, for example, about what constitutes a community, and how the animals who live within the confines of a city, town, or area, might be better integrated as real community members, as opposed to simply pets or commodities.

About Zipporah Weisberg

We Animals: Animal Rights Photojournalism and the Importance of Stories

Jo-Anne McArthur

Thursday, October 26, 4:15 – 5:15pm, SOL Auditorium

When Jo-Anne McArthur shifted her focus towards animal rights photojournalism fifteen years ago, few professional photographers were documenting The Invisible animals, as McArthur calls them. Those we eat, wear, conduct research on and use for entertainment. Fewer still were examining the constructs of factory farming, fur farming, laboratories and the like. During this time, much has changed and more photographers are now bringing these stories to light. In this presentation, McArthur frames animal rights photojournalism in a historical context, shares stories that she has witnessed and documented in over fifty countries, discusses lessons learned, and outlines some ways forward when it comes to animal rights photojournalism.

About Jo-Anne McArthur

Jo-Anne McArthur is an award-winning photojournalist, author, and educator based in Toronto, Canada. Through her long-term body of work, We Animals, she has been documenting our complex relationship with animals around the globe for fifteen years. Thousands of these images are made available for free to anyone helping animals at weanimalsarchive.org. McArthur is the author of two books, We Animals, published in 2014, and Captive, published in 2017. McArthur’s newest endeavour, the Unbound Project, is a photographic project that celebrates female leaders at the forefront of animal advocacy, both contemporary and historical. McArthur was the subject of the critically acclaimed 2013 documentary The Ghosts in Our Machine, which followed her as she documented the plight of abused and exploited animals and advocated for their rights as sentient beings.

Uplifting the Human and Dominating the Animal:

Imperialism, Violence and the “Civilizing Process”

Erika Cudworth and Matthew Cole

Friday, October 27, 1:30 – 2:30pm, LUX Aula Nedre

Norbert Elias’ influential work, The Civilizing Process (1939) traces the development of social attitudes in European modernity and the causes of these changes. Elias considers how post-medieval European mores on matters of sexuality, bodily functions, violence, table manners and speech were transformed over time through the internalization of self-restraint. Significant levels of structural and interpersonal violence are compatible with the increased salience of narratives of civilization, however, and conceptions and practices of ‘civilization’ are rooted in specific understandings of ‘the human’ and ‘the animal’. Elias makes an important contribution to understanding the civilizing process as one of ‘taming’, training and subduing ‘the animal’ in the human. While sixteenth century European crowds might be entertained by spectacles of the burning, maiming, killing and fighting of non-human animals, many of these practices are now banned and widely regarded as ‘cruel’ and ‘inhumane’. Some sociologists have argued that the growth of animal welfare mores and a revulsion against the use of violence against both humans and other animals emerged with European industrialization and urbanization. A more detached attitude towards animals is accompanied by an increase in sentimentalized and romanticized relations and the development of non-human animals as subjects of moral concern. Consequently, the mass slaughter of animals for food had to be hidden out of sight, and cruel practices such as the public torture of animals for entertainment came to be questioned. This paper will argue that those who have applied Elias’ ideas have given insufficient attention to ‘decivilization’, and the extent to which mores and practices surrounding human animal relations have been ‘transformed’. In addition, those outside of civilization have been regarded as in some ways less than human. Those that assert membership of a higher civilization do so on the basis of the extent to which a particular grouping has been able to separate itself and become independent of nature. Such contentions reproduce the duality between the human and non-human nature in that the civilized are considered as separate/superior to the non-civilized, and on the grounds of that superiority have a right of dominion over them in ways that parallel human relations with non-human nature. Comparisons can be drawn between the processes of dealing with those outside of civilization (both historically and contemporarily) to the treatment of non-human animals. This leads us to the conclusion that what must be resisted is not only the animalization of those others who are dominated, but the reproduction of an imperial human through the discourse of ‘civilization’.
About Erika Cudworth and Matthew Cole

Erika Cudworth is Professor of Feminist Animal Studies in the School of Social Sciences at the University of East London, UK (e.calvo@uel.ac.uk). Her research interests include complexity theory, gender, and human relations with non-human animals, particularly theoretical and political challenges to exclusive humanism. She is author of Environment and Society (2003), Developing Ecofeminist Theory (2005) and Social Lives with Other Animals (2011); co-author of The Modern State (2007) and Posthuman International Relations (2011); and co-editor of Technology, Society and Inequality (2013), Anarchism and Animal Liberation (2015) and Posthuman Dialogues in International Relations (2017). Erika’s current projects are on animal companions and the messy nature of multi-species life and the ‘animalizing’ of social theory. With her colleague and long term writing partner Steve Hobden, she is working on the more-than-human way of war and on posthuman emancipation. Their new book, The Emancipatory Project of Posthumanism, is published in 2017.

Matthew Cole is a sociologist especially interested in researching how the oppression of other animals is made to seem normal and natural, and therefore in how that ‘normality’ can be destabilized and ultimately destroyed. This has led him to write on topics such as childhood socialization, anti-vegan bias in mass media and academic discourse, and the legitimation of the oppression of nonhuman animals in popular culture. Matthew published his first book (with Dr Kate Stewart) with Ashgate in 2014: Our Children and Other Animals: The Cultural Construction of Human-Animal Relations in Childhood. Matthew is the co-editor of Critical Animal and Media Studies: Communication for Nonhuman Animal Advocacy (Routledge, 2015 with Núria Almiron and Carrie P. Freeman), and is currently co-authoring Animalizing Sociology with Prof. Erika Cudworth. Matthew was a trustee of The Vegan Society in the UK between 2008 and 2012, including a spell as Chair of the society between 2011-2012. He is currently an Associate Lecturer and Honorary Associate in Sociology with The Open University, UK (m.d.d.c.cole@open.ac.uk).

THE CULTURED CHIMPANZEE. BRIDGING THE HUMAN-ANIMAL DIVIDE

Volker Sommer

Saturday, October 28, 10 – 11am, Pufendorf Institute Room A

Everyday language readily distinguishes animals from humans. The former are perceived as instinctual and savage, the latter as reflective and cultured. Indeed, depending on ethnic background, people favour different technologies, customs and values – traits considered to be hallmarks of "culture". However, recent studies reveal similar degrees of intraspecific variance for many non-human animals, too – particularly for societies of our closest living relatives, the primates. For example, chimpanzee populations differ in dietary preferences and tool use pattern, but also in terms of what is considered socially acceptable. This creates a quasi-religious group-based morality and identity. Such constructions of "us" versus "them" regularly lead to violent clashes between neighbouring ape communities – intergroup conflicts that also permeate the course of human evolution. Cultural boundaries therefore create a sense of belonging as well as xenophobic feelings – conceptualized by anthropologists as "we-ness" (entitativity) versus "other-ness" (alterity). An evolutionary perspective can help us to better understand our often parochial attitudes and behaviours towards members of our own species as well as towards other animals.

About Volker Sommer

Volker Sommer is Professor of Evolutionary Anthropology at UCL. His research focuses on the evolution of social and sexual behaviour, rituals and cognition as well as biodiversity conservation and animal rights. He conducts long-term field studies on monkeys and apes in the jungles of Asia and Africa. Sommer is on the scientific board of the Giordano-Bruno-Foundation, a German-based think-tank for the promotion of secularism and evolutionary humanism.
CONFERENCE SCHEDULE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26

8:30 – 9:15am  REGISTRATION AND BREAKFAST

9:15 – 9:30am  WELCOME

SOL Auditorium

9:30 – 10:30am  KEYNOTE: Animal Liberation and Feminist Politics in the Age of Trump
SOL Auditorium  Zipporah Weisberg

10:30 – 10:45am  BREAK

10:45am – 12pm  PANELS 1 + 2
Room B (upstairs)  PANEL 1: Speciesist norms and psychological barriers to change
Why are we so morally inconsistent when it comes to animals?
Simon Gerlach
The Political Logics of Modern Speciesism
Per-Anders Svärd
Marketing & “Meat-a-physics”: Managing an appetite for meaning in modern consumer society
David Pedersen

Room A (downstairs)  PANEL 2: Nonhuman animal liberation: Strategies and communication
Rise of the Living Dead: Production Animals on Video
Pinja Mustajoki
Images that liberate: Strategic visual communication of farmed animals’ exploitation. A study of animal liberation activists in Spain
Laura Fernandez Aguilera
Nonhuman Animals & Sustainable Development: Overcoming the anthropocentric outlook of the latter
Leonie Bossert

12 – 1pm  LUNCH

1 – 2:15pm  PANELS 3 + 4
Room B (upstairs)  PANEL 3: Animal exploitation in contemporary marketing and campaigns
The Happiness Paradox and the Dairy Industry
Jessica Thiel
Interspecies Encounters in a marketing context: Proximity and transparency in Finnish meat companies’ marketing campaigns
Saara Kupsala
The Welfare Economic Treatment of Farm Animal Welfare
Marcus Ventin
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26 (continued)

Room A (downstairs)  **PANEL 4: Intersectionality: perspectives on decolonization and feminism**

- Building Space for Animals in Colombian Peace Process
  - Terry Hurtado

- Cannibal Nutrition: Big Slaughter, Big Hunger ... and what about the right to NOT be food?
  - Abi Masefield

- An Ice Cold Glass of Pure Racism: Entanglements of milk and exploitation
  - Iselin Gambert and Tobias Linné

2:15 – 2:30pm  **BREAK**

2:30 – 3:45pm  **PANELS 5 + 6**

Room B (upstairs)  **PANEL 5: Marxist perspectives**

- Adorno’s Utopian Animals
  - Camilla Flodin

- Animal Labour and the Commodified Flesh: A Marxist Critique
  - Onur Alptekin

- Veganism, Ideology and the Critique of the Political Economy
  - Tobias Rein

Room A (downstairs)  **PANEL 6: Perspectives on vegan activism and campaigns**

- Weaponizing Compassion: The 1990s Vegan Straight Edge Metalcore Movement and Hybrid Masculinity
  - Elizabeth Price

- Animal Rights Activism, Comics Art, and Independent Publishing: Matt Miner’s Liberator, Critical Hit, and Black Mask Studios (TBC)
  - Micha Edlich

- The Second-curve model, a promising framework for studying change: veganism as a case study
  - Estela Diaz

3:45 – 4:15pm  **FIKA**

(coffee break)

4:15 – 5:15pm  **KEYNOTE: We Animals: Animal Rights Photojournalism and the Importance of Stories**

- Jo-Anne McArthur

5:15pm  **OPTIONAL SELF-PAY DINNER**

Gather outside SOL Auditorium to form small groups to coordinate dinner in Lund or Malmö.

The following websites have great overviews of vegan options in Lund and Malmö:

Malmö: [http://www.veganistan.se/malmo](http://www.veganistan.se/malmo)
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 27

8:45 – 9:15am  REGISTRATION AND BREAKFAST

9:15 – 10:30am  PANELS 7 + 8
Room A (downstairs)  PANEL 7: Interspecies Encounters
For Terraism: multispecies community in a time of extinction
Erika Cudworth

Subjects or Tools? The objectification of dogs, and other animals, in the ongoing
development of Animal Assisted Interventions
José De Giorgio-Schoorl

The Political Economy of Camel Husbandry: Human-Nonhuman relationships as a
determinant of political behavior
Matthew Porges

Room B (upstairs)  PANEL 8: Animals (ab)use and Scientific Research
Interspecies Relations in polio vaccine practices in the Netherlands
Anne van Veen

Animals as Laboratory Objects: Analysis of the Power Discourse
Tereza Vandrovcová

Wrongful discrimination of animals
Jari Kärkkäinen

10:30 – 10:40am  BREAK

10:40 – 11:10am  POSTER PRESENTATIONS + ORGANIZATIONAL PRESENTATIONS
Foyer  Other-Than-Human Ontologies: Of Ancestor + Clan Animals in AlterNative Storytelling
Amina Grunewald (POSTER PRESENTATION)

Room B  Presentation by Djurens Rätt
Room C  The Activists’ Perspective: concrete and creative ways of challenging the anthropocentric city
Arternes Aarhus [the city of the species]

Room D  Presentation by the European Confederation of Human Animal Studies

11:15 – 12:30pm  PANELS 9 + 10
Room B (upstairs)  PANEL 9: Critical Problematising in Animal Politics
Naughty Fido: canine transgression in the Surveillance Society
Delia Langstone

Humane Jobs: Towards Multispecies Wellbeing
Kendra Coulter

From public indignation to emancipatory critique
Mathias Elrød Madsen and Marie Leth-Espensen

Room A (downstairs)  PANEL 10: Theoretical perspectives on advocating animal liberation
Is appealing to climate change and environment an effective advocacy strategy to reduce
oppression of nonhuman animals? A discussion on evidences and arguments
Núria Almiron

The Doings of Emotions in the Struggle Against the Speciesist, Patricolonial System
Jonna Håkansson

Rules of the Pack – Moral Practices Among Canids
Dorna Behdadi
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 27 (continued)

12:30 – 1:30pm LUNCH

1:30 – 2:30pm KEYNOTE: Uplifting the Human and Dominating the Animal: Imperialism, Violence and the “Civilizing Process”
LUX Aula Nedre
Erika Cudworth and Matthew Cole

2:30 – 2:45pm BREAK

2:45 – 4:00pm PANELS 11 + 12
Room A (downstairs) PANEL 11: Interspecies Communities
Organize and Resist with Farmed Animals: Prefiguring Anti-Speciesist/ Anti-Anthropocentric Cities
Darren Chang

Between Caring and Killing – Ambivalences in the Profession of Farm Animal Veterinary Medicine
Julia Gutjahr

From Animal Bio-politics to Post-Livestock Animals – Narratives and Practices of German Sanctuary Farms for New Human-Animal Relations
Markus Kurth

Room B (upstairs) PANEL 12: Animal symbols, reconstruction and resurrection in literature and art
Elizabeth Costello’s Dilemma is very real: A few observations on the problematic relationship between Critical Animal Studies and the field of literature
Claudia Alonso Recarte

Reading Animals Literally: The Activism of Desymbolization
Maria Trejling

The Choir of Isaac van Amburgh and his Animals
EvaMarie Lindahl

4:00 – 4:15pm FIKA
Foyer
(coffee break; those going to Bishop’s House will walk there during this time)

4:15 – 5:30pm PANELS 13 + 14 + SMALL GROUP BREAK-OUTS FROM PANEL 12
Room A (downstairs) PANEL 13: Interspecies politics
You see we’re all political animals, or: The importance of moving from nonhuman animal rights to interspecies democracies
Eva Meijer

The Swedish “Meat norm”: Obstacle to political reform
Jana Canavan

Judicial attitudes towards animals
Opi Outhwaithe

Room B (upstairs) PANEL 14: Animals in Entertainment
Bullfighting as an unethical dark tourism practice in Mexico
Alvaro López & Jafet Quintero

Speciesism Party: A vegan critique of Sausage Party
Matthew Cole
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 27 (continued)

Bishop’s House

**SMALL GROUP BREAK-OUTS FROM PANEL 12**

**BISHOP’S HOUSE TOUR**
EvaMarie Lindahl

Room C

**WORKSHOP: Creative Dissent: Why Imagination is Critical for Social Change**
Paula Meninato

Room D

**KATT PEOPLE BOOK DISCUSSION**
Julia Lindemalm

**7pm**

**OPTIONAL SELF-PAY DINNER AT KAO’S IN Malmö**
Gather at Kao’s for buffet-style vegan dinner (155 SEK/person)

Kao’s

Föreningsgatan 37
Malmö

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 28

**9:30-10am**

**REGISTRATION AND BREAKFAST**

**10-11am**

**KEYNOTE: The Cultured Chimpanzee: Bridging the Animal-Human Divide**
Volker Sommer

**11 – 11:15am**

**BREAK**

**11:15 – 12:30pm**

**PANELS 15 + 16**

Room A (downstairs)

**PANEL 15: Food activism: challenging the use of nonhuman animals**
*Communicating Care through Food. Food as a medium to enforce and disrupt normative understanding of human-animal and environmental relations*
Eva Giraud

*Grandma’s Buns, Kitchen Experiments and Happy Stomachs: On Becoming-Vegan as an Affective Bodily Process*
Sari Irni

*“Stop forcing veganism on Children”: not eating non-human animals as a force of moral panic in Estonia*
Kadri Aavik

Room B (upstairs)

**PANEL 16: Animals and Media representations**
*The Anthropocene: Animals on Television*
Brett Mills

*Music and Speciesism*
Martin Ullrich

**12:30 – 1:45pm**

**LUNCH ON YOUR OWN IN LUND**

The following website has a great overview of vegan options in Lund:
http://vegolund.herokuapp.com/
SATURDAY, OCTOBER 28 (continued)

1:45 – 3pm  **PANELS 17 + 18**

**Room A (downstairs)**  **PANEL 17: Philosophy, Ethics, Ontology**

*Getting down to the root of trouble: nonhuman animals in language*
Karin Kunde

*Noticing, translating and deconstructing categories in history. Olympe de Gouges, the French revolution and the significance of the animal category*
Lisa Gålmark

*Animal Ethics in Light of Judith Butler’s Philosophy: The Problem of Nonviolence*
Sanna E Karhu

**Room B (upstairs)**  **PANEL 18: Grief, Empathy, and the Psychology of Speciesism**

*Following a Beastly Trace: Aurochs and the Alphabet*
Seth Josephson

*Affect Beyond Proximity: Empathy, Drone Targeted Killings and Humanely Slaughtered Meat*
Kurtis Boyer and Fabio Cristiano

*Social Dominance Theory: A psychosocial approach to understand speciesism*
R. Waldhorn

3 – 3:15pm  **FIKA**
(coffee break)

3:15 – 5pm  **FILM SCREENING OF THE GHOSTS IN OUR MACHINE**

**Room A (downstairs)**  **CONFERENCE CLOSING**

Featuring sweets from Cashew Vegan Kitchen
ABSTRACTS

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26
10:45am – 12pm Panels 1 + 2
Room B

Panel 1: Speciesist norms and psychological barriers to change

Why are we so morally inconsistent when it comes to animals?
Simon Gerlach

Nonhuman animals occupy an ambiguous space in the moral landscape. People care about other animals, but also engage in the activity of meat eating. Farming and eating nonhuman animals poses great threats to the environment and causes immense amounts of suffering for the animals involved. The present paper takes a Critical Animal Studies perspective on people’s morally inconsistent relationships with other animals to highlight one of the most significant ethical challenges of our time. The paper contributes a social psychological analysis of morality, empathy and human-animal relations. Drawing on key works from the field of moral psychology, including the theories of Jonathan Haidt, Martin Hoffman and Albert Bandura, it is shown that the common conceptualization of morality as being firmly rooted in rationality is outdated. Instead, it is argued that intuitive and affective processes with empathy as a baseline offer a better conceptual framework for understanding the inconsistent human moral behavior exhibited in human-animal relations. From this conceptual orientation, the present paper sheds light on a range of social and cognitive factors that might explain disengagement of morality and empathy towards some animals, but not others. A discussion on the agent-structure dualism reveals that people are not moral agents in the traditional sense. Rather, moral behavior is a result of material and discursive social influence in a complex interplay with human cognition. This paper shows that cognitive limitations combined with society’s speciesist material conditions and discursive constructions lay the foundation for people’s morally inconsistent relationships with other animals. Furthermore the paper connects these theoretical insights to practical issues of activism for animal liberation and poses the question: How can psychology help us become more effective activists and advocates for establishing more just and morally consistent trans-species ethics?

The Political Logics of Modern Speciesism
Per-Anders Svård

It is a widespread assumption that the history of animal welfarism has been a largely progressive affair, primarily expressing a growing social attention to nonhuman suffering. According to this view, modern animal welfarism is best conceived as a logical, organic expansion of the earliest regulations against animal cruelty. The preventive and standard-setting model of animal welfare is seen, in short, as a significant improvement over the older laws that were restricted to punishing animal cruelty after the fact. In this presentation I argue to the contrary that the emergence of animal welfarism as the dominant paradigm for legal regulation of animal treatment came about as a way to overcome a long-standing crisis of the previous anti-cruelty paradigm that threatened to undermine the speciesist social order as such. The turn to animal welfarism, I hold, became necessary because the ambition to curb animal cruelty always threatened to become a little too effective by questioning deeply entrenched social norms. Abandoning the anti-cruelty paradigm in favor of the new welfarist one, therefore, worked as a way to reaffirm speciesist values and practices in the face of surmounting challenge, rather than as a way of criticizing and overcoming them. Using examples from the history of animal protection politics in Sweden, this presentation conceptualizes the shift from anti-cruelty politics to welfarist politics as the outcome of a struggle between two competing political logics: the logic of equivalence and the logic of difference (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985/2001). While the older anti-cruelty laws were structurally conducive to a logic of equivalence that encouraged questioning of animal treatment, the modern animal welfare regime typically operates according to a logic of difference that counters and nullifies radical demands by separating them and absorbing them into the existing legal framework. In addition, drawing on the work of Glynos and Howarth (2007), I present a model for how these logics are mobilized both to challenge and maintain the speciesist status quo.

Marketing and “Meat-a-physics”: Managing an appetite for meaning in modern consumer society
David Pedersen

This presentation will raise the question of the role that meaning and culture plays in consumption in general and meat consumption in particular. It will pursue the notion that culture, understood as the concepts and actions humans use to construct our identities, are highly influential to consumer habits. Apart from the strictly nutritional properties of meat, many anthropologists believe it’s involved in the thoroughly cultural acts of expressing masculinity and power, social status and wealth, and dominion over nature. If so, then the question of meat consumption and overcoming barriers to reducing it, becomes not only a question of the ethical aspects, but perhaps even more so, a question highly existential in nature. The presentation will also discuss some possible solutions to addressing the negative effect that the “crisis of masculinity” is having on meat consumption.
**Panel 2: Nonhuman animal liberation: Strategies and communication**

*Rise of the Living Dead: Production Animals on Video*

Pinja Mustajoki

Ten years ago Finnish animal activists released videos from over one hundred Finnish factory farms, including pig farms, cowhouses and egg-laying chicken farms. In 2009 and 2011 and the forthcoming years the campaign continued with more revealing videos. The "graphic" imagery was spread all over the Internet and resulted in extensive discussions throughout media, politics and the meat industry. The published videos made the audience both aware and worried about animal welfare and the transparency of meat production. A vast number of violated animals were seen on the videos but eventually the charges were raised against the activists – not the farmers who mistreated animals. Pig farmers sued two activists for defamation and trespassing, but most charges were dismissed in court.

After the increased visibility of mass produced animals through the activist videos, the Finnish meat product manufacturers felt the pressure to play with the idea of transparency in their own campaigns: factory farmers and the farmed animals were prominently featured in meat industry's marketing videos and the narrative of transparent, secure and down-to-earth animal production was created. The most shocking imagery on activist videos contains both humans and nonhuman animals just before the act of slaughter. I call it the moment of transformation: a pig turns into pork and a cow into beef. As spectators of this part of production animals' lives, we become witnesses of the resistance of death – and the zest of life that nonhuman animals demonstrate before their slaughter. In my presentation I am examining Jacques Derrida's idea of nonhuman animals as "living dead" and their ability to sur-vivre, to "over-live (death)". I combine this with the self-evident perception that production animals are not alive, but they merely exist. But where there is no life, can there be death? It can be argued that the activist videos have failed to improve the situation of production animals. Meat consumption is increasing and neglecting farmed animals keeps continuing. Animals are produced as food without any intrinsic value: their lives are seen as mere uncomfortable necessities and they become valuable only post mortem, after death. Some might think that activist videos' brutal imagery creates rejection instead of empathy. I argue that moral reflection requires empathy but also guilt and anger. We need also “negative” emotions to reach the sense of justice. In my presentation I’m comparing animal activist videos and meat product manufacturers' campaign videos. How can the same farms and the same animals appear in such a different manner in these audio-visual representations? In which ways the videos affect our perception of farmed animals – the animals we usually meet only as either (dead) meat or as visual representations? In wider perspective, I’m exploring the boundaries of activism and research, animal and human, fact and fiction, life and death. Our lives are based on these kinds of dichotomies, but the more you look into it the more it seems that there are no boundaries at all.

*Images that liberate. Strategic visual communication of farmed animals’ exploitation: A study of animal liberation activists in Spain*

Laura Fernandez Aguilera

The animal liberation movement have historically considered images of animal exploitation as one of the pillars to spread nonhuman animals’ violent realities and to raise awareness on speciesicism. Nonetheless, the visual effectiveness of the different types of images, particularly of images with explicit violence, is under researched and no clear results have been provided so far. To contribute to fill this gap of knowledge, this paper will introduce the findings from a research addressing the effectiveness of visuals related with the use and exploitation of farmed animals from the experience of animal liberation activists in Spain. In particular results will address first what kind of images of farmed animals had the greatest impact on the activists and pushed them to become vegans and animal liberation activists; and, second, what type of images they use in their daily activism (traditional campaigns, social networks, etc.). The purpose of this research is to study the characteristics of the images considered effective, focusing specifically on the level of explicit violence of the images and the species of farmed animal(s) appearing on it, but also looking for other information as the age of the animals, the frame of the image or if there is an individual animal or a collective appearing on it. While examining the trajectories and experiences of animal liberation activists, the concept of moral shock (Sullivan y Longnecker, 2010; Faunalytics, 2011; Bertolaso, 2015; Wrenn, 2013) is used to enrich the analysis. The methodology applied in the research consists of focus groups with animal liberation activists to analyse their activist experience with the use of images, combined with in-depth personal interviews to learn about their own individual process of becoming vegans and activists. Both interviews and focus groups are complemented with thematic and narrative analysis.

In this study, *effectiveness* is defined according to the extent to which an image is useful for the antispeciesist perspective – the ethical stance that rejects the use, exploitation and violence towards nonhuman animals. Thus, an image is considered effective when it promotes and generates change according to:

- Considering farmed nonhuman animals as sentient beings (not objects) with interest in living, avoid suffering and being respected.
- Questioning human legitimacy to use nonhuman animals for their necessities or pleasures, in this case as food.
- Promoting veganism as a moral duty of humanity rather than a mere “personal option”.

---

**Panel 2: Nonhuman animal liberation: Strategies and communication**

*Rise of the Living Dead: Production Animals on Video*

Pinja Mustajoki

Ten years ago Finnish animal activists released videos from over one hundred Finnish factory farms, including pig farms, cowhouses and egg-laying chicken farms. In 2009 and 2011 and the forthcoming years the campaign continued with more revealing videos. The “graphic” imagery was spread all over the Internet and resulted in extensive discussions throughout media, politics and the meat industry. The published videos made the audience both aware and worried about animal welfare and the transparency of meat production. A vast number of violated animals were seen on the videos but eventually the charges were raised against the activists – not the farmers who mistreated animals. Pig farmers sued two activists for defamation and trespassing, but most charges were dismissed in court.

After the increased visibility of mass produced animals through the activist videos, the Finnish meat product manufacturers felt the pressure to play with the idea of transparency in their own campaigns: factory farmers and the farmed animals were prominently featured in meat industry's marketing videos and the narrative of transparent, secure and down-to-earth animal production was created. The most shocking imagery on activist videos contains both humans and nonhuman animals just before the act of slaughter. I call it the moment of transformation: a pig turns into pork and a cow into beef. As spectators of this part of production animals' lives, we become witnesses of the resistance of death – and the zest of life that nonhuman animals demonstrate before their slaughter. In my presentation I am examining Jacques Derrida's idea of nonhuman animals as "living dead" and their ability to sur-vivre, to "over-live (death)". I combine this with the self-evident perception that production animals are not alive, but they merely exist. But where there is no life, can there be death? It can be argued that the activist videos have failed to improve the situation of production animals. Meat consumption is increasing and neglecting farmed animals keeps continuing. Animals are produced as food without any intrinsic value: their lives are seen as mere uncomfortable necessities and they become valuable only post mortem, after death. Some might think that activist videos' brutal imagery creates rejection instead of empathy. I argue that moral reflection requires empathy but also guilt and anger. We need also “negative” emotions to reach the sense of justice. In my presentation I’m comparing animal activist videos and meat product manufacturers' campaign videos. How can the same farms and the same animals appear in such a different manner in these audio-visual representations? In which ways the videos affect our perception of farmed animals – the animals we usually meet only as either (dead) meat or as visual representations? In wider perspective, I’m exploring the boundaries of activism and research, animal and human, fact and fiction, life and death. Our lives are based on these kinds of dichotomies, but the more you look into it the more it seems that there are no boundaries at all.

*Images that liberate. Strategic visual communication of farmed animals’ exploitation: A study of animal liberation activists in Spain*

Laura Fernandez Aguilera

The animal liberation movement have historically considered images of animal exploitation as one of the pillars to spread nonhuman animals' violent realities and to raise awareness on speciesicism. Nonetheless, the visual effectiveness of the different types of images, particularly of images with explicit violence, is under researched and no clear results have been provided so far. To contribute to fill this gap of knowledge, this paper will introduce the findings from a research addressing the effectiveness of visuals related with the use and exploitation of farmed animals from the experience of animal liberation activists in Spain. In particular results will address first what kind of images of farmed animals had the greatest impact on the activists and pushed them to become vegans and animal liberation activists; and, second, what type of images they use in their daily activism (traditional campaigns, social networks, etc.). The purpose of this research is to study the characteristics of the images considered effective, focusing specifically on the level of explicit violence of the images and the species of farmed animal(s) appearing on it, but also looking for other information as the age of the animals, the frame of the image or if there is an individual animal or a collective appearing on it. While examining the trajectories and experiences of animal liberation activists, the concept of moral shock (Sullivan y Longnecker, 2010; Faunalytics, 2011; Bertolaso, 2015; Wrenn, 2013) is used to enrich the analysis. The methodology applied in the research consists of focus groups with animal liberation activists to analyse their activist experience with the use of images, combined with in-depth personal interviews to learn about their own individual process of becoming vegans and activists. Both interviews and focus groups are complemented with thematic and narrative analysis.

In this study, *effectiveness* is defined according to the extent to which an image is useful for the antispeciesist perspective – the ethical stance that rejects the use, exploitation and violence towards nonhuman animals. Thus, an image is considered effective when it promotes and generates change according to:

- Considering farmed nonhuman animals as sentient beings (not objects) with interest in living, avoid suffering and being respected.
- Questioning human legitimacy to use nonhuman animals for their necessities or pleasures, in this case as food.
- Promoting veganism as a moral duty of humanity rather than a mere “personal option”.

---
Nonhuman Animals and Sustainable Development – Overcoming the anthropocentric outlook of the latter

Leonie Bossert

Over the last few decades, sustainability has become a buzzword, used in sciences, politics, everyday life and in the media. Similarly, the discourse on Sustainable Development (SD) has become very famous, and plenty of different approaches of SD emerged. Critics claim that because of the broad use of the term sustainability and the concept of SD, have both turned into meaningless terms, which are used in an arbitrary way (cf. Christen/Schmid 2012). Consequently, scientific approaches have been developed trying to frame SD in a way that allows for the possibility to distinguish between sustainable and unsustainable actions (f. ex. Becker 2012; Dobson 1998; Ott/Döring 2011). Summarised it is obvious that the discourse on SD is huge and the concept gains a lot of public and political attention on an international level.

Approaches of SD are as different as the discourse is broad. But what (almost) all of them have in common is their anthropocentric outlook. In most of the SD theories nonhuman animals are only seen as “renewable resources”, “genetic resources”, part of an endangered species or as a “thread” to sustainability because of the alarming impacts of f.ex. intensive livestock farming on the environment.

Within the last few years, some very important works within the field of Critical Animal Studies have evolved, which explicitly shown that human-nonhuman animals-relationships need to be taken seriously in the realm of SD.

All of these works demonstrate the disastrous consequences of the animal-industrial-complex for the environment and societies and that this must be seen as a reason why nonhuman animal exploitation should never count as sustainable (cf. Twine 2010; Stănescu 2011; Probyn-Rapsey 2016). That the promotion of so-called “sustainable animal products” is for many reasons wrong, and even dangerous is shown by Vasile Stănescu (2011). Richard Twine (2010) critically reflects on the role of nonhuman animals in the SD discourse while focussing on the question of how sustainability language frames “animal science” and how one should ethically evaluate attempts to breed nonhuman animals in a way that their “products” are healthier for the consumer and have fewer negative effects on the environment. While these works are highly important and f. ex. Twine takes an ethical perspective, what is still missing to date is a fundamental ethical argument about why nonhuman animals as individuals have to be included in all SD-approaches, independent of the disastrous effects of their “production” for the environment and societal circumstances (cf. Boscardin/Bossert 2015). What form such argument could take will be presented in the offered talk, providing a merger of SD and animal ethics.

1 – 2:15pm
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Panels 3 + 4

Panel 3: Animal exploitation in contemporary marketing and campaigns

The Happiness Paradox and the Dairy Industry

Jessica Thiel

The dairy industries are experts at turning other animals’ bodily fluids into attractive products while at the same time hiding the ugly reality of systematic oppression and exploitation. During this presentation I will do a basic analysis of a few representative short media productions (for example TV ads) from the dairy industry in Sweden. Arla is the biggest dairy company in Sweden. One of their marketing techniques is to use an Instagram account called “Bregottfabriken” (the Bregott Factory) to advertise their products and to interact with their consumers. In the majority of posts, the captions describe how the cows are taking part in what I want to describe as obviously human activities. A few examples are graduating from school, doing yoga, getting a spa treatment, using the “Tinder-app”, using Skype and more. An advertisement video from the dairy company “Skånejemeler” is the next piece I analyze. In the video the cows are walking around outdoors, on big green pastures, resting in the shade under the trees and getting pats from the farmer. The narrator tells us that “These cows could not have it any better” and “They walk in and out when they want.” The last piece of material analyzed is a so called educational video produced by the interest organization LRF (Association of Swedish Farmers). In this cartoon video the children are taught, for example, that there are “meat cows” and “dairy cows”, that cows take well care of their calves, and that the cows also take care of us, that they give us meat, milk, butter, butter and more. After analyzing these advertisements and campaigns it stands clear that the dairy industry is feeding lies into society through media to make us buy their products and not question their production. The fact that they are even lying to children shows that they feel no shame and are willing to use deeply unethical methods to push their agenda. I encourage people to rapport these lies and false advertisements to the Consumer Agency. The freedom of other animals and their right to their own bodies and lives are dependent on humans speaking up for their interests. We need to take action against injustice when we see it.
Interspecies Encounters in a marketing context: Proximity and transparency in Finnish meat companies’ marketing campaigns

Saara Kupsala

In recent years Finnish meat companies have notably increased consumer communication as regards to farmed animal welfare. With various marketing campaigns, which emphasize “openness”, “transparency” and “responsible production”, meat companies attempt to maintain consumer trust in Finnish production and to secure their position in increasingly competitive markets. Particularly, the recent release of undercover videos from farms and slaughterhouses by animal rights activists has received high media attention, necessitating meat companies to respond with their communication campaigns to preserve their public image. In this paper, I critically examine the industry’s transparency-oriented marketing campaigns, with a case study of a blog marketing campaign on chicken production. In this marketing campaign, external actors—food bloggers—visited a meat company’s slaughterhouse and chicken production unit, interviewed the farmer and the company representatives and wrote a blog text about their experiences. The blog texts mostly constructed a narrative according to which previous shaky impressions and images of meat production, often negative ones, were replaced during the visit by “facts” and first-hand experience, which were mostly positive in terms of animal welfare. I approach the event as a performance, framed and partly scripted by the meat company, but being also an outcome of the acts of chickens, the bloggers, the farmer, the company representatives and workers. I analyse the bloggers’ representation of the event based on their blog postings. The analysis suggests that although the blog campaign was portrayed as promoting consumer proximity with chickens, it was permeated with the discourses of moral distancing. Strategies of moral distancing included for instance deindividualization and the hygiene rules that prevented touching, despite chickens’ curiosity toward the visitors, leaving gaze as the main mode of interaction. Melanie Joy (2011, p. 20) has suggested that the invisibility of violence toward nonhuman animals, enhanced by spatial and psychological distance to industrial animal farming and slaughtering, is the “primary defence” of the carnistic system, an ideology that normalizes and naturalizes meat eating. As food industries employ marketing strategies that emphasize proximity to farmed animals (cf. Linné and Pedersen 2016), they seemingly pierce the invisibility embedded in the carnistic system. This study examines in detail the mechanisms of moral distancing nested in the constructed proximity in the marketing texts, describing how these mechanisms reinforce carnism by normalizing and naturalizing industrial animal farming and slaughtering.

The Welfare Economic Treatment of Farm Animal Welfare

Marcus Ventin

This paper will seek to demonstrate how welfare economics appears to be opposed to the pursuit of improvements in farm animal welfare. In order to do this, it will be necessary to outline some of the fundamental assumptions of welfare economics and assess the ways in which they affect how proposed changes in farm animal welfare are viewed. The key theories that underpin welfare economics generally rely upon two major (and related) theories: the Pareto and Kaldor-Hicks accounts of economic efficiency. These two measures will be outlined before being applied to the topic of farm animal welfare through cost-benefit analysis. I will assess whether each measure is well-suited to bringing about improvements in farm animal welfare through both a speciesist and a non-speciesist cost-benefit analysis. The aim of this analysis is to determine whether there are any circumstances where these measures of efficiency allow us to claim that improvements in farm animal welfare can increase social utility.

I shall argue that a speciesist Pareto analysis struggles to justify making improvements to farm animal welfare because in many cases improvements in farm animal welfare come at the expense of overall farm productivity, and consequently the interests of the animal owner may be opposed to those of the animal itself. In some instances a speciesist Pareto analysis would in fact justify harming farm animal welfare. A non-speciesist Pareto analysis also encounters difficulties in justifying improvements to farm animal welfare because these improvements are likely to be costly and must be paid for by the animal owners and consumers of animal products, and so do not amount to a Pareto improvement in social utility. A non-speciesist analysis using the Kaldor-Hicks account also struggles to justify improvements in farm animal welfare as being advantageous to social utility. This method implausibly requires farm animals to be able to compensate their owners for costly improvements to their welfare. Given the status of farm animals as non-economic agents it is not obvious how this is possible. However, a speciesist Kaldor-Hicks cost-benefit analysis may allow us to justify making improvements to farm animal welfare in certain circumstances. If there are a large number of animal lovers in a society then they may, in some instances, experience an overall utility increase from improvements in farm animal welfare. These individuals may be willing to compensate those who suffer a utility loss, to the extent that nobody is made worse-off by the policy change. However, while this approach may yield improvements in farm animal welfare, these improvements seem to be of secondary importance. In these instances it appears that human interests are held to be of more direct significance; animal interests seem to matter here only to the extent that humans have an interest in their satisfaction. Many would argue that this is an inappropriate way to try to bring about improvements in farm animal welfare, because it relies upon human preferences for animal welfare and therefore appears to ignore the moral considerability of animal interests.
Room A

PANEL 4: Intersectionality: perspectives on decolonization and feminism

Building Space for Animals in Colombian Peace Process
Terry Hurtado

Colombia has been in a political armed conflict over 50 years in which dozens of thousands of humans have been killed, kidnapped or disappeared. Nonetheless the lack of information about how many non-human animals have suffered directly by the armed conflict is enormous. This lack of information is due to factors related with not recognizing non-human animals as subjects, or even objects, affected or target by the parties in conflict. This presentation will be about the on-going endeavour of the Colombian animal rights movement to include non-human animals in the reflection about peace in Colombian society. The journey goes through many players to achieve this: victim associations, social and political movements, political parties, academy, government and the guerrillas. It will also introduce an interpretive framework to think peace with animals. This is an on-going process that aims to achieve for non-human animals the recognition of the political and legal status of victims due to the political armed conflict in Colombia. It also is looking forward to create commitments, within the government and the guerrillas, for non-human animals of truth, non-repetition, and reparation.

As part of the construction of peace, in the political-armed post-conflict period, the animal rights movement is aiming to achieve the will of the peasants, and the ex-guerrilla members that will be supported by Estate projects, to prefer economical activities which don’t require the use of non-human animals.

Cannibal Nutrition: Big Slaughter, Big Hunger ... and what about the right to NOT be food?
Abi Masefield

The focus of the paper will be on the identification of political agendas for a critical animal discourse analysis of the discursive fields associated with global hunger and malnutrition, representations of the hungry as animal and the aggressive promotion of a ‘let them eat meat’ approach. Perspectives from positions associated with both Critical Animal Studies and Decoloniality can deepen understanding of the interplay of colonial power and speciesism at work in the context of development discourse such as that associated efforts to classify, measure, explain and address global hunger and malnutrition. Discourses of development being rooted in racism (defined by Grosfoguel as ‘a global hierarchy of superiority / inferiority along the line of the human’) the research thereby recognizes the inseparability of dichotomies of hierarchy and dynamics of oppression at work across imagined boundaries such as species and race.

A central theme in the research is the recognition that the same tension between ‘welfarist’ and ‘rights based’ approaches that has played out in politics relating to the animal question, can be seen in the context of the discursive field of hunger and malnutrition. The dominant approach to ensuring minimum standards of ‘food and nutrition security’, as revealed in the slogan ‘Feed the World’, remains firmly anchored in colonial ‘developmentalist’ assumptions. It is focused on addressing the symptoms of hunger and malnutrition through a corporate driven, overly technical (productivist, reductivist and nutritionist) approach to intervention as ‘salvation’ and ‘civilizing’ rather than recognizing and addressing the systems and methods of representation and commodification at work that reproduce injustice as an ongoing and deliberate act of ‘dehumanization’. A short nutrition TV campaign / commercial being broadcast on Bangladeshi TV to promote increased feeding of ‘animal sourced foods’ to infants and young children can be presented and discussed. While recognizing the significance of an anti-capitalist and ‘decolonial’ critique of development theory and practice in the context of the ‘food justice’, food sovereignty and ‘right to food’ movements (in terms of making visible the power dynamics that underpin the structural persistence of poverty, hunger and malnutrition) the research seeks to understand why such apparently progressive discursive domains appear so resistant to the possibility of exploring the validity of ‘a right to NOT be food’ and to take a stance in opposition to all industries of ‘enfleshment’. To date the diverse range of critical enquiries, united by their concern to address the absence of explicit attention to the ‘animal question’ in relation to discourse around hunger and malnutrition, have remained marginal and somewhat incoherent as a result of a focus on the anthropocentric driven concerns to optimize productive efficiency. The anticipated contribution of discourse analysis informed by Critical Animal Studies is to open up an intersectional investigation of the anthropocentric roots, relevance and potential limitations of a narrowly hum-animal rights based approach to eradicating hunger and malnutrition, and the violent ontological and epistemological dualism associated with processes of ‘other-ization’ and ‘animal- ization’.

An Ice Cold Glass of Pure Racism: Entanglements of milk and exploitation
Iselin Gambert and Tobias Linné

This presentation explores the entanglements of milk, oppression and exploitation of both humans and non-humans. Milk, both literally as a substance and symbolically in culture and social life, has been connected to exploitative and oppressive practices through history, and the inherent exploitation of other animals involved in milk can be seen as triggering other kinds of exploitative and oppressive practices. Many authors have addressed questions of how food has come to play a significant role in colonial projects and in the subjugation of both people of color and the nonhuman animals occupying the colonized territories. Authors like Carol Adams have explored how meat-eating contributed to the Western world’s pre-eminence, describing how “the racialized politics of meat” worked to split the “world into intellectually superior meat eaters and inferior
plant eaters,” accounting for the Western conquering of other cultures. Others, like Melanie DuPuys, have analysed how dairy milk was considered the ideal food by northern white Europeans, who due to a genetic mutation are able to digest lactose as adults, unlike most of the world’s population. “By declaring milk perfect, white northern Europeans announced their own perfection,” wrote DuPuys. By examining dairy propaganda from the early-to-mid 20th century as well as recent examples of the use of milk in Trump America, where white nationalists have been using it as a symbol both in online settings and throughout the spring of 2017 at numerous pro-Trump and “alt-right” demonstrations, this presentation maps what could be called “the racialized politics of milk” that manifests in discourses about physical/bodily and social perfection and white racial superiority, as well as ways in which dairy production and consumption are permeated by the complex dynamics of race, gender, class and species, thereby shaping food production/consumption and dietary regimes.

2:30 – 3:45pm PANELS 5 + 6
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**Panel 5: Marxist perspectives**

**Adorno’s Utopian Animals**
Camilla Flodin

Theodor W. Adorno (1903–1969) is not generally regarded as a prominent contributor to the field of Critical Animal Studies. The role of animals in his thinking has until quite recently also been largely overlooked in Adorno research. But as Jacques Derrida notes in his acceptance speech for the Adorno Award in 2001, animals play an important role in Adorno’s thinking. And I want to claim that Adorno has a lot to contribute to the critique of our current relationship with nonhuman animals and nature. Adorno speaks of human being’s forgotten “likeliness to animals” (Tierähnlichkeit). The repression of our affinity with nonhuman animals and the definition of ourselves in opposition to them – something which constitutes part of the definition of culture as opposed to nature – does not lead to a liberation from nature’s hold, but to an even deeper immersion in a destructive conception of nature. Art, however, preserves the memory of our likeliness to animals, as well as the memory of the suffering that the subjugation of nonhuman animals and nature has caused outside art. Adorno argues that art, or more precisely, what he terms “authentic art”, can give voice to repressed nonhuman animals and nature. This mediatory function is not just a burden for art, that is to say, it is not something merely negative, but it is always also entwined with joy: the joy of lending suffering a voice. Through the expression of suffering, the wish, and the possibility, for the end of suffering is simultaneously voiced. In some cases, Adorno also seems to claim that the actual animal – and for the most part in the shape of a non-domesticated herbivore – can in itself point towards utopia: the reconciliation between human and nonhuman animals. In my paper, I will analyse examples of nonhuman animals mediated through art (mostly literature and music), discussed by Adorno. I will also examine other nonhuman animal examples in his oeuvre, where herbivorean peacefulness is often contrasted with human being’s destructive behaviour towards the rest of nature. The peaceful ideal of the herbivore suggests that humanity has the capacity to realize its potential, and liberate itself as well as nonhuman animals from the constrains of oppression. It is by combining rigorous critique of our society, and its oppression of nonhuman animals and nature, with a refusal to abandon the possibility of utopia, that Adorno’s thinking remains vital for anyone who tries to envision a truly liberated society.

**Animal Labour and the Commodified Flesh: A Marxist Critique**
Onur Alptekin

Employing a Marxist critique of use-value and exchange value for the relations between human beings and nonhuman animals, this paper promises to investigate the animal-labour and the commodification of animals both as bodily-parts or as products that animals produce. The Marxist method for inter-human relations as class struggle between workers and capitalists is metamorphosed into the relations between the non-human animal and the ‘non-animal’ human. Referring to Marxist methods, this paper criticizes the ideology that conceals the vitality of animals by presenting them as living things instead of living beings and that justifies the exploitation of animals, including the ones of Karl Marx. Therefore, this paper also promises a Marxist critique of Marx in the context of Animal Studies.

**Veganism, Ideology and the Critique of the Political Economy**
Tobias Rein

Veganism has arrived in the middle of society. The media take notice of vegan topics and discuss them largely. Companies sell more and more products that aim to substitute meat, cheese or milk. Politicians seem to feel compelled to react to the rise of veganism by claiming it is unhealthy. Though the percentage of people who actually live vegan is very small, the term “vegan” is known within society and most people do know a vegan person in their circle of acquaintances. But the extraordinary rise of veganism does not come without a cost: To adapt veganism to the mainstream, veganism is promoted as a lifestyle, as a way to look good and healthy. Therefore, it seems, veganism does become more and more unpolitical and a-ethical the broader it gets. More and more vegans do not link veganism to animal rights but to its health, environmental or lifestyle aspects. In my presentation, I aim to develop a critical notion of veganism as an ideology. This understanding is ambivalent: It does not only refer to veganism as an ideology, but also to the ruling ideology of speciesism which constitutes the frame in which veganism operates as a social movement. With an understanding of the species frame of our
societies it is possible to understand the relation between veganism and animal rights/animal liberation. On the other hand, if it is true that we cannot escape ideology, what does that mean for veganism and for the animal rights movement? How is the ideology of veganism linked to the ideology of animal rights and how is their relation to the capitalistic ideology? This then leads to an understanding of the main principles and the functioning of capitalism. Hitherto, there has not been such an accurate understanding of capitalism as it has been developed by Karl Marx. As it is the 150th year since „Capital“ was published and the destructive forces of capitalism become more and more obvious, a reexamination of the works of Marx is something the animal rights movement only can profit from. So, Marx will be a point of reference of my presentation. To go further, we can understand Marx as a utopian thinker, who wanted to develop a new society by analysing the structures of the current one. This is something the animal rights movement needs if it will not remain in mere moralizing.

**Room A**

**Panel 6: Perspectives on vegan activism and campaigns**

**Weaponizing Compassion: The 1990s Vegan Straight Edge Metalcore Movement and Hybrid Masculinity**

Elizabeth Price

The vegan straight edge metalcore movement, active in the 1990s, was a music subgenre micro-culture primarily focused on writing concept L.P. and E.P. recordings that “brought a militant cry for veganism and animal rights to the scene,” according to straight edge scene ethnographer, Ross Haenfler. I have conducted a qualitative content analysis of lyrical discourse from works dating 1988-1999. The contents of the data suggest that the movement’s participants form a collective identity as a class of consumers, transformed into an “ethical consumer” movement using consumer choice in attempts to destabilize what lyrical narratives refer to as an “evil empire.”

Given that each and every track in the 50 song dataset is written and performed entirely by male-identifying vocalists, while a growing body of literature demonstrates that women constitute a larger number of participants in animal rights-centered activist movements, a closer look at this micro-culture offers a profile of what a male centered, male dominated, and nearly male-isolationist animal rights movement looks like. Though not a formally recognized verb, I argue that the movement “weaponizes” the compassion that they feel when witnessing non-human animal suffering by encasing narratives about their pursuit of animal liberation and their desire to destabilize anthropocentric patriarchal societal structures in war-related metaphorical devices. The movement forges a divergent, hybrid masculine identity by contending with masculine hegemony through dramatic and public performances of unrestricted emotional release, noticing and mourning non-human animal suffering, fostering compassion for non-human animals, and expressing grief and loss when witnessing environmental destruction. Such narratives are coupled with observing masculine posturing rituals derivative of the fusion of metal and hardcore, two music genres that construct arenas of artist and audience hyper-masculine performance. The discourse reflects that the lyricists often struggle to negotiate the contradiction of being at odds with emotional constriction requirements of masculine stoicism and allowing themselves to observe the wide range of emotions they feel when witnessing the suffering they seek, which transforms the “referent” of their work from compassion to militarism and leaves them betwixt identities hinged upon images of men besieged by a world that makes them mourn and men besieged by a world that makes them enraged. I examine the rituals of interpersonal violence observed by scene ethnographers and accounts that appear in lyrical narratives and draw new lines of inquiry about how “violent” affect moving between bodies transforms the way scene participants care for themselves, one another, vulnerable bodies, and their world.

**Animal Rights Activism, Comics Art, and Independent Publishing: Matt Miner’s Liberator, Critical Hit, and Black Mask Studios (TBC)**

Micha Edlich

In a 2013 interview on his Liberator comic book series featuring underground animal rights activists, American writer Matt Miner notes that this crowdfunded project for an underground publisher “jumps right into the action with two animal rights activists, one above ground (legal) activist and one underground (illegal) activist. The duo have very different tactics but the same goals, to save animals and end exploitation.” Combining elements of traditional superhero comics, articles by or on animal rights activists, and, among other aspects, progressive gender politics, Liberator and the more recent series Critical Hit seek to harness the popular appeal and the visual language of the medium of comics to stop animal abuse and exploitation. As such, the 24-page comic book series is but one building block of a complex animal rights intervention and only one of several concerted efforts for a wide range of progressive social causes advanced by an alternative publisher committed to, as stated on the website of Black Mask Studios, “a punk rock ethic.” Drawing on the insights of (critical) animal studies, ecocriticism, and comics studies, this paper aims to analyze Matt Miner’s Liberator and Critical Hit series and, in part by comparing it to other comic book series such as Grant Morrison’s Animal Man series from the 1980s, to assess its (potential) contribution to the animal rights and liberation movements. This paper argues that while the actual story and the comic art in both cases may be fairly traditional and may thus miss numerous opportunities to give a voice to animals, the series written by Miner and his artistic collaborators, in combination with related campaigns, can make a vital contribution to the discourse on and the fight for animal rights. Micha Edlich worked as a graduate student instructor in the Department of Modern Languages at Ohio University in Athens, OH, as a lecturer in the first-year writing program at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, and as an
instructor in the American Studies Program at Johannes Gutenberg Universität in Mainz, Germany. In the academic year 2009-2010, he was a fellow at Columbia University in the City of New York. He is currently completing his dissertation on contemporary environmental life writing. Since October 2014, he has been a staff member at the Writing Center at Leuphana University of Lüneburg in Lüneburg, Germany.

The Second-curve model, a promising framework for studying change: veganism as a case study

Estela Díaz

The aim of this paper is to build on the literature on critical animal studies and veganism from the lens of the theories of innovation, and specifically, from diffusion theory. First, key concepts regarding those theories are given. Second, ethical-veganism (hereafter, veganism) is used as a case study to show how the second-curve model offers an opportunity to reframe the understanding and analysis of veganism and the journey towards it. Lastly, some implications for researchers and practitioners are considered. The theory of diffusion of innovation is a social theory, which seeks to explain why, how, and at what rate innovations spread over time among members of a social system (Rogers 1976, 1995, 2003). Recently, a ‘double-S-curve’ model (‘second-curve’ or ‘two-curves’) has been proposed to portray the change dynamics between incremental innovation (the first curve) and radical innovation (the second curve) (e.g., Handy 2015; Morrison 1996). Drawing on these theories, we posit that veganism is the second-curve, an innovation radically different from ‘usoanimalism’, the first curve. Veganism is an ideological, moral, and political stance (‘software’ aspect) rooted in antispeciesism and expressed in everyday consumer behaviors (‘hardware’ aspect) that exclude, for moral reasons, the use of animals (McGrath 2000). Usoanimalism is a mental model rooted in anthropocentrism and speciesism that sustain that animals are merely resources (‘software’ aspect) expressed in everyday consumer behaviors (‘hardware’ aspect) that approve the exploitation of animals. Furthermore, we stand that usoanimalism is an innovation cluster comprised of multiple incremental innovations (e.g. plant-based diets, vegan diet, flexitarianism, reducetarianism, and vegetarianism). This framework has important implications. For researchers, it is more complex and dynamic than the widespread continuum model — according to which omnivorism and veganism stand at each side of the spectrum (e.g. Povey et al., 2001) — because it enables to perform multidimensional analyses of behaviors, to study the relationships between different trends, and to explore key questions (e.g. how do adopters ‘jump’ between curves?). For practitioners and policy-makers, can offer clarity to decision-makers by enabling them to develop strategies, to innovate business models, and innovate products/projects in accordance to objectives: on the first, second or both curves.

FRIDAY, October 27
9:15 – 10:30am  PANELS 7 + 8
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**Panel 7: Interspecies Encounters**

**For Terraiism: multispecies community in a time of extinction**

Erika Cudworth

We humans and a multiplicity of other species create eco-systems and possibilities for life continually. These contexts of mutuality might be thought of as political in that they address the problem of what might be done in the face of the existential threat of climate change and mass extinction in the Anthropocene/Capitalocene. What is the possibility of fruitful futures in times of great precarity for vulnerable embodied critters? This paper sets out a ‘posthumanist manifesto’ which argues for a createurely politics and promotes a strategy of terraiism in which the flourishing of posthuman community might secure political change from the bottom up. This rejects a position of liberalisms in which grand calls are made and demands placed on existing international institutions. Rather, critical approaches to life in and beyond the ‘Anthropocene’ are required. The paper draws on the recent call by Simon Springer (2016) to ‘Fuck Neoliberalism’. This involves expressing rage (through scholarship and protest); rejection (doing things differently); and prefigurative politics in which we learn to create new worlds. Similarly, Amy Allen’s (2016) notion of negativistic emancipation suggests the need for a combination of the critique of existing society with an examination of ‘heterotopic spaces’ as alternate though not utopian spaces, where practice challenges prevailing social structures. While the fucking-up of the Capitalocene is desperately needed, we also require prefiguration. Thus this paper will argue for a ‘createurely politics’ which stresses the bodied nature of the human and our bedding in vital networks with others. This does not only imply a critical perspective on the human centred organisation of our economic organisation, our social practices and our ways of doing politics, it also requires a shrinking of the idea of ‘the human’ as we know it, and a transition to a more creatively condition in which we humans share vulnerabilities with other creatures and living things. Second, following William Connolly’s call for “micro-experimentation on several fronts” (2013: 38) and Donna Haraway’s (2016: 5-7) invitation to stay “with the trouble” of our times through creative practices emergent in “actual encounters”, the paper argues for the development of ways of flourishing in our precarious times, in particular through ‘posthuman communities’. Employing a more critical version of companion species than we find in Haraway, two kinds of posthuman communities are considered: those found in the edgeland spaces where dogs and their people hang out in contemporary urban and rural Britain, and the rather more tense and fragile spaces of warfare, past and present.
Subjects or Tools? The objectification of dogs, and other animals, in the ongoing development of Animal Assisted Interventions
José De Giorgio-School

One specific dimension that is based on the utilization of nonhuman animals is the field of animal assisted interventions. A field difficult to address in regards of nonhuman wellbeing, both because of the presence of normative anthropocentrism, as of the mainstream eagerness to create ‘feel-good’ activities between human and nonhuman others. But because of anthropocentric bias, what often looks like a tribute to the social side of dogs and other species, is - in contemporary animal assisted interventions - an exploitation where in the practical application, the nonhuman animal is not understood as subject or as social agent. To turn the tables in this ongoing objectification, which is being picked up as acceptable and even as trend also by media and company product marketing, a decentralization of ourselves in the interaction with nonhuman animals is required, in order to explore the interspecies dynamics from the nonhuman point of view, especially within the field of Animal Assisted Interventions (AAI). We need to question how we can learn to think in terms of nonhuman individuals with their own unique way of being in the world and each with their own needs, preferences, emotions, and mind---sets and what that thinking in those terms means in our coexistence with other animals in daily life. Answering these questions requires a redefinition of our understanding of the way nonhuman animals are in dialogue with the world and with us. One of the biggest obstacles in preserving subjectivity in AAI and in our coexistence in general, is the tendency to develop studies and applications regarding the human---nonhuman interaction, which are still based on, or focused on, training---methods, in the assumption that nonhuman animals need to be trained in their coexistence with humans. But focusing on desired behavioral outcomes creates a filter within the interspecies dialogue. While human tend to further micro-manage nonhuman otherness’ expressions, we are also desensitizing ourselves in ‘not recognizing and experiencing’ otherness anymore, nurturing the presence of normative anthropocentrism, instead of putting it in discussion. If we learn to recognize nonhuman otherness within the interspecies interaction and learn how to preserve their subjectivity, we can learn again to preserve our own animal subjectivity as well, as first step to being reciprocally involved in exploring and experiencing the world with nonhuman animals, accepting a paradigm shift and growing towards a modern and ethical coexistence between human and nonhuman animals, where everyone can be understood for his own way of being in this world. In such way, evolved knowledge regarding nonhuman animals as sentient beings will no longer be ignored for the benefit of human animals.

The Political Economy of Camel Husbandry: Human-Nonhuman relationships as a determinant of political behavior
Matthew Porges

Nomadic pastoralism—the seasonal movement of human populations between and within grazing areas—is a millennia-old practice in the Sahara, where the harsh climate and limited vegetative cover necessitate both a predominantly carnivorous diet and a certain degree of mobility. Saharan nomads have historically relied on three species of semi-domesticated livestock: camels (C. dromedarius, the Arabian Camel), goats, and sheep. Each of these three species has substantially different husbandry requirements, and each predicts a different pattern of social behavior for nomadic populations that rely more heavily on one species than the others. Camels, for instance, require a great deal more food than goats or sheep, and are less able to subsist on urban waste. Unlike goats and sheep, camels are also drought-resistant and less amenable to intensive domestication. In recent decades, Saharan nomadism has been undergoing a seismic shift both as a result of multiple geopolitical drivers of sedentarization and from climate change, both of which have been far more consequential for camel-based nomadism than for goat- or sheep-based nomadism. This paper examines the changing relationship between humans and camels in the Sahara. I find that the husbandry requirements of a given species of livestock shape the social and political choices made by nomads, and that camel biology is a politically relevant force that must be understood when assessing relationships between Saharan nomads and the states with which they interact. Saharan states—notably Mauritania, Mali, and Algeria—tend to be heavily urbanized as a result of the limited carrying capacity of the open desert, and are ill-equipped to deal with mobile populations. In assessing the surprising ways in which camel biology has shaped the politics of Saharan nomadism, particularly in recent decades, I attempt to draw lessons for future analysis of the political relevance of human- nonhuman relationships and of the correspondence between humans and their ecological contexts. This paper, which is based on six weeks of fieldwork conducted in Algeria, Western Sahara, and Mauritania in 2016, draws on both an understanding of Saharan geopolitics and an ethnographic assessment of the nomads’ own conceptions of their relationships with non-humans and the desert ecology.
Soon after the first successes with a polio vaccine by Jonas Salk in the US in 1954, the Dutch also started to immunize their young humans. For thousands of Cynomolgus monkeys living in the wild, this meant being captured and transported to the premises of the RIVM, where they would be used to produce and test the vaccine. Promoted by a looming monkey shortage, the RIVM developed ways to drastically reduce monkey use by technoscientific innovations such as the use of microcarriers and monkey cell cultivation. A monkey breeding program was started at the RIVM in 1974 to ensure independence from foreign sources and to get ‘cleaner’ monkeys (i.e. monkeys with less infections). Complete replacement of monkeys did not happen until the beginning of the 21st century, when the use of a continuous cell-line rendered monkeys obsolete altogether.

In this paper, I perform a genealogy of animal testing and alternatives in polio production and control practices at the RIVM to understand how this great reduction in monkey use was made possible and why it took so long to end monkey use completely, but also what made these polio practices using monkeys possible in the first place. In doing this, I take a critical posthumanist perspective, analyzing polio practices as a multispecies practice involving monkeys, humans, rats, mice and many others. A human/animal dichotomy is not taken for granted, but rather it is investigated how this dichotomy is both (re)produced and challenged. Published articles and archival materials are studied to analyze the workings of material-discursive practices that make some polio practices possible while excluding others. Interviews and historical images are used to give a deeper understanding of the embodied experiences of the animal beings involved as well as the different interspecies intra-actions that were part of the IPV production practices.

The reasons given in RIVM articles and documents for reducing the use of monkeys were: difficulties obtaining monkeys, costs, safety concerns and scientific quality. Ethical considerations did not come into the picture until the 1980s, when the largest reduction in monkey use had already been achieved. The use and killing of monkeys (or other animals) for human benefit is not something that required explicit justification in the 1950s when polio vaccine production started. Rather, not producing the polio vaccine because it is produced using nonhuman animals would have been unthinkable. In polio practices, the monkeys used became research materials, quantifiable and increasingly adapted to human scientific needs (e.g. through controlling their reproduction), thereby reproducing the ‘animals as resources’ material-discourse and human/animal dichotomy. In day-to-day intra-actions between humans and monkeys however, this dichotomy was also challenged, for example in instances of play.

**Animals as Laboratory Objects: Analysis of the Power Discourse**

Tereza Vandrovcová

In this lecture I will introduce the main outcomes of my dissertation thesis which encompasses a critical discourse analysis of the power correlates of expert knowledge and other factors that can hinder the open and unbiased discussion concerning the ethical aspects of the use of nonhuman animals in biomedical experiments. First I will draw upon my research as I analyzed scientific texts to reveal how laboratory animals are socially constructed as scientific objects and I will briefly describe the effects this has on the perception of their moral value.

Next I will introduce results of a qualitative research based on a series of semi-structured interviews with critics and advocates of animal experimentation, such as animal rights activists and laboratory workers who conduct experiments on animals.

During my analysis of the interviews with laboratory workers I came to the conclusion that people from my sample were absolutely convinced of the necessity and legitimacy of current practices, that they have a tendency to suppress animals’ individuality when describing their work, that lab workers deem their critics as being uninformed and incompetent at entering into the discussion, and they admit to being unfamiliar with their opponents’ arguments. It is not surprising that based on their beliefs about the necessity of animal research, strengthened by laboratory culture of objectification of animals that they are socialized into, they have a strong tendency to disregard ethical issues and marginalize critical opposition. It also seems that they are thoroughly unaware that they may be biased this way.

Activists interviewed for purposes of my research stressed ethical arguments based on the principles of justice and on the rejection of human supremacy. Methodological arguments pertaining to the imperfect transferability of research results obtained from animals onto human patients, as well as the availability of alternative methods, were also cited by the activists. Activists from my sample felt they are not welcome in the discussions about animal research and some of them even mentioned they tried to start some form of cooperation with animal research supporters but without any success. Again, this is not very surprising given what laboratory workers thought about animal rights activists. I conclude that better understanding of barriers which hinder open discussion between animal research supporters and critical opposition can help us contribute to the progress of both ethics and science.
Wrongful discrimination of animals
Jari Kärkkäinen

Wrongful discrimination sets individuals discriminated in a worse off situation than their rightful place would be. This causes them either absolute harm or relative harm or both. Absolute harm might be physical harm, such as suffering caused by violence, loss of material goods or social deprivation. Relative harm is harm in relation to peers, setting discriminated individuals in a lower capacity to fulfill their goals.

The paper will show we have good reasons to understand inconsiderate treatment of animals as wrongful discrimination. This is done by discussing two different definitions for discrimination. The first is Kasper Lippert-Rasmussen's definition stemming from political sciences emphasizing the relevance of the group discriminated individuals belong. The second one is Oscar Horta’s definition for discrimination with much less weight on the group relevance. Through examples will be shown that both definitions are suitable for understanding traditional discrimination cases such as infringements of disabled people’s rights to participate. However, group emphasis is problematic in cases where we are not accustomed to recognize group membership as a defining characteristic of the individual discriminated. Certain ethical choice or health critical diets, such as vegan or gluten free diets, form basis for grouping pupils in dietary groups in schools. If these diets are not respected, it’s evident these pupils are discriminated against, because they are set in a worse off situation than their peers. Dietary choices are not a thing we immediately recognize as a defining characteristic tying these pupils together. Alone, without more extensive context, such as religious or sacramental functionality, diet is a much weaker group membership emblem than disabilities are.

Furthermore, holding group membership as a crucial element in discrimination prevents us from understanding discrimination cases where individuals are not recognized beyond their group. International discrimination is one example of this unrecognizability of individuals. Individual people in faraway countries or regions are seen as peoples rather than persons forming those peoples. International policies affecting them are therefore not seen or understood as discriminatory. Rather these policies and their consequences are thought to be neutral parts of the international relations.

Also common animals with abundant populations are often seen as species, not individuals forming the species. When individual mallards are seen as the species mallard, there conceptually is only one individual, namely species mallard. One individual does not constitute a meaningful group, because all the group characteristics are at the same time the individual's characteristics. There is no distinction between the group and the individual and therefore no room for the shared group emblems to attach.

For abovementioned reasons we should consider a definition for discrimination without the burden of the group membership. In the paper there will be demonstrated that Horta’s definition with less weight on group relevance gives different and possibly better chances to handle these problematic cases. Especially the case of inconsiderate treatment of animals as discrimination becomes clear.

10:40 – 11:10am POSTER PRESENTATIONS + ORGANIZATIONAL PRESENTATIONS
Foyer POSTER: Other-Than-Human Ontologies: Of Ancestor and Clan Animals in AlterNative Storytelling
Amina Grunewald

Native epistemologies and ontologies are closely connected to North American tribal lands and worldviews. Native land and its non-human relationalities are an indispensable resource of Indigenous survivance and sovereignty in North America. Modes of Indigenous knowledge (production) connected to an all-my-relations paradigm based on land and various human – other-than-human relationalities are visualized in Native activist artworks that promote public access to distinctly political agendas of lawful land claims and tribal sovereignties within Euro-American settler nation states through the depiction of animal ancestors, clan animals, and other-than-human transformer figures. Contemporary visual cultural production of these relationalities serves not only as alterNative heritage production and archive but also as contemporary evidence production over land claims and unique worldviews outside anthropocentric human hierarchies.

Nativarious artworks by Marianne Nicolson, Jordan Bennett, Cory Bulpitt and Larissa Healey shall serve as iconographies of anticolonial protest and collective tribal affirmation of extra- anthropocentric worldviews that include other-than-human beings as relations, thus confronting Euro-North America and its asymmetrical and mere commodity relations with non-human animals.

My paper will be informed by Indigenous methodologies, American Cultural Studies and the concept of artworks as agent to discuss other-than-human ontologies as cultural and spiritual decolonial imperatives – re-imagined specially for Indigenous audiences to sustain them, and for non-Native audiences to converse with them in a step-by-step decolonizing discourse.

Room B Presentation by Djurens Rätt
The Activists’ Perspective: concrete + creative ways of challenging the anthropocentric city

Arternes Aarhus [the city of the species]

How to voice the political interests of a bumblebee? How can an owl take part in a public meeting? Meet a group of activists who are currently experimenting with establishing interspecies democracies through very concrete and creative initiatives. While unfolding stories, and lessons learned, activists from “Arternes Aarhus” will facilitate a discussion on the potentials and the shortcomings of promoting nonhuman agency through activism. These novel experiences from Denmark can serve as inspiration to anyone – researcher or activist – who are interested in the compromises and imperfections to be faced when attempting to disrupt human dominance and open new doors for nonhuman resistance and change. “Arternes Aarhus”, roughly translated as ‘the city of the species’ is an initiative launched in spring 2017 in Aarhus, the second biggest city of Denmark. Arternes Aarhus operates quite differently compared to traditional animal rights groups in that they are focusing on giving voice to the wild rather than the domestic - nonhuman animals as well as plants and fungi.

Presentation by the European Confederation of Human Animal Studies

11:15 – 12:30pm  PANELS 9 + 10

Panel 9: Critical Problematising in Animal Politics

Naughty Fido: canine transgression in the Surveillance Society

Delia Langstone

This paper considers how, in the same way as human animals, nonhuman animals are increasingly finding themselves the objects of routine, technologically mediated surveillance. In 2016, a pioneering DNA registration scheme was launched in London: PooprintsTM is designed to systematically gather samples from offending dogs and to identify them, and therefore their owners, for punitive action. The launch of the scheme gave rise to much mirth in the press, not least because of the location of the pilot. TV news and the national press gleefully reported that there would be ‘Pugshots’ of the worst offenders’. The scheme has been flagged up as a badge of considerate dog ownership yet, far from being a laughing matter also one that can be franchised to tie up with diverse income streams being described as advantageous in the age of austerity. In 2017, it has been reported that this scheme is to be rolled out in other areas and is moving from being voluntary to being mandatory with the enforcement of Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) necessitating outlay from dog owners to be able to access protected ‘public spaces’. PSPOs have been described as ‘geographically defined ASBOS’ that have come into force under the Anti-social behaviour and policing Act (2014); they often work to criminalise activities that were not previously considered illegal. Within surveillance studies, the surveillance of nonhuman animals has often been overlooked either focusing on epidemiology or being side-lined as being something on the periphery of human-animal behaviour. This paper argues that some forms of animal surveillance are subject to surveillance creep and result in social sorting and curtailment of freedoms of both animals and their human animal companions. It investigates this phenomenon and considers the ramifications of animal surveillance, drawing on news media sources and on interviews with those involved in the scheme.

Humane Jobs: Towards Multispecies Wellbeing

Kendra Coulter

Worlds of work have a significant impact on the lives – and deaths – of other species. The expansive human-animal labour terrain is quite heterogeneous as workplaces where animals are present can be violent and oppressive, compassionate and thoughtful, or something more complex and uneven. For-profit industries producing commodities for human consumption are where and why the largest numbers of animals are subjected to short lives of intense suffering. As a result, and given the simultaneous damage done to human workers, the environment, and public health, critical animal studies scholarship is replete with critiques of such spaces and industries. Yet in addition to critiques, more intellectual and political work is needed to develop and foster solutions and alternatives. Paid work is central to people’s lives and all contemporary communities and countries. Therefore along with condemning problematic employment practices and industries, we ought to be proposing and articulating alternatives.

To these ends, I have developed the concept of humane jobs: jobs that benefit both people and animals. I propose humane jobs as both a direct response to the ubiquitous-ness and severity of human-animal harm, and as an opportunity to envision and cultivate more ethical political economic relations. In other words, the concept of humane jobs can be enlisted responsively and proactively to help envision and create more just, sustainable, and solidaristic multispecies societies. In this paper, I synthesise the foundational tenets of my vision of humane jobs, and consider a) the roles of/for human labour that helps animals, b) how to replace harmful practices and patterns with ethical alternatives, and c) whether animals can be engaged as co-workers in some collaborative workplaces. By interweaving feminist political economy, a multispecies approach to labour process theory and care work, my concept of interspecies solidarity, and a commitment to praxis, I offer conceptual fodder and practical ideas. I strive to honour both utopian or ambitious aspirations and pragmatic possibilities, and recognize the importance of work, work-lives, and lives.
From public indignation to emancipatory critique
Mathias Elrød Madsen and Marie Leth-Espensen
This paper deals with situations where the killing of particular nonhuman animals causes massive public critique and indignation. The paper seeks to advance an understanding of how this critique and indignation constitute a potential in terms of challenging the oppression, exploitation and marginalization of nonhuman animals in society (Cudworth 2011). In order to do so, one specific case is examined, namely the killing of the young giraffe, Marius, in Copenhagen Zoo, in 2014. From a Critical Animal Studies perspective, this paper deals with two general obstacles in this and similar situations: Firstly, the cynical and misguided dismissal of the empathetic reactions towards particular nonhuman animals and secondly, the anthropocentric nature of the otherwise commendable critique of the killing of particular non-human animals. We will suggest that the potential of the Marius-debate lies in the indignation shared by the many critics of the killing, but that theoretical support and argumentative rhetoric is needed in order for the indignation to be channelled into an emancipatory critique. An attempt to provide this theoretical support and argumentative rhetoric is made, which exposes the disarmament of the critique and make the case that it is not only reasonable but also crucial to empathize with nonhuman animals the way people did with Marius. We will argue, that although the injustice Marius suffered cannot be rectified, we can learn from it. By critically engaging with the disarmament of the critique, and by arguing for the sanity of opposing the casual killing of a nonhuman animal, we seek to demonstrate how Critical Animal Studies scholars and animal liberation activists can intervene in situations where anthroparchal routines and relations (Cudworth 2011) are momentarily disrupted. These situations should be viewed as opportunities to affirm people in their moral inclination for compassion. In this paper we apply the sociology of critique proposed by social scientists Luc Boltanski, Laurent Thévenot and Ève Chiapello, which offers a strong theoretical and methodological framework to Critical Sociology, informed by ordinary actors’ critical capacities. Generally, we find that a greater focus on actors would be valuable within Critical Animal Studies. In this regard, the sociology of critique could have a significant place in the field, enabling critiques of anthroparchy grounded in the situational indignation of actors.

Panel 10: Theoretical perspectives on advocating animal liberation
Is appealing to climate change and environment an effective advocacy strategy to reduce oppression of nonhuman animals? A discussion on evidences and arguments
Núria Almiron
The dilemma regarding what are the best arguments when advocating for nonhuman animals is a permanent source of controversy. Communication scholars, social marketing experts and social psychologists have recurrently stressed that the perfect strategy simply does not exist; effectiveness depends on the public you want to influence, and there are as many different publics as potential strategies. Inevitably, the perfect strategy is the one best adapted to our target. However, attempting to identify triggers of social change that can be influential on a wide range of targeted audiences is not a futile task. To this respect, one of the arguments most widely used in the struggle to reduce oppression of other animals is the environmental impacts of our speciesist practices, particularly the impact of the agribusiness industry on global warming. It is well known that the FAO’s notorious report Livestock Long Shadow (2006) has been followed by an already long list of academic, governmental and non-governmental researches supporting the claim that exploiting animals for food is extremely polluting and amongst the most important, if not the most, causes of global warming. This important data has ever since been used as a strong point against human exploitation of other animals. Animal scholars and advocates, including the author of this paper, have progressively added the environment to the justice and compassionate approaches in the defence of nonhuman animals to reach larger audiences, attract the interest of media and influence human habits. Nowadays it is very common in advocacy campaigns and academic discussions to use climate pragmatic and utilitarian messages (emphasizing human self-interest in preventing global warming) along with, or even in place of, more radical and ideological messages (emphasizing justice, abolition and cruelty toward other animals). US scholar Carrie P. Freeman (2014), for instance, in her research on the arguments and effectiveness of the US animal rights movement, includes the environmental destruction in her recommendations for framing animal foods as a problem (following injustice and cruelty/suffering frames). In the advocacy field, Philip Lymbery (Compassion in World Farming) has been for instance putting a great emphasis on the environmental impact of the industrial animal agriculture in his books Farmageddon. The True Cost of Cheap Meat (2014) and Dead Zone. Where the Wild Things Go (2017). The best-selling quality of Lymbery’s work evidences the attractiveness for the public of such a utilitarian approach, and thus the undeniable impact of the environmental message. However, the real, long-term effectiveness of environmental arguments is unclear. Research has shown that an effective argument for quick behavioural change may not always trigger a lasting change. Some studies suggest that food practices sustained on ethical principles produce stronger commitment to a vegetarian/vegan diet, and that this commitment remains longer (for instance Hoffman et al, 2013, or Radniz et al, 2015). It is also true that research has been so far usually focused on comparing health, not environmental, arguments vs ethical arguments. This paper will elaborate on this topic to contribute to the discussion of whether environmental protection in general, and climate change mitigation in particular, are effective claims for a long term behavioural change. To this extent, I will first discuss the most relevant experimental evidences addressing behavioural change and vegetarianism or veganism. Second, I will
elaborate on the environmental message to identify what are the weak and strong points of using this frame as a pragmatic approach towards the abolition of animal exploitation.

**The Doings of Emotions in the Struggle Against the Speciesist, Patricolonial System**

Jonna Håkansson

My paper presentation makes visible how we can loosen up the dichotomous understanding of feelings creating the border between human and nonhuman. It sheds light to the attitudes of specicism and the structural dimensions of oppression. It also addresses the importance of avoiding constructed dichotomies, and feelings of shame with the risk to create numbness, as a step in the direction towards an intersectional feminist struggle for the rights of all animals.

The struggles of social movements are sometimes fragmented and shattered, resulting in not forming accurate strategies. I find theories about emotions, decoloniality and diffractive promising when it comes to analyze and form activist strategies against what I call the speciesist, patricolonial system. This is a system based upon speciesism, patriarchal power and white supremacy.

An intersectional and diffractive understanding of power relations and oppression urges us to see it as one oppressive system with different effects for different individuals and groups. At the core of this system is the divide human/nonhuman. Only some beings are seen as fully human, everybody else (nonhuman as well as human) is made more or less nonhuman, more or less justified to oppress. By pushing some individuals into the realm of nonhuman they are made the dualised others, possible to use through a web of intimate power relations.

Inseparably bound up with the divide human/nonhuman is the dichotomy rationality/emotion. Theoretically Sara Ahmed’s (2004) phenomenological understanding of what emotions do breaks down this border between emotions and rationality, by making visible the emotional and embodied aspects of rationality. How can emotions be used as an analytical tool and strategy against the speciesist, patricolonial system?

To address this question I use a diffractive methodology. Together with other AR-activists within Djurrättsalliansen (The Animal Rights Alliance) I was part of creating a movie (Djurfabriken), hoping to mobilize emotions toward nonhuman animals through the multisensorial experience of film. I consider this an attempt to move beyond experiencing bodies as separate entities, creating interaction between different types of bodies.

The movie was shown within several workshops consisting of feminist vegans and vegetarians to analyze which emotions were made possible or impossible, and the consequences of these emotions in their way of acting towards nonhuman animals. Starting from the theories of Ahmed combined with posthumanist theories I took the body as my starting point.

 Appearing was two dimensions of pain within the groups. One was closely tied up with feelings of shame, steaming from an often heavy focus on identity and the self rather than on approaches and practices, blocking other feelings and resulting in a sort of numbness towards nonhuman animals. The other dimension of pain tended to get close to frustration, tightly bound up with feelings of anger, appearing as acts of resistance, since anger results in a reading of the speciesist discourse as a construction and thereby possible to change. Using emotions as a strategy points in the direction of the importance to create possibilities for us to feel together with each other, without appropriating the feelings and experiences of others by making them into objects of our feelings. Rather it urges us to act upon the pain of others. To make this happen we need a broad and nuanced movement against all forms of oppression, targeting the logics of the oppressive system.

**Rules of the Pack – Moral Practices Among Canids**

Dorna Behdadi

In this paper I will argue that some non-human animals, namely canids (dogs, wolves, coyotes and related species), can be said to be moral agents and morally responsible.

As most debates concerning non-human moral agency and responsibility assume what one might call a ‘standard method’ (Eshleman, 2014) for applying criteria for moral agency and responsibility I want to suggest an alternative approach. Instead of setting my starting point to be determine whether a certain individual or group has certain capacities (like rationality, phenomenal consciousness and free will), I want to see if they are involved in moral practices. Could other species than humans be said to have moral practices?

A moral practice here refers to a broadly Strawsonian (Strawson, 1962) usage, i.e. a set of behaviors where the purpose of said practice determines whether or not someone is morally responsible. So, instead of asking whether other animals are phenomenally conscious, rational and free, I want to investigate whether they can be said to engage in practices of holding morally responsible.

My thesis statement is that practices involved in social play among canids are analogous to human moral practices (blaming and praising, reactive attitudes etc.), and by extension that canids can be moral agents and morally responsible.
**2:45 – 4:00**
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**Panel 11: Interspecies Communities**

**Organize and Resist with Farmed Animals: Prefiguring Anti-Speciesist/Anti-Anthropocentric Cities**

**Darren Chang**

This paper focuses on terrestrial farmed animals and begins with the assumption that nonhuman animals live in a state of colonial war waged against them by humans. In this context, cities built by humans are constructed with weaponized architectures that reproduce violence against animals, and therefore exists as weapons of occupation. The aim of the paper is to imagine how cities could be remade from weapons of colonial occupation to become places where other animals could flourish. Drawing on lessons from the human sanctuary city movements that offer refuge for asylum seekers, I identify some ways in which farmed animal sanctuaries (FASes) are limited in dealing with the violent segregation between humans and farmed animals. For example, one of the obstacles that FASes fail to challenge are the speciesist segregation laws that exclude farmed animals from urban areas in cities, making them invisible to most humans and reinforce their status as lower-class animals. Relying on theories of nonhuman animal resistance, I offer prefigurative organizing at sites of informality as an alternative approach to fight for the right of farmed animals to exist in cities. Prefiguration refers to “the notion that our organizing reflects the society we wish to live in—that the methods we practice, institutions we create, and relationships we facilitate within our movements and communities align with our ideals” (Walia, 2013). Informality refers to gray areas or situations that are neither fully legal nor fully illegal in urban spaces. Illustrating through numerous stories of farmed animals living in cities against bylaws that prohibit their residence, I argue that these urban farmed animals exist in states of informality. Prefigurative organizing with farmed animals at informal sites would require building solidarity networks between urban farmed animals with traditional FASes, in order to transgress speciesist boundaries to subversively resist against human domination.

**Between Caring and Killing – Ambivalences in the Profession of Farm Animal Veterinary Medicine**

**Julia Gutjahr**

Although animal farming is embedded in an (increasingly problematized) ambivalent human-animal relationship, and veterinarians play an important role in animal agriculture, livestock veterinary medicine as a specific healthcare profession has received little attention from sociology so far. Sociological research about people working with livestock animals has shown the ambiguous nature of these relationships (Wilkie 2010). Professional work in animal healthcare also is, as in human medicine (Merton 1976), framed by ambivalences. However, these differ from other health professions: The specific constellation of actors and professional values, which aim to serve both people and animals, lead to particularly complex moral issues in daily work (Atwood-Harvey 2005, Swabe 2000), which include, for example, euthanasia (e.g., Sanders 1995, Rohlf/Bennett 2005). Farm animal medicine specifically holds conflicting demands. Animals are functionalized as commodities, and economical constraints determine the value of healthcare, but veterinarians also work with sentient beings and have a curative mandate (c.f. “Caring-Killing Paradox”, Arluke/Sanders 1996: 85).

This paper aims to answer the question: How do farm animal veterinarians make sense of job-related ambivalences? The paper introduces a theoretical classification of ‘ambivalence management’ about the ways veterinarians cope with conflicting requirements of their professional work. The basis is an empirical study with qualitative, semi-structured interviews with 16 cattle veterinarians in Germany. The results show, that vets form complex perceptions about ambivalences and develop a professional identity with strategies to deal with them, such as normalization and distancing techniques.

**From Animal Bio-politics to Post-Livestock Animals – Narratives and Practices of German Sanctuary Farms for New Human-Animal Relations**

**Markus Kurth**

In Northern Germany, somewhere between Hamburg and Berlin, is the “Lebenshof”1 “Land der Tiere” located. Here lived the hen Vrieda. An animal rights undercover film team rescued her more dead than alive, her wing had to be amputated and she suffered from different ills. But Vrieda will be remembered as a hen with a strong will to survive. Also, the turkey Georg lives here. Because of his functionalized farmed animal genetics, he has to carry an enormous breast part. Results are a reduced mobility and a raised disease susceptibility. But he will be remembered for his character as a rowdy and caring stepfather as well. How is that possible?

Animal subjectivity is a good topic to demonstrate the intersection of society, media, and culture, as mentioned in the call. Medial representations of individual animals mostly exclude the category of the farmed animal. The practices of biopolitical and genetical manipulation of factory farmed animals try to erase their individuality for the sake of a strong factory farm discipline. Representations like undercover investigations can only show the subjectivity of these animals as suffering victims. And new representations of these animals will not succeed, until they can represent a new culture of living with farmed animals.

---

1. The “Lebenshof” is a sanctuary in Germany dedicated to rescuing and caring for farmed animals. References to “Land der Tiere” are a play on words, combining the names of two important figures in the animal rights movement in Germany.
I want to argue that these new representations and practices can be found empirically on German sanctuaries for farmed animals. As a central result, out of the liberation or rescue of farmed animals not only new lives arise but a new category for these animals. Post-livestock animals still have to struggle with the livestock biopolitics inscribed in their bodies, but are also recognized as subjects with individual needs and interests by the activists of the “Lebenshof”. Being neither pets nor livestock, the caring relations with post-livestock animals introduce a new category of human-animal relations. But how represent sanctuaries this new animal category and these new practices of relation?

Based on a combination of fieldwork and a discourse analysis of the publications, discussions, and social media activities of some “Lebenshöfe”, I compared in my Master thesis the biopolitics of farmed animals with the narratives and practices of the sanctuaries. Following my material, I assume that the little stories and updates about individual animals on social media build fragments of animal biographies, which are crucial for the recognition of (post-)livestock subjecitivity. Using the theoretical framework of Donaldson and Kymlicka as well as a (post-)foucauldian understanding of the “Lebenshof” as a subjectivation regime, I identify three intertwined narratives about these post-livestock animals. Reading farmed animals not only (1) as passive victims but (2) potential subjects with (3) a wounded subjectivity and agency, can be a key for a change of the societal perception of farmed animals. There is a strong force and a promising strategy in creating images and stories of post-livestock individuals who struggle with their bodies which were not intended to survive the date of the slaughter, but did.

**Panel 12: Animal symbols, reconstruction and resurrection in literature and art**

*Elizabeth Costello’s Dilemma is very real: A few observations on the problematic relationship between Critical Animal Studies and the field of literature*

Claudia Alonso Recarte

Critical Animal Studies (CAS) has, in recent years, gained prominent ground in academia, and literary scholars have been amongst the most proactive in the attempt to integrate it in their field of expertise. It is my contention, however, that literature as a field of research and as an aesthetic taught in higher education presents a series of inherent characteristics that greatly problematize the extent to which primordial themes and concepts such as animal consciousness and/or sentence and animal ethics can be fully comprehended. J.M. Coetzee evoked such limits through the somewhat cryptic character of Elizabeth Costello, particularly in *The Lives of Animals* (1999). Costello fails to discursively and conceptually link the urgency of animal ethics to neither literature nor philosophy (despite her own background as a novelist). Her effect over the academic community is perplexing, and her message comes off as the ramblings of an old woman.

Elizabeth Costello functions as a symbol from which to initiate an in-depth discussion on the difficulties that literature faces in assimilating the nonhuman other as a full, sentient subject. The aim of this paper is to identify, classify and evaluate what those problems are, and to initiate a constructive debate as to how literature can truly reflect and become an instrument through which to study animal subjectivity (and consequently, inspire exegeses from an animal ethics perspective). I first begin with a few observations on how CAS is perceived amongst literary scholars. I argue that although considerably potent within the British, American and Scandinavian networks, CAS is still very much in its embryonic stages in Mediterranean universities, and as such is often met with contempt by the (literary) scholarly community. I then focus on the literary artifact itself, as a discursive construct in which determining factors such as rhetoric, form, style and genre, among many other elements, contribute to a suspension of disbelief that would in theory invite the reader to gaze at the nonhuman other differently (and ideally, more justly). Yet literature’s traditional treatment of the animal through anthropocentric symbolism and anthropomorphism has proven a difficult obstacle to overcome, to which one must add the very limitations imposed by human language, that which articulates literature. However, (and somewhat in defiance of Thomas Nagel’s conclusions in his brilliant essay “What Is it Like to Be a Bat?”), I argue that varying manipulations of literary language and speech can surrender more ontologically accurate portrayals of certain species. Through a brief analysis of animal narratology as a representative form of literary exploration of animal consciousness, I discuss how, through their particular strategies regarding the treatment of language, some authors may have succeeded more than others in verbalizing the sentence and consciousness of nonhuman others. I conclude with a few remarks on the need to theorize more about the essence of interdisciplinarity to allow CAS to reach its full potential within the academic sphere and the teaching environment.

*Reading Animals Literally: The Activism of Desymbolization*

Maria Trejling

In human society, nonhuman animals tend to be seen as symbols of something that they, in themselves, are not. Fur on a coat is a material object that represents the immaterial idea of style rather than what it actually is: remains of a living being that is now dead. A deer that is shot by a hunter is immaterialized when the killing of it is turned into a symbol of skill, luck, or a return to nature. A Sunday roast is not perceived as a skinned and cooked corpse, once the body of a living individual; instead, it embodies immaterial values such as tradition and family. Thus, even when nonhuman animals are put to material use, this is done to them by means of turning...
them into immaterial symbols, rather than seeing each of them as what Derrida calls “this irreplaceable living being.” Similarly, in literature nonhuman animals have traditionally been read metaphorically, usually as representations of the human unconscious or of “primitive” cultures. Admittedly, literary animals often do have a metaphorical function within literature, but that does not mean that a critical reading of them has to stagnate at the level of metaphor. In fact, such an interpretation is often a failure to acknowledge the physical presence of the animal character in the narrative. Hence, reading literary animals literally has at least two effects. Firstly, it can reveal new aspects of the text by changing its inner dynamic. Secondly, and in this context more importantly, reading literary animals as living beings comparable to the human characters of a text functions as a model for desymbolizing real animals, recognizing their individuality. I will discuss this in relation to one passage respectively from two literary texts: Women in Love by D.H. Lawrence and The Cat by Colette. In both examples, a nonhuman animal is abused by a human, and both scenes tend to be read metaphorically. However, when the animals of these passages are literalized, the dynamic as well as the moral of the scenes change. This will show how merely focusing on nonhuman animals in literature is insufficient if our aspiration is to end the abusive human exploitation of real animals; what is required is an engagement with each of them—real and literary—as an individual and agent, present in literature and society as itself rather than as a symbol. Jacques Derrida. The Animal That Therefore I Am. Trans. David Wills. New York: Fordham University Press, 2008. P. 9.

The Choir of Isaac van Amburgh and his Animals
EvaMarie Lindahl
In this paper I will present the art project After Isaac van Amburgh and his Animals which is the first chapter of three that together will form the main body of the practice based doctoral project Re-Framing the Non-Human Animal in Art Production at the Centre for Human Animal Studies at Edge Hill University, UK. I will discuss the use of anthropomorphism and empathy as an artistic method while writing the history of artworks from the perspective of non-human animals, and read and present the text-based artwork The Choir of Isaac van Amburgh and his Animals. In art history we are used to see non-human animals depicted through paintings from the beginning of humankind to today. They are mostly present to tell the story of one or several humans. Horses fight our wars, lions are placed in the centre of menagerie paintings, dogs sit on the lap of their queen. But it is not only the visuality of animals that plays an important part in the history of art telling the story of humans. Their physical bodies are also used as material when slaughtered and picked apart and turned into brushes, paint and glue. The non-human animals are present in every part of the artistic process. Yet at the same time very much silenced. The exhibition After Isaac van Amburgh and his Animals is made with the intention to break this silence by writing an alternative art history from the perspective of the non-human animals forced to take part in art history. An attempt of writing this alternative art history is made in the text-based artwork The Choir of Isaac van Amburgh and his Animals, based on the oil painting Isaac van Amburgh and his Animals (1839), by the animal painter Edwin Henry Landseer (1802-1873). The painting focuses on the final part of one of the performances of the lion tamer Isaac van Amburgh, when he together with seven caged animals, enacts the bible verse Isaiah 11:6: “The wolf shall live with the lamb, the leopard shall lie down with the kid”. In The Choir of Isaac van Amburgh and his Animals the non-human animals within the cage of the painting tell their alternative history through a collective we and I. Together they tell us how the lion tamer Isaac van Amburgh forces them into obedience through a combination of violence and kindness with the help of a crowbar, a whip and forced starvation. They tell us of the consequences of art. As an extension of this presentation a short guided tour of some of the artworks at the Bishops House in Lund will take place.

4:15 – 5:30pm Panels 13 + 14
Room A

Panel 13: Interspecies politics
You see we’re all political animals, or: The importance of moving from nonhuman animal rights to interspecies democracies
Eva Meijer
Proponents of nonhuman animal rights usually want to establish just treatment of other animals through installing laws that would protect their basic liberties. In this scheme, humans design the laws involved, and other animals depend on humans to interpret them and speak for them. Even proposals that ask for extensive reformulations of nonhuman animal representation, for example in the form of trustees or proxies, such as official advocates and ombudspersons, added by institutionalized systemic accountability by ethological experts, media, animal advocates and others, still start from the idea that humans act on behalf of nonhuman animals, and not from the idea that nonhuman animals can, or should be able to, express themselves politically. This is unfortunate, because nonhuman animal political participation is important for nonhuman animals, and for democratic reasons. Other animals speak, and act politically, and this needs to be taken into account if we want to move beyond anthropocentrism. Extending existing political structures and institutions to incorporate nonhuman animal interests and voices can form a starting point for building new relations, but in order to develop a non-anthropocentric society, we will also need to develop new political practices and institutions with them. In my presentation I will first outline why political nonhuman animal participation is important, and how we can begin to extend existing political structures to include nonhuman animal political voices, broadly understood. In the second half of the talk I will focus on developing new political interspecies experiments, which
can inform existing political structures, and can function as a starting point for new political practices and institutions. I discuss existing situations in which humans and other animals co-shape the grounds for interaction, and explicate their political value, and I discuss the potential of farm sanctuaries as spaces for further political interspecies experiments.

**The Swedish “Meat norm”: Obstacle to political reform**

Jana Canavan

This presentation outlines the initial cornerstones and problem formulations of my newly started PhD project in CAS and Political Science at Lund University.

The aim of the project is to examine the socio-political implications of continuing to uphold the Swedish “meat norm” to explore how underlying power processes and values upholding meat normativity are implicit to constructions of human liberty. The Swedish “meat norm” refers to normalised animal consumption specific to the Swedish context. Scrutinised as a hindering factor to a significant reduction of meat consumption, this project critically examines how conceptualisations of individual choice derived from taken for granted notions and values of human liberty are related to the instrumentalisation of animals and nature.

I argue that the fact that meat consumption is perceived as individualised, personal choice risks a depoliticisation of its negative socio-political impacts on the environment, social inequality, and public health. The large-scale killing of animals for food is a systemic issue and its endorsement of violence intersects and does not only affect the animals but reinforces socio-political issues on various levels. So is animal agriculture a driving force behind pressing environmental problems such as climate change, biodiversity loss, air and water pollution, deforestation, and unsustainable land and water use (FAO 2006, Weis 2013). It moreover contributes to malnutrition and hunger affecting marginalised groups of humans, as crops fed to farmed animals could directly be used for human consumption (Cudworth 2011).

Therefore, political intervention is needed in order to redirect consumption patterns, as argued by various representatives referring to harm caused by intensified and globalised animal production (FAO 2006, KTH 2015). One of the key responsibilities of the state is to govern for the common good of the public, future generations included. Being faced with the societal and environmental costs of meat eating, the question arises whether and how governments should interfere to work towards a reduction of meat consumption to approach greater public good. Little attention has been paid to researching the complexity of these underlying power processes in culturally specific contexts to determine the advantages and challenges of political intervention.

The lens applied here is that through carnism (Joy 2010), a sense of entitlement is created which suggests that choosing what or whom to eat is entrenched in conceptualisations of human liberty. I argue that such speciesist and anthropocentric conceptions of liberty obstruct political intervention to reduce meat consumption and to challenge current ideas about other animals as expendable resources. Re-examining how and for whom liberty is constructed and deployed within the discourse of Swedish meat normativity reveals dualist reasoning seeking to uphold “the distinction between human freedom and animal necessity” (Emel and Wolch 1998). Understanding implicit epistemic assumptions about social order is relevant to understand our relation to animals and the environment, but also to marginalised human groups and future generations.

**Judicial attitudes towards animals**

Opi Outhwaite

The field of animal law has developed rapidly in the past 15 years, with epistemological roots in environmental law, human rights law and ethics. Much work in this field seeks to promote (in the case of advocacy) or assess (in the case of academic work) the extent to which the law does or could achieve particular standards of animal health, welfare or conservation; the moral and ethical position of animals within given legal codes; and — an issue of increasing prominence — the opportunities for the law to recognise certain rights of non-human animals. In recent years there have been several cases, in countries including the USA, Argentina and Brazil, in which courts were asked to grant writs of habeus corpus to species in the great ape family.

Separately from analysis of the legal systems applicable to animals and the individual in-struments which determine the ways in which animals will be managed, controlled or cared for, the decisions of the courts in relevant cases have profound relevance to the status of animals in the law both individually (for the specific animal(s) in question) and more fundamentally in developing the way that the law conceptualises and responds to animals. As well as the explicit reasoning of judges, underlying attitudes and assumptions will influence the outcome of cases in the field of ‘animal law’. This paper will present work in progress examining these judicial attitudes. The paper will focus on key cases in animal law, analysing the judicial reasoning evident and what this implies for the position of animals in the law. This work forms part of a larger project which seeks to move beyond an assessment of the adequacy of the law with respect to given issues and instead to analyse case reports to examine the language used by judges and what it might mean for the development of animal law and especially for the development of ‘nonhuman rights’. This analysis aims to reveal underlying ethical, moral and legal assumptions about the differences between human and nonhuman animals, the fundamental aims and scope of rights and the conceptualisation of animals.
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Bullfighting as an unethical dark tourism practice in Mexico
Alvaro López & Jafet Quintero

Bullfighting is a Latin-American cultural element derived from both the cult of the bull as a deity and its ritual sacrifice, which was brought by Spanish people, since they conquered some parts of America Continent, as a "recreational" practice. Nowadays, bullfighting is a public display consisting on fighting bulls either on horse or by foot in a closed ring-shaped area for this purpose, called Plaza de Toros. The Fiesta Brava as it is known by the vernacular mind, is promoted as a (zoo)tourism resource for those visitors who wish to deepen in the cultural patterns of some Latin American countries, including Mexico. The presence of this ritual not only strengthens and legitimizes the power relations among humans and non-humans but also has created domestic and international tourist fluxes as travelers are looking to live the experience of being in a bullfight as spectators. In Spain, for instance, there are tour operators specialized in excursions of tauroturismo (bullfighting tourism), so that travelers discover the world of the essence and passion of the art [sic.] of bullfighting through a unique experience. These agents organize and assemble closed packages from the visit to different bullfighting rings, museums of the activity and bullfighting-themed restaurants. However, this degree of that kind of tourist specialization has not yet been reached in Latin America, but it does not mean that for some places, bullfighting been an important activity for recreation purposes and tourism. Some of main spaces in Mexico where bullfighting is linked with the tourist activity are: The Monumental Plaza de Toros Mexico, in Mexico City and the Plaza de Toros de Cancun, in Quintana Roo. The first one attracts thousands of visitors yearly during two main seasons and every February there is a sole fight in order to celebrate the ring’s anniversary. The latter is a prime example of a tourist representation without reference designed on purpose to attract visitors and generate an economic impact. In both cases, the show is promoted by diverse tour operators and even recommended by online forums such as Trip Advisor as part of the tourist experience. Tauroturismo is framed and promoted as a plethora of cultural resources; nevertheless, if the activity is studied from a non-anthropocentric perspective and from the critical animal studies paradigms, it holds all the elements to fit within the theoretical framework of dark tourism, because the visitors go to the bullring with the purpose of witnessing the death of bulls and, eventually, of bullfighters. Traditionally, dark tourism has been defined as the travelling to places historically associated with death and tragedy, mainly of human-animals. But in this work the aim is to show that visiting places to witnessing the massacre and death of non-human-animals (bulls), and a remote probability of human-animals’ death (bullfighters), also it is an activity of dark tourism, if the consideration is from a non-anthropocentric perspective. Through netnographies and discourse analysis, this research shows how tourists engage in unethical tourist practices as the desire to experience a real cultural element that opposed to animal welfare, especially because the death of the bulls responds to a recreational and tourist needs of visitors, which are not primaries needs.

Speciesism Party: A vegan critique of Sausage Party
Matthew Cole

This paper provides a critical vegan reading of the spoof animation film Sausage Party (2016), which situates anthropomorphised food items as heroic outsiders struggling against seemingly invincible opposition (human consumers) in a plot recalling the predicament of numerous animated nonhuman animal protagonists such as The Lion King, Chicken Run, or Shaun the Sheep. These films are problematic for their reproduction of speciesist norms that legitimate the consumption of other animals. A key aspect of this process is their use of the absent referent (Adams, 2004b), which invisibilizes the fates of real exploited nonhuman animals through the distraction of anthropomorphised animal ‘characters’.

Sausage Party exemplifies the absent referent through the characterisation of products made from nonhuman animals’ bodies or reproductive by-products, and redoubles it by reanimating those bodies as processed food items rather than as the original animal victims. The film demonstrates Davis’s (2011) contention that nonhuman animals under capitalism are represented as yearning for their own oppression by humans, such that a higher state of fulfilment can be achieved post-mortem (see also Adams, 2004a; Cole and Stewart, 2017a). In Sausage Party, that fulfilment inheres in the humanisation of the characters; for example, their capacities for human speech, armed resistance, and their pursuit of sexual fulfilment. The latter centres on the romantic attachment between Frank, a ‘hotdog’ and Brenda, a ‘glamor bun’. This reductively heteronormative centre of the film pivots on patriarchal stereotypes of the active male pursuit of passive and reluctant females. Humanisation also emerges through the allegiance of the anthropomorphised food items to a hierarchy of national/racial stereotypes, in which ‘meat’ in the guise of the hotdog characters reside at the pinnacle, as phallic emblems of heteronormative masculine (US)American identity.

The critique of Sausage Party is contextualised by our on-going series of vegan critiques of popular culture (Cole, 2016; Cole and Stewart, 2014; 2016; 2017a; 2017b; Stewart and Cole, 2009), and has particular salience due to its comedic approach. Humour is a powerful discursive tactic for deflecting ethical critique (Weaver, 2011) and capitalism depends on such affective strategies for maintaining acquiescence to the commodification of nonhuman animals, given its lack of ethical grounding. The paper therefore reflects on the importance of critiquing speciesist humour and the intersected oppressions that it draws on and reproduces.
We cannot achieve social change by continuing to repeat the same actions. Strategies peak in effectiveness when they are new, so we must utilize our imagination to formulate new strategies and re-invent old ones. This discussion will analyze the structure of political organizing, effective creative campaigns, and display examples of artists who use their work as a tool for social change. While the presentation will focus on animal rights, most of the examples will come from other social movements that have successfully accomplished significant objectives.

Birgitta has 22 rescued cats in her back yard. Anders puts his Sphynx in a dress. Grålis the cat gets fed every day – but has never known a human being. Katt People is a photographic book, and exhibition, that explores the relationship between cats and people. It’s a bond that is intense and heartfelt, but also complex and unequal. I will talk about my work with the book Katt People, a photobook that portrays people and cats, and the connection between them. The intensity of cat love as well as the low status of feral cats. Further I will talk about my strive to upgrade the relationship between humans and non-human animals in my work.

This paper examines the role of food in communication by contrasting two contexts where food has been used to enact narratives of care about animals and the environment: The promotion of milk at special farm marketing events by the Swedish dairy industry and the performative distribution of vegan food by activists in the UK in anti-fast food campaigns. The first case focuses on a set of new marketing strategies introduced by the Swedish dairy industry following dramatic decreases in dairy consumption during recent years. Through so called pasture releases - celebratory events when cows are let out on summer pasture - and open farm events, the Swedish public have been invited out to dairy farms to learn about milk production, how the farmers care for their animals and the animals’ everyday life. Families with children and school classes are especially targeted for the events. During the events, food plays a central part in communicating the values of the dairy industry. Visitors are offered a glass of milk before they enter the barn to look at the cows being milked and the end of tour at the open farm events usually features a tasting of different dairy products. The food is symbolically presented using nostalgic ideas of local and organic dairy production, responding to larger societal debates about sustainability in the production of food and to the demands of care for the welfare of animals from concerned consumers (Stanescu 2014). These ideals corresponds to what has been described as the ‘new carnivore’ movement (Gutjahr 2013; Parry 2010; Potts, Armstrong & Brown 2013) and the ‘happy meat’ discourse (Cole 2011; Gillespie 2011; Stanescu 2014) that during recent years have been used to embody, shape and legitimate certain values and ideals of human-bovine relations and farmed animal subjectivities in meat and dairy industry settings (Cole 2011; Holloway 2007; Thierman 2010). We contrast this use of food to naturalise particular ways of eating and relating to animals with the performative role of food in vegan campaigning work, where it is used to highlight, trouble, and intervene in normative consumption patterns. We focus specifically on activist uses of “free food giveaways” in central urban spaces, which are routinely used as a tactic for disrupting consumer rhythms and engage publics in discussion about consumption (Mitchell and Heynen, 2009; Sbicca, 2013). Food has long been recognised as playing an important symbolic role in the construction of activist identity (Clark, 2009; ref), with the consumption of gleaned and vegan food being used to signify embodied resistance to the agricultural-industrial complex (Giraud, 2013). Food giveaways enrich and complicate understandings of food as a communicative medium, through elucidating how food does not just act as a symbolic marker but transmits meaning through opening up new communicative channels with publics. Through contrasting food’s communicative role in these contexts the paper builds on recent calls to understand how the dynamics of particular media ecologies can transform unexpected entities into powerful communicative actors – what Anna Feigenbaum terms ‘other media’ (Feigenbaum, 2017). These case studies illustrate the conceptual utility of ‘other media’ for grasping the dynamics of food activism, by elucidating the integral role of food itself in naturalising (or de-naturalising) particular understandings of care for animals and the environment.

**Room C**

**WORKSHOP: Creative Dissent: Why Imagination is Critical for Social Change**

Paula Meninato

We cannot achieve social change by continuing to repeat the same actions. Strategies peak in effectiveness when they are new, so we must utilize our imagination to formulate new strategies and re-invent old ones. This discussion will analyze the structure of political organizing, effective creative campaigns, and display examples of artists who use their work as a tool for social change. While the presentation will focus on animal rights, most of the examples will come from other social movements that have successfully accomplished significant objectives.

**Room D**

**KATT PEOPLE BOOK DISCUSSION**

Julia Lindemalm

Birgitta has 22 rescued cats in her back yard. Anders puts his Sphynx in a dress. Grålis the cat gets fed every day – but has never known a human being. Katt People is a photographic book, and exhibition, that explores the relationship between cats and people. It’s a bond that is intense and heartfelt, but also complex and unequal. I will talk about my work with the book Katt People, a photobook that portrays people and cats, and the connection between them. The intensity of cat love as well as the low status of feral cats. Further I will talk about my strive to upgrade the relationship between humans and non-human animals in my work.
Grandma’s Buns, Kitchen Experiments and Happy Stomachs: On Becoming-Vegan as an Affective Bodily Process
Sari Irni
As Donna Haraway notes, ‘no species is ever One; to be a species is to be constitutively a crowd, in symbiogenetic naturecultures, with no stopping point’ (2008, xxiii). Concentrating on Finland, this paper asks what living in such naturecultures means, affectively, at the face of climate change and increasing knowledge about the contradiction in what is known about nonhuman animals as agental beings and their current conditions in food production. In this situation responsible naturalcultural cohabitation and existence seems to require, among other things, a radical transformation in food practices and politics. In the current situation, however, not enough political will has existed to enact effective political change (in subsidies or taxation, for example) that would support more ethical and climate sustainable food practices. Because of this, striving towards the transformation has been more or less a responsibility of activists and individual consumers. In this paper I discuss one such attempt towards transforming food practices.
I explore the process of becoming-vegan (or near-vegan, or exploring veganism) by a preliminary, qualitative analysis of feedback forms to the Finnish Vegan Challenge of 2016. Vegan Challenge (‘Vegaanihaaste’) is a continuous campaign organised by Finnish animal rights activists, where the participants take a challenge to try vegan food for one month. In January 2016, ca 1600 participants allowed their responses to the campaign feedback form to be used in research anonymously. In this paper I do not make an all-encompassing analysis of the feedback forms, but concentrate on the bodily and affective conditions within which participants make their food choices.
While rational argumentation about sustainable food practices and about ethical treatment of nonhuman animals as activist strategies are important, I suggest that it is crucial to also account for the affectivity of everyday practices and bodily experiences related to eating. Theoretically the paper draws from feminist scholarship that focuses on technologies and practices in (women’s) every-day lives and activism (Murphy 2012, Oinas 2014; Vehviläinen 2014) as well as on intersectional analyses of power and ‘cultural politics of emotion’ (Ahmed 2004).
In this paper I raise two main points, on the one hand about the challenges that contemporary power relations and food normativities can bring about in social situations for those striving towards veganism, and on the other, about becoming-vegan as an affective ‘opening up’ of one’s world that can experientially encompass much more than making rational or ethical choices. I suggest that focus on the notions of identity and identification or on rational choices are not fully able to grasp this affective transformative process that was depicted by some of the participants for example, as bringing about cheerfulness, ‘feeling lighter’, or even getting ‘clear conscience and unrestrained well-being’ where ‘the stomach problems have wholly disappeared’. I wish to discuss with the other conference participants what it entails politically and for activists to account for various affective and bodily aspects related to transforming naturecultures.

“Stop forcing veganism on Children”: not eating non-human animals as a force of moral panic in Estonia
Kadri Aavik
On March 23, 2017 an article based on an interview with the head of the Estonian Association of Paediatricians was published in a newspaper issued by Tallinn municipality. The article was titled “Dr Ülle Einberg: veganism forced on small children might be life threatening”. This piece of writing unleashed a series of other articles and editorials, as well as some TV and radio appearances on the same topic, involving mostly doctors, nutritionists and journalists, as well as some vegans on the other side. This was not the first attack on veganism in the Estonian public sphere, but thus far, the most intense.

In my presentation, I take a closer look at this media storm around veganism and particularly, around vegan children. I understand these events as an instance of moral panic. According to Stanley Cohen (1972, p. 9), “moral panic occurs when ‘...[a] condition, episode, person or groups of persons emerges to become defined as a threat to societal values and interests’. I aim to unpack as to how and why veganism and its association with children became constructed a source of moral panic in the Estonian society. How was this nation-wide fear mongering achieved? What argumentation was used and what emotions were appealed to and how? What was characteristic to the media articles and interviews declaring veganism as unsuitable and even life-threatening to children, was that they overwhelmingly did not rely on scientific evidence, presented half-truths and a number of false claims, infused with personal beliefs of their authors. Therefore, the concept of “post-truth” seems particularly useful in making sense of this moral panic. The Oxford Dictionary defines the concept of “post-truth” as an adjective “relating to or denoting circumstances in which objective facts are less influential in shaping public opinion than appeals to emotion and personal belief”. While presented as a concern over potential nutritional deficiencies in children, I argue that this attack against veganism was in fact political. The moral panic emerged as a response of particular food choices, seen as political, as they challenge the existing social order, in this case, human exploitation and use of other animals for food. Thus the concern was not about nutritional deficiencies per se, but those seen as resulting from veganism specifically. I contextualise this particular instance of moral panic within the broader medical discourse on nutrition (including national dietary guidelines) in Estonia, which deems veganism as unsuitable for human health and endorses the consumption of other animals.
PANEL 16: Animals and Media representations

The Anthropocene: Animals on Television

Brett Mills

In August 2016 the International Geological Congress was advised to declare that the Earth is now in a new geological epoch; the Anthropocene. This epoch recognizes human impact upon the planet, whereby traces of activities such as the Industrial Revolution and nuclear bomb testing while be evident in the biosphere for future generations. Scholars in many humanities subjects have drawn on the idea of the Anthropocene to examine humanity’s relationship to its environment; media and cultural studies have been notably absent in such endeavours. In this paper I outline television’s roles in offering representations of the non-human that legitimise an anthropocentric ethics. The devastation wrought by what the Anthropocene represents is enabled by screen media’s depictions of other species, and the prioritisation of the human above all else. As such, I argue, we should see such media as functioning as an Anthropocene. This Anthropocene will be explored primarily through the analysis of representation of wildlife in BBC natural history programming. Such programming, presented by the renowned David Attenborough, is commonly seen as encouraging environmental awareness and, as such, as progressive in terms of animal representation. I argue the exact opposite; that television is a medium whose technology is anthropocentric and which draws on representation of the ‘natural world’ entirely within human-centred contexts. Through detailed analysis of the representations on offer in specific moments from these programmes, the ways in which television both creates and normalises the Anthropocene will be outlined. This paper will note the significance for this approach not only for Animal Studies, but also for Media Studies, Television Studies and Film Studies. That is, while the stuff of a range of forms of media has repeatedly been interested in issues of representation, animals have largely been absent from this consideration. As such, these fields are themselves anthropocentric in their concerns and approaches. The Anthropocene, then, is not only a tool for analysing the programmes under discussion here; it will be posited as a significant and necessary intervention into the field within which I work.

Music and Speciesism

Martin Ullrich

Music can be seen as an interspecies phenomenon. Several musical traits are present in nonhuman animals. Many animal species sing, and there have been several attempts to present human music to nonhuman listeners and even to establish musical collaborations between members of different species. Nevertheless, there is also a strong tradition of constructing music as a purely human domain that excludes all other animals. While nonhuman animals are the metaphoric ‘others’ for many human musicians and aestheticians, the material basis for several musical instruments consists of animal parts. Eduard Hanslick, the famous author of the influential music aesthetic work The Beautiful in Music, has put it this way: “Nature does not supply us with the art-elements of a complete and ready prepared system of sound, bit only with the crude matter which we utilise for our music. Not the voices of animals, but their gut is of importance to us; and the animal to which music is most indebted is not the nightingale, but the sheep.” (Hanslick 1891) This is a striking example of a speciesist point of view on music. Nonhuman animals are at the same time rhetorically excluded from the musical realm and materially used to produce ‘human’ music. That, amongst other aspects, means that a vegan music culture has yet to be established. While issues like animal rights sometimes are raised in popular music culture, animal-free musical instruments are still very rare. One can imagine a growing demand for vegan musical instruments in the near future, but up to now the usage of animal parts in musical instruments has mainly been discussed in the context of protection of endangered species. While this is an important aspect, the ethical problems of killing individual animals for the production of musical instruments have rarely been addressed. A vegan grand piano has not yet been build, and there seems to be no vegan symphony orchestra at all. So, the replacement of animal materials in musical instruments is a huge challenge. The tradition of many instrument makers is dependent on animal parts and animal materials. Nevertheless, the substitution of ivory as the former typical key surface material in pianos shows that animal parts in principal can be excluded from musical instrument making.

PANELS 17 + 18

Getting down to the root of trouble: nonhuman animals in language

Karin Kunde

Debates in animal ethics often turn on the question if there is a fundamental moral difference between humans and nonhuman beings (e.g. Kulenkampff 2015, p. 45; Singer 2002; Nussbaum 2007; DeGrazia 2001). This paper does not examine if there really is a significant difference that would normatively justify the use and killing of nonhuman beings for human purposes. It is rather about the question if and to what extent human language serves to distinguish between human and nonhuman animals on the one hand and between nonhuman animals of same species and race (e.g. guinea pigs, dogs – especially bea-gles, horses) within different fields of human activities and practices on the other hand. The examina-tion’s special attention is devoted to moral implications that go along with the use of language in the latter case, claiming that the actual unequal treatment of e.g. a
horse as a pet or as a farm animal is also (but not only) enrooted in the labelling of a nonhuman animal as e.g. a pet or a farm animal by language. Up to now there has been some research on animals in language and literature (e.g. Waldow 2015) also under a linguistic perspective (Habermann 2015; Heuberger 2015) that recommends a mindful and re-flected use of specific terms and phrases when it comes to serious ethical considerations on animals and especially to whether or not nonhuman beings should have certain rights (mostly the right to live and the right of physical integrity). This paper comprises a generic linguistic-semantic analysis of German compounds which are used as conventionalized expressions (Goddard 2011) and often utilized to categorize domestic animals based on “what they are for”. Three of those compounds will be analyzed: Nutztier (which can be translated into English as either livestock or farm animal as well as working animal), Haustier (pet) and Laborstier (laboratory animal) in which {-tier} serves as the head of the compound and the constituents {Nutz-}, {Haus-} and {Labor-} modifying the head. Based on the semantic analysis this paper argues that there are at least normative traces within each part of the composite that add up to a new, dense meaning of significant moral relevance. In lexical semantics it is generally assumed that through the process of information compression in word-formation the resulting compound can gain a metaphorical character. The paper proposes that specific differences of practices in dealing with nonhuman beings – even of same species and race (e.g. dogs, living as pets but being also used in animal research laboratories) – are not only reasoned but also legitimized (not only) because of ethical primes that evolve out of the dense compound’s meanings. The aim of this examination is to critically reflect the principle of word-formation processes on a se-mantic level under an ethical perspective by the example of German conventionalized expressions and to scrutinize the legitimation of animal (ab-)use reasoned with the categorization of nonhuman animals by particular terms.

**Noticing, translating and deconstructing categories in history. Olympe de Gouges, the French revolution and the significance of the animal category**

Lisa Gålmark

The category of animals, materially and discursively, is seldom highlighted in texts on historical human relations although this category may be read as playing a significant part in the argumentation and the historical narrative. In this essay – a translated and concentrated version of my article in Sosiologi idag 43 (2013) 2 – Aristotle’s theory of natural slavery forms a background for reading texts by the author and literary activist Olympe de Gouges (1748–1793). During the French revolution, de Gouges, using references to animals and nature, defended especially two categories of humans excluded from citizenship: people of colour and women. Here, this discourse is read as opposed to the antique definition of the fully worthy human/citizen and as a contribution to a non-colonial philosophy which, with de Gouges as its messenger, was punished with the very means it sought to abolish: violence and killing.

Appendix to this essay: The playwright and literary activist Olympe de Gouges is the author of what may be the first European feminist manifesto, Déclaration de les droits de la femme et de la citoyenne from 1791. There are studies about Olympe de Gouges in French and in English, however in Swedish there is not much written. The first book title in Swedish on Olympe de Gouges, the foreword and drama Revolutionens rosenvatten (2016), is now made accessible in English in a digital edition: The Revolution’s Rosewater.

**Animal Ethics in Light of Judith Butler’s Philosophy: The Problem of Nonviolence**

Sanna E Karhu

Judith Butler’s recent work (e.g. Precarious Life 2004; Frames of War 2009; Parting Ways 2012, Notes Toward a Performative Theory of Assembly 2015) provides a powerful critique of violence in the context of contemporary global conflicts by asking whose lives count as valuable enough for protection against violence and suffering. Underlying Butler’s analysis lies her ethical notion of vulnerability, which is based on the idea that although all bodily life can be understood as precarious and thus vulnerable to violence, our ability to respond ethically to the suffering of certain populations is conditioned by the social norms that differentiate between “livable” and “unlivable” lives. During this period of her thought, Butler performs a significant shift that moves her critical focus from “the human” to the consideration of the normative construction of “livable lives” more generally. While this move would allow Butler to address the systematic forms of violence suffered by nonhuman animals as well, the question remains unaddressed in her thought. For this reason, several scholars (e.g. Wolfe 2013, Iveson 2012, Taylor 2008) have claimed that Butler’s theorization of “livability” is based on the human/animal divide and thus excludes animals from ethical reflection. Although I agree that Butler leaves “the animal” on the margins of her work, I contend however that her critique of violence offers us promising tools for theorizing the “unlivable” lives of animals. Since one of Butler’s key aims is to question normalized types of violence against those lives regarded as “unlivable,” and since she has started to problematize anthropomorphism in her later work, I argue that this extension is not only possible but also necessary for the consistency of Butler’s critique of violence. Yet, to fully understand the production of “unlivable” animal lives—or, what I call, following Donna Haraway, “killable lives”—I will pay specific attention not only to the question of how norms separate between human and nonhuman animals but also how they distinguish between different kinds of animals. Most strikingly, this normative hierarchy appears in the differential way we treat our pets and those we call “food animals.” Therefore, my focus in this presentation will be on examining and contesting the ways in which norms produce “livable” and “lovable” animal lives on the one hand, and “killable” and “consumable” on the other. I will argue
that a critique of the distinction between “livable” and “killable” animal lives has important implications for theorizing a more inclusive notion of nonviolence.

Room B

**Panel 18: Grief, Empathy, and the Psychology of Speciesism**

*Following a Beastly Trace: Aurochs and the Alphabet*

Seth Josephson

Once widespread among megafauna of Europe, Africa, and Asia; the “wild bull” or aurochs was the progenitor and wild “cousin” of domestic cattle (much as wolves are to dogs). The last known aurochs quietly perished in 1627 in the Forest of Jaktorów, a royal hunting preserve southwest of Warsaw. Through the records of royal gamekeepers it can be given the dubious distinction of being the first species whose extinction was witnessed and documented as it occurred. The large red and black animal was the last of its kind, but it’s descendant or near-cousin, the modern cow, is now among the most prolific animals on the planet. The impact of cattle on and the world at large (through their role in deforestation, pollution, and climate change) and on human bodies and culture (as a necessary part of the agricultural complex that gave rise to “civilization” as we know it) cannot be overstated. The aurochs however was an independent creature, building a habitat around itself in a way cannot fully know. In this talk I will present the aurochs as a figure of a lost “wild,” and consider how, despite its extinction and its near disappearance in human memory, it continues as a hidden presence in human cultural and material life. But, how do we best mourn the loss of not just an individual, but a whole species? Tracing the aurochs is a practice of imperfect resurrection. It is a returning of the aurochs to the only life they can now have, a symbolic one. Now only a trace of nonhuman life within human life, the aurochs offers an entry point to consider one of animal studies’ central problems: the obligation we humans have to other life.

**Affect Beyond Proximity: Empathy, Drone Targeted Killings and Humanely Slaughtered Meat**

Kurtis Boyer and Fabio Cristiano

The recent affective turn in political theory strives to affirm the centrality of emotions and affect in politics. Ascribing the lack of empathy to different social and moral constructs, these debates generally argue that our inability and unwillingness to be moved emotionally depend on the distances we create from others through social categories. These categories - national, ethnic, speciesist, etc. - sub tend our construction of otherness and disaffection. Accordingly, existing critique has mainly focused on putting these categories into question and rethinking the ways in which our political subjectivities are (not) mobilized by creating proximity to others. In the spirit of these debates, this article explores how the social construction of others through remoteness enables violent killing in the context of drone-targeted killings and humanely slaughtered meat. Albeit different, these cases convey similar insights into how the construction of remoteness between the source and the target of violence unfolds and justifies killing. At the same time, as both these constructions fail in removing bodies from affective experiences, we argue that the creation and maintenance of affective theatres encompass more than negotiating those social categories that make up for otherness. For this reason, and in line with work done in the cognitive sciences, this article suggests that a perceptual and embodied understanding of empathy needs to be integrated to those social constructivist approaches aiming to shed light on how political subjectivities are mobilized on emotional grounds in contrast to remoteness.

**Social Dominance Theory: A psychosocial approach to understand speciesism**

Daniela R. Waldhorn

Influential philosophers (Singer, 1975; Regan, 1983) have argued that animals that belong to other species than human should be considered members of a discriminated group since: (a) animals are actively or passively subject to social human structures; (b) animals have their own interests, at least, not to be harmed; (c) in determining the distribution of damages and benefits animals’ interests are not taken into account or are considered less important than similar human interests. The differential treatment towards animals is usually justified by appealing to similar narratives that have intended to justify other forms of discrimination, alluding, for example, to the lower intellectual capacities of the members of the subordinate group. Given the similarity with the unavoidable treatment received by minority human groups, this discrimination by specie was designated by the term ‘speciesism’.

From its very beginning, theoretical parallels have been drawn between speciesism and racism and sexism. Therefore, a general theory about human discrimination should ideally also explain species discrimination. However, social and psychological scientists have recently started to study speciesism, after having largely treated it as a non-issue. In that regard, empirical evidence is beginning to show that there are psychological mechanisms that condition the way we treat animals (Bastian et al., 2012; Ploos, 2003). Nevertheless, a general approach to speciesism from social theories is lacking.

In the field of social psychology, Social Dominance Theory (SDT; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) is the only theoretical framework that, so far, has attempted to address speciesism. SDT proposes a fruitful account of group-based social inequality. This theory suggests that discrimination is produced and maintained by the dynamic interactions between individual, contextual and institutional factors.
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According to SDT, Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) is a general desire for group- based dominance and inequality. SDO could explain the individual psychology of group- based discrimination. Recent studies have suggested that SDO is a key factor responsible for the significant association between ethnic outgroup attitudes and speciesist attitudes. This work aims to present various evidences that could lead to comprehend speciesism as a social phenomenon of discrimination. This review will follow the multi-level analysis proposed by SDT - (a) institutionalized practices that harm animals, (b) legitimizing myths that frame and justify a speciesist social structure, and (c) psychological predispositions that would favor behaviors of discrimination towards nonhuman beings. The application of social psychology in general and of SDT in particular, can expand the understanding of speciesism and its relationship to the discrimination of devalued groups of humans.
Abi Masefield
Abi Masefield has worked for the United Nations, European Commission and several NGOs as an advisor on international policies and programmes to address hunger and malnutrition for 25 years. She continues to work as an independent consultant while engaged in PhD research with Edge Hill University (UK) exploring the intersections of coloniality and speciesism in development discourse around food security and the right to food. After living in Ethiopia and India for much of her adult life, Abi currently lives with her family in the North of England. Abi has been a vegan for 27 years and has raised her three children (two of whom have now left home) as vegans from birth.

Alvaro Lopez Lopez
Alvaro Lopez Lopez is a Professor and Researcher of Geography of Tourism at the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM). He received his doctorate in Geography at the same institution and completed a postdoctoral fellowship at the University of Waterloo in Canada. His recent publications include Animal ethics and food consumption as part of the tourist experiences, the perception of tourist in dark tourism sites and the role of local population in tourist development. His research interests include Geography of tourism, animal ethics and Geography, local development and tourism and sex tourism. He is currently coordinating a research project about Dark Tourism Spaces in Mexico and has just completed a course on animal ethics.

Amina Grunewald
My postdoc research focuses on (alternative) animal ethics and and related archives and practices, as well as on animal resistance narratives of/about non-human animals, especially in North American, Asian-Indian, and Southern African cultures and related epistemologies, and ontologies. After having obtained my PhD dealing with North American Postindian self-designs at Humboldt-Universitaet zu Berlin and short-term PhD research stays in the UK and Canada, I’m currently publishing my thesis with some more publications in the pipeline, and temporarily teaching as an assistant at HU Berlin. Additional research interests are First Nations literature(s) and contemporary visual arts, material studies, memory studies, jazz/blues studies, science histories, and alterNative archives in general. I hold an M.A. in American/English, French, and Educational Studies of HU Berlin. I spend an amount of my M.A. and PhD studies at Goldsmiths College London, Philipps Universitât Marburg, Concordia University Montreal, and in Vancouver at the Museum of Anthropology, and various other public cultural spaces to investigate First Nations self-representation and trauma memory in texts and visual representations. I have obtained support by the Fritz Thyssen Stiftung, the GKS, and HU Berlin, winning the Jürgen Saße Award by GKS (herewith kindly acknowledged).

Anne van Veen
Anne van Veen is a PhD candidate in History and Philosophy of Science at Utrecht University, researching the history of animal testing and alternatives in the Netherlands between 1950 and 2016 from a critical posthumanist perspective. In addition, she works as a dancer and choreographer and part of the PhD research is being conducted using arts-based research methods. Website: http://annevanveen.com

Brett Mills
Brett Mills is a senior lecturer in Television Studies at the University of East Anglia, UK. He is the author of and articles on television’s representations of animals related to privacy, sexuality, medicine, and disability, and the forthcoming monograph Animals on Television.

Camilla Flodin
Camilla Flodin (PhD in Aesthetics, Uppsala University) is appointed researcher with the Humanimal Research Group at the Centre for Gender Research, Uppsala University. Her current research project is funded by the Swedish Research Council and compares Adorno’s conception of the art–nature relationship with ideas developed by the early German Romantics and Schelling. Flodin has published in, for example, Estetika: The Central European Journal of Aesthetics and Journal of Aesthetics & Culture, and her article on the importance of Hölderlin for Adorno’s conception of the art–nature relationship is forthcoming in Adorno Studies. She has previously been Senior Member at Robinson College, University of Cambridge (2014 and 2015). She has also been Visiting Scholar at the Faculty of English, University of Cambridge (2014), and at the Department of Philosophy, Columbia University (2010).

Claudia Alonso Recarte
Claudia Alonso Recarte is Assistant Professor of English at the University of Valencia (Spain), where she teaches literature. In 2012 she obtained her PhD at the Complutense University of Madrid with a dissertation on the mythography and historiography of jazz narratives, but eventually turned her attention to the field of Critical Animal Studies. She has written about the ethics of
art involving live animals, about the history of vivisection, and about eco and animal rights terrorism, and her current focus is on exploring literary theory criteria through the consideration of animal subjectivity, about which she is preparing a book. She has published in several journals on these issues (see a selection of publications bellow) and has presented her research in several national and international conferences. She is also part of the editorial team of an upcoming online journal to be published by IUSTEL, called *Journal of Animal Law and Interdisciplinary Animal Welfare Studies*.

**Daniela R. Waldhorn**

Daniela R. Waldhorn is a psychologist, holds a master’s degree in Developmental Cooperation and a master’s degree in Ethics and Politics. She is a Ph.D. candidate in Social Psychology from the University of Barcelona in Spain (danielawaldhorn@gmail.com).

**Darren Chang**

Darren Chang is a Master’s student at Queen’s University studying political philosophy, and is an active participant in the Animals in Philosophy, Politics, Law, and Ethics (APPLE) program at Queen’s, as well as the animal advocacy group Queen’s Animal Defence. From 2012-14, Darren worked as a research assistant at the UBC Animal Welfare Program, and has volunteered with various grassroots animal rights/liberation groups in Vancouver, B.C, Unceded Coast Salish Territories since 2011.

**David Pedersen**

David Pedersen started in the field of traditional animal rights philosophy, where he was concerned with the philosophical issue of bringing non-human animals into the sphere of moral concern, as exemplified by his first thesis: "The Moral Contract: Can you sign with claws and hooves?". He has since moved into the field of cultural branding, and recently finished his masters in Philosophy and Business Administration from CBS, with a minor in Social Entrepreneurship and Not-for-profit Management. His dissertation was entitled "Marketing and "Meat-a-physics": Managing an appetite for meaning in modern consumer society" and examines the cultural aspects of meat, it’s connecting with anthropocentrism and how an increased cultural understanding might help animal advocates address the exploitation of non-human animals. He is also an experienced campaigner, speaker and has among others feats, hosted the worlds first vegetarian training course for the Copenhagen association of butchers.

**Delia Langstone**

Delia Langstone is a Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Sciences at UEL. She is interested in the social history of technological development particularly new surveillance technologies, privacy, the social construction of the individual as a data subject and social sorting issues. She is a member of the Society, Technology and Inequality Research Group (STIR) and has contributed a chapter entitled ‘Myths, crimes and videotape’ in *The Myths of Technology: Innovation and Inequality*, (Peter Lang 2009) which is one of STIR’s *Technology, Society and Inequality* series of books. Delia is drawing together her interest in surveillance with that of our relationships with non-human animals. The research is investigating how surveillance has been more-than-human, not only through the use of technology, but in the range of ways in which non-human animals have been both tools and subjects of surveillance. It is looking at the relationship between animals and technology, and particularly, animals as the subjects and objects of surveillance. Delia has done some research looking at how wildlife - specifically British badgers - are ‘watched’ by wildlife documentaries, through the activities of badger protection associations and being tracked for culling. That is just one case study in this wider project. I presented two papers in Portugal on this research, one at the ‘Animals in the City’ conference in Almada, another in Lisbon at the ‘Human and Nonhuman Animals’ conference.

**Dorna Behdadi**

I’m a PhD-student in practical philosophy at the University of Gothenburg. My project concerns the moral agency and moral responsibility of non-human entities, where I in part consider the moral agency and responsibility of non-human animals.

**Elizabeth Price**

Elizabeth Price studies Political Science, with a concentration in American Politics, and Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies at The Ohio State University. Elizabeth focuses specifically on Appalachian regional socioeconomic conditions, the feminization of poverty, and images of rural Queer identities. Elizabeth can be contacted at price.1128@osu.edu

**Estela Díaz**

PhD, social researcher and professor in Economics and Business Administration (Comillas Pontifical University); animal activist; NGO advisor, and humane educator. In 2004 she began her professional life working in non-profit organizations committed to animal rights, social justice, and environmental protection. Graduated in Law and postgraduate in Sustainability & Corporate Social Responsibility and in Research on Economic & Business, Estela Díaz holds a PhD in Economic and Business Administration (Spain). Her research is mainly focused on animal rights movement, veganism, animal-human relationships, gender, ethical and transformative consumption behavior, corporate social responsibility & sustainable lifestyles; topics on which she has conducted research, presented conference papers, and published reports and scientific journal papers.
Eva Giraud
Eva Giraud is a Lecturer in Media, Communication & Culture at Keele University. Her research explores the mediation of environmental politics with a particular focus on ‘contentious’ activism, and has been published in journals including *Theory, Culture & Society, Feminist Review, Subjectivity and Convergence*.

Eva Meijer
Eva Meijer recently defended her PhD thesis in philosophy, titled ‘Political Animal Voices’, at the University of Amsterdam. In the thesis she develops a theory of political animal voice. She taught the course ‘Animal Ethics and Politics’ at the University of Amsterdam and is the chair of the Dutch study group for Animal Ethics, as well as a founding member of Minding Animals The Netherlands. Recent publications include a book on nonhuman animal languages, Dierentalen, and a novel about bird scientist Len Howard, Het vogelhuis. In addition to her academic work, Meijer works as a novelist, visual artist, activist, and singer-songwriter. More information can be found on her website: www.evameijer.nl.

EvaMarie Lindahl
EvaMarie Lindahl is a Malmö based artist and doctoral student. Her research project Re-Framing the Non-Human Animal in Art Production is practice based within the field of Critical Animal Studies, and is conducted at the Centre for Human Animal Studies at Edge Hill University, UK. Lindahl works with extensive drawing projects as well as with text. Her work is currently focusing on the subordinate position of animals within the system of art. In 2008, Lindahl received her Master of Fine Arts at Malmö Art Academy and has since then exhibited her work frequently. For more information please visit www.evamarielindahl.com

Fabio Cristiano
Fabio Cristiano is a doctoral candidate and lecturer at the Department of Political Science, Lund University (Sweden). His research interests lie at the intersection of international relations (IR), cyberwarfare and critical theory. He’s currently finalizing his manuscript on Palestinian cyberwar and hacking, engaging with the concept of jihad to explore how sovereignty and subjectivity are re-articulated in relation to virtuality. Fabio has also published on cyberwar, embodiment theory, Palestine, and gaming/augmented reality. At Lund University, he convenes various courses on IR theory, war theory, Israel/Palestine, development studies, research methods, and digital pedagogy.

Gino Jafet Quintero
Gino Jafet Quintero is a PhD candidate in Geography at the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM). His research interests include Geography of tourism, regional integration and Anthrozoogeography: links between tourism and animal welfare. His recent publications include Animal ethics and food consumption as part of the tourist experiences, Bullfighting as a cultural element of dark tourism, Transport and tourist integration in Central America. He is currently at the final phase of his PhD and works as a high school teacher of Human Geography and Economic Geography at the Modern American School in Mexico City.

Jonna Håkansson
Jonna Håkansson is a Master Student in Gender Studies, Department of Cultural Sciences at Gothenburg university, and an animal rights activist. She gives lectures on AR and feminism, and is involved with the Swedish organization Djurrättsalliansen (The Animal Rights Alliance). Combining experiences from practical activism with academic knowledge her research centers around activism and how to resist the speciesist patricolonial system. Starting from the notion of diffractivity and decolonality she explores the potential of emotions as an analytical tool and strategy of resistance. Her main fields of interest are Critical Animal Studies, Intersectional Feminist Theory and Posthumanism. Currently Jonna is doing her internship with Docent Helena Pedersen, focusing especially on an educational development project on Critical Animal Pedagogies. Together with Docent Juan Velásquez she introduced Critical Animal Studies at several courses in Gender Studies at Gothenburg university. She wants to be part of creating platforms for strategic activism targeting the animal industrial complex.

José De Giorgio-Schoolr
José De Giorgio–Schoolr is a cultural change facilitator, teacher in human-nonhuman relationship dynamics Learning Animals, Institute for Animal Ethics, Animals Studies and Zooanthropology, the Netherlands Email address: info@learning-animals.org

Iselin Gambert
Iselin Gambert (igambert@law.gwu.edu) is Professor of Legal Writing at The George Washington University Law School, where she teaches courses in legal communication and rhetoric and runs the law school Writing Center. She is a contributor to the book *Letters to a New Vegan: Letters to Inform, Inspire, and Support a Vegan Lifestyle* (Lantern Books 2015).
Jana Canavan
Jana Canavan is a doctoral student in Political Science at Lund University. Her main research interests lie within Critical Animal Studies, ecofeminism, and the intersectionality of oppression. Holding a master’s degree in Social Studies of Gender with a major in Political Science, her thesis titled “Intersectional oppression across species boundaries: Swedish dairy production as force of oppressive ideology and practice” critically examined the practices and speciesist conceptions of bovines abused in the Swedish dairy industry. Jana is one of the co-founders of the Lund University Critical Animal Studies Network (LUCASN) and she teaches in the undergraduate course called “Critical Animal Studies: Animals in Society, Culture, and the Media” at Lund University (jana.canavan@svet.lu.se).

Jari Kärkkäinen
Doctoral student in the University of Turku, philosophy unit. Working with the funding by Nessling Foundation. I’m working on a dissertation titled Intentional Minds - A Non-anthropocentric View of the Valuer and the Value of the Natural Complexes. In my work I argue that natural complexes, such as ecosystems, biotic communities and even species get their value through attribution by valuing agents. This valuing agency is dependent on intentionality, or directedness, of the mental states of the agent. Intentional valuing states are possible also for non-human animals. I also have a background in organizational activities, in animal rights (Animalia and Turku Academic Animal Rights Society) and nature conservation associations (Turku Nature Conservation Association).

Jessica Thiel
Jessica Thiel is an animal rights activist who took the course Critical Animal Studies at Lund University in the spring of 2017. She runs a small but growing youtube channel where she promotes the vegan lifestyle to her audience and informs about the animal industries. She is planning to start veterinary school this year and help build a bigger network of vegan veterinarians. Email: jessica@thiel.nu

Julia Gutjahr
Julia Gutjahr studied Sociology, Political Science, Musicology and Pedagogy at the University of Hamburg. She has been doing Critical Animal Studies for several years now, and among her research interests are ambivalences in the human-animal relationship, meat consumption, the interrelations between gender and animal exploitation, social theory and animals, and violence on animals in the agricultural-industrial complex. She is currently working on her PhD in Sociology about farm animal veterinary medicine and gender.

Julia Lindemalm
Julia Lindemalm (born 1984) lives in Malmö and works as a freelance photographer. She is holds a BA in photojournalism from Midsweden University. In addition to photography she has studied Critical Animal Studies at Lund University. In her work she explores the relation between humans and animals. Julia Lindemalm began visiting European zoos in 2011 and the result is a photographic reflection that is simultaneously personal and documentary. “Zoo World” is an exhibition portraying our relationship with animals in captivity on an existential level. It has been shown several times in galleries in Sweden. Her first book, “Katt People”, was released in December last year and shows cats and people and the multifaceted connection between them. For her work Julia Lindemalm has received a several grants and in 2016 she received the first Lars Tunbjörk Award.

Kadri Aavik
Dr. Kadri Aavik is lecturer in sociology at Tallinn University. Her research interests in critical animal studies are related to feminism, intersectionality and animal liberation, as well as the role of national dietary guidelines and food policies in promoting the consumption of other animals (Contact: kadria@tlu.ee).

Karin Kunde
Karin Kunde is currently holding a scholarship for writing her dissertation on agricultural ethics within the graduate school “Ein Dritter Weg zur Ernährung der Einen Welt” located at the Christian-Albrechts-University in Kiel (Germany) funded by Evangelisches Studienwerk Villigst e.V. Kunde teaches in the field of applied ethics, specifically environmental ethics, animal ethics, agricultural ethics, ethics in biology and theories of sustainability at the universities of Kiel and Rostock in Germany. She is associated member of the Department of Philosophy and Ethics of the Environment (Prof. Dr. Konrad Ott) in Kiel. Kunde’s main research interests are animal ethics, agricultural ethics, theories of justice and theories of responsibility.
Kendra Coulter
Kendra Coulter is an associate professor in the Department of Labour Studies and Chancellor's Chair for Research Excellence at Brock University in Canada where teaches the unique course Animals at Work. An anthropologist and award-winning author, her latest book is Animals, Work, and the Promise of Interspecies Solidarity. Her current research focuses on how to conceptualize and promote humane jobs and solidaristic multispecies cultures.

Kurtis Boyer
Kurtis Boyer is a PhD candidate in political science at Lund University. His dissertation research engages with the concepts of human empathy and cognition, and the role they have in informing our conceptions of, and relationship to, animals in politics. Kurtis currently serves as the managing editor for the journal Politics and Animals (www.politicsandananimals.org). He is also a co-founder of LUCASN (Lund University Critical Animal Studies Network) and co-teaches a course on Critical Animal Studies at Lund University.

Laura Fernández Aguilera
I studied social and cultural anthropology in the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. In my end-of-degree project, “Towards more animal worlds: a critical approach to the ontological binarism from non-human bodies”, I explored some similarities between oppressions from an ontological perspective (the common binarist way of structuring the world).
I am currently completing the MA in International Studies on Media, Power and Difference in Universitat Pompeu Fabra. My final Master thesis is about the effectiveness of certain kind of images and ways of communication in raising awareness and changing attitudes regarding Animal Liberation issues. I am a PhD Candidate at the Department of Communication at Universitat Pompeu Fabra, where I would work with the UPF-Centre for Animal Ethics. My main interests are the politics of total liberation, intersectionality, the feminist and de-colonial approaches to Critical Animal Studies, Animal Liberation activism and the effective communication against speciesism (laura.fernandez19@estudiant.upf.edu / lauferagui@gmail.com).

Leonie Bossett
Leonie Bossett is a phd student holding a scholarship of the Heinrich Böll Foundation Germany. She is member of the junior research group “Ethics of Science in the Research for Sustainable Development” at the International Centre of Ethics in the Sciences and Humanities (IZEW) at the University of Tübingen as well as of the working group Chimaira Arbeitskreis für Human-Animal Studies e.V., mainly situated in Berlin. As member of these groups she is co-editor of several anthologies about sustainability, sustainable lifestyles and Human-Animal Studies and the author of a monography about ethical questions concerning wild animals as well as papers about animal ethics. Leonie is teaching Animal Ethics, Environmental Ethics and Theory of Science at the University of Tübingen, University of Landau and University of Applied Science Nürtingen-Geislingen.

Lisa Gålmark
Lisa Gålmark is an independent freelance author and debater educated in history and philosophy (1996) with a gender perspective (2001) from Uppsala University and Stockholm University. She was the editor of cultural section and debate at the Animals’ Rights Magazine between 1989 and 1999; co-founder of the Stockholm Free Paper and editor of the cultural section in 2000–2001; columnist at the Metro paper 2001 – 2002; contributor to the cultural section of the Aftonbladet paper 2007- . She is an initiator and organizer of authors’ visits, among others Astrid Lindgren, Eeva Kilpi, Peter Singer, Barbara Noske; an elected member of the Swedish Writers’ Union and an elected member of the PEN, a World Association of writers, Swedish Centre. Her cultural study Skönhet & odjur, a feminist critique of the animal – human relationship (2005) analyses the oppressive relationship between humans and the category of animals including the subordination of human groups. The book employs an historical and sociological perspective, introducing and developing the issues of animal studies in general and in relation to feminism. In her work, the historical and current expression ‘like animals’ is deconstructed beginning with the role of the animal category in Aristotle’s theory in Politics. Lisa Gålmark is the author of research and essays on Lizzy Lind af Hageby (1996; 2014); Olympe de Gouges (2013; 2016); and she is a reviewer of non-fiction and fiction, speaker, editor, translator, author of books on vegan issues, critical power perspectives on ‘animal’ ethics, the economic environmental climate crisis and feminism. Currently she is an editor at Arimneste Anima Museum.

Marcus Ventin
My name is Marcus Ventin, and I am a PhD student at the University of Durham researching the ways in which welfare economics impacts upon farm animal welfare, as well as exploring the ways in which the discipline may be capable of bringing about improvements in animal welfare and changes in our relationship with the animal world.

Maria Trejling
Maria Trejling graduated from the Master’s Program in English Literature at Stockholm University in June 2016 with a thesis on animals in D.H. Lawrence’s novel Women in Love. She gave a paper at the International D.H. Lawrence conference in Paris in March 2017, and she will present another one at the SLSAeu conference with the theme “Empathies” in Basel in June 2017.
Marie Leth-Espensen
Marie is a sociologist and doctoral student at the Department of Sociology of Law at Lund University. Her research engages with the subject of animal rights, social movements and rights discourses. She is a co-founder of the Danish network in Critical Animal Studies (marie.leth-espensen@soclaw.lu.se).

Markus Kurth
Markus Kurth, M.A., sociologist, co-founded the German human-animal studies network “Chimaira – Arbeitskreis für Human-Animal Studies” in 2010. He co-edited henceforth three anthologies on topics of the human and critical animal studies and wrote several articles, especially on animal subjectivity and transformative human-animal-relationships. In addition, he is part of the editorial staff of the animal liberation movement magazine “Tierbefreiung” (markus.kurth@human-animal-studies.de).

Martin Ullrich
Martin Ullrich studied piano and music theory in Frankfurt and at Berlin University of the Arts. In 2005 he received his PhD in musicology. His main research area is the function of sound and music in the interdisciplinary context of animal studies. He presented and chaired at international conferences, among them Animals in History (Cologne 2005), Minding Animals I (Newcastle/Australia 2009), Arte e Natureza (São Paulo 2011), Animals and Aesthetics (Berlin 2011), Minding Animals II (Utrecht 2012), Minding Animals III (Delhi 2015) and Animal Biographies (Kassel 2016) and has published on animal music and the relationship between animal sounds and human music.

Since 2005 he was professor for music theory at Berlin University of the Arts. Since October 2009 he has been president of Nuremberg University of Music and since October 2013 professor for interdisciplinary musicology and human-animal studies at Nuremberg University of Music.

Mathias Elrød Madsen
Mathias has a MA in sociology from the University of Copenhagen and works within the field of Critical Animal Studies. He wrote his Master’s Thesis about the killing of Marius, the giraffe, in Copenhagen Zoo in 2014, examining the nature of the critique and justification of the killing. Mathias also works for animal liberation outside of academia as an activist in the Danish grassroots organization Go Vegan. Previously, he has worked with topics such as New Carnivorism, ethics, visibility and invisibility in ‘meat’-eating combining different qualitative methods.

Matthew Porges
Matthew Porges is an incoming PhD student in Social Anthropology at the University of St. Andrews. His research explores, among other things, the political relationships between human populations and their ecological contexts. He has conducted fieldwork in Morocco, Algeria, Western Sahara, and Mauritania.

Micha Edlich
Micha Edlich worked as a graduate student instructor in the Department of Modern Languages at Ohio University in Athens, OH, as a lecturer in the first-year writing program at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, and as an instructor in the American Studies Program at Johannes Gutenberg Universität in Mainz, Germany. In the academic year 2009-2010, he was a fellow at Columbia University in the City of New York. He is currently completing his dissertation on contemporary environmental life writing. Since October 2014, he has been a staff member at the Writing Center at Leuphana University of Lüneburg in Lüneburg, Germany.

Núria Almiron
Núria Almiron is Associate Professor of Communication at the Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF). Her main research topics include and merge the political economy of communication, the ethics of mediation, interest groups, and critical animal studies and environmental ethics. Her work has appeared in journals such as Journalism Studies, Environmental Communication, International Journal of Communication, International Communication Gazette, Triple-C, and American Behavioral Scientist. She is the author and editor of several books in different languages, including Critical Animal and Media Studies (Routledge, 2016 with Matthew Cole and Carrie P. Freeman). She is coordinator of the MA in International Studies on Media, Power, and Difference, director of the THINKClima research project and co-director of the UPF-Centre for Animal Ethics.

Onur Alptekin
Onur Alptekin, M.Sc. in Latin and North American Studies, is now Ph.D. student in Sociology at Koc University, Istanbul, Turkey. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Ortaköy Mah. Marmara Sitesi Yolu Marmara Sitesi C1 Blok D:2 34347 Beşiktas/Istanbul/Turkey. Contact: onuralptekin16@ku.edu.tr
Opi Outhwaite
Dr Opi Outhwaite is a Senior Lecturer in Law at the School of Law, University of Greenwich. Opi has over 10 years experience in biosecurity and environmental law. She currently leads the project ‘Understanding judges understanding animals’, funded by the Peter Har- ris Trust and most recently published ‘Neither fish, nor fowl: honeybees and the parame- ters of current legal frameworks for animals, wildlife and biodiversity, in the Journal of En- vironmental Law (April 2017).
Dr Outhwaite’s broader research interests focus on governance, natural resources and the environment including accountability of multinational corporations and public and private governance for health, agriculture and the environment. Opi has published widely in her research areas as well as undertaking numerous outreach and dissemination activities. She has a track record of providing research and consultancy for governmental and non-governmental bodies including as a member of the Electronics Watch Advisory Group and for the UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) and equivalent bodies in Tanzania and Belize. Opi is Managing Editor of the IUCN Academy of Environ- mental Law journal (‘e-journal’) and participates in several networks for international envi- ronnemental law and business and human rights.

Paula Meninato
Paula Meninato is a Philadelphia-based artist and activist. She graduated from Tyler School of Art with a BFA in Painting, academic honors, and a presidential scholarship. Her work has been exhibited in various galleries, including the Embassy of Argentina in Washington DC, Georgian Court University, The National Real Estate Gallery, Tyler School of Art, and the Da Vinci Art Alliance. Her paintings and drawings serve to address the complexity behind political issues through personal perspectives, with her current body of work focusing on animal ethics. Over the past ten years, Meninato has organized political events, including conferences and marches, for a variety of causes - including but not limited to animal rights, immigrant rights, LGBT rights, student debt, the anti-war movement, and the Bernie Sanders campaign. She worked as the Civic Engagement Coordinator for the Pennsylvania Immigration and Citizenship Coalition during the 2016 election. During the past year, she has given over 200 presentations to over 5,000 attendees on a diverse set of topics, including animal rights, immigrant rights, civic engagement, organizing, and creative activism.

Per-Anders Svärd
Per-Anders Svärd is a lecturer at the Department of Political Science, Stockholm University. He has a background in the Swedish animal rights movement, among other things serving as the President and Director of Djurens Rätt/Animal Rights Sweden, the country’s largest animal rights organization. His research has been focused on the historical discourses of the human–animal relationship in the field of animal protection politics.

Pinja Mustajoki
Doctoral Candidate on Visual Culture, Aalto University, School of Arts, Design and Architecture Helsinki, Finland

Saara Kupsala
I am a PhD Candidate in Environmental Policy at the University of Eastern Finland and a visiting researcher in Hanken School of Economics. In my current research project, I am studying meat companies’ marketing campaigns as regards to farmed animal welfare. I am also finalizing my doctoral dissertation on citizens’ and consumers’ perceptions about the use of animals in food production (kupsala@uef.fi https://uef.academia.edu/SaaraKupsala).

Sanna E Karhu
Sanna Karhu is an activist and a scholar who works in Gender Studies in the Department of Philosophy, History, Culture, and Art Studies at University of Helsinki, Finland. Currently, she is a visiting graduate research scholar in the Department of Comparative Literature, NYU. Her background is in social and moral philosophy, and her interdisciplinary research interests include feminist and queer theory, feminist ethics as well as critical animal studies. Her doctoral dissertation discusses Judith Butler’s theorization of norms, focusing particularly on the questions of violence and ethics. Her most recent publication “Judith Butler’s Critique of Violence and The Legacy of Monique Wittig” (2016) appeared in Hypatia – A Journal of Feminist Philosophy.

Sari Irni
Sari Irni works as University Lecturer in Gender Studies at University of Tampere, Finland. During 2015-2017 Sari is on research leave at University of Turku, Turku Institute for Advanced Studies (TIAS). Their current research interests include critical animal studies, food politics, cats, trans/queer/feminist theory, affective transdisciplinary encounters, science studies, material feminisms, and political histories of sex hormones. The time left from research and teaching Sari uses mostly with their rescued cats and also takes part in different types of activism, including the new Vegelupaus (‘VegePromise’) that attempts to get political decision makers to contribute to a transformation in current Finnish food politics.
Seth Josephson
Seth Josephson is a scholar of religion, science, and animal studies completing a Ph.D. at Ohio State University's Department of Comparative Studies. He can be contacted by email at seth.josephson@gmail.com.

Simon Gerlach
Simon Gerlach holds a master’s degree in psychology from University of Copenhagen and has international speaking experience. He has a great interest in Critical Animal Studies (CAS) and has attended CAS courses at both Lund University and Stockholm University. His research centers around issues of trans-species empathy, moral disengagement and moral inconsistency in human-animal relations. For more than ten years he has been involved in various forms of social justice activism. Currently he is working as a project leader on a Danish vegan challenge campaign, VeganerUdfordringsen. He is also co-founder and organizer of the Danish animal rights organization Go Vegan.

Tereza Vandrovcová
Tereza Vandrovcová is a PhD candidate in Sociology at the Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague. Her book “Animal as an Experimental Object: a Sociological Reflection” (in Czech) has been published in 2011. She teaches Social Psychology and Sociology at UNYP (University of New York in Prague) and Introduction to Animal Studies at UNYP, Charles University in Prague and Masaryk University in Brno. Her research interests include critical animal studies, social psychology, bioethics, qualitative methodology and sociology of science.

Terry Hurtado
Terry Hurtado organized the first anti-bullfighting demonstration in the city of Cali in 1996; since then has took all sorts of legal and non-violent direct actions against the bullfighting industry. Took part of banning of “pull-wagon horses” at county capitals of Colombia, and the use of wild animals in circus. Stopped the biggest horse parade of the country. Currently is member of the Federación de Liberación Animal. Runs the Animal Liberation School. Has undertaken several editorial projects and currently is director of Vida Libre (free life) magazine. Holds an MSc in Holistic Science. Works in the Indigenous Councils of the North Cauca and the University of Cauca. Some of the research interests are mathematics in indigenous communities and the water footprint of cattle in Colombian highlands. Participates actively in social and environmental movements (terry.animal@gmail.com).

Tobias Linné
Tobias Linné (tobias.linne@kom.lu.se) is Associate Professor at Lund University in Lund, Sweden, where he teaches courses in critical animal studies and is co-founder of the Lund University Critical Animal Studies Network.

Tobias Rein
I am a PhD student at the University of Basel, working on Karl Marx’ ethics and critique of morals. I have a M.A. in Social Theory and am a member of the Graduate School of Social Sciences in Basel. I am vegan since 2009 and follow the vegan and animal rights movement since then. Despite my academic work I write for BLAUFUX, the magazine of the Vegan Swiss Society (VGS) (tobias.rein@unibas.ch).
THANK YOU TO OUR SPONSORS AND SUPPORTERS!

1. European Association for Critical Animal Studies (EACAS)
2. LUCASN (Lund University Critical Animal Studies Network)
3. Chimaira AK (Human-Animal Studies)
4. ARIWA (Animal Rights Watch)
5. Djurens Rätt (www.djurensratt.se)
6. Dr. Bronner’s All-One!