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Plenaries

# Henry Buller, ‘The One and the Many: Interkingdoms, (un)Natural Participations and the Farm’

The singular ‘farm’ is increasingly a place of ever-greater multitudes, a deceptive and porous whole that is, in so many ways, very much less than the sum of its constituent parts. What might stand as a seemingly fixed entity or unit is, in reality, a constant flow and passage of multiple life (*zoe*) and individual lives (*bios*). To borrow from Heraclitus’ attributed aphorism, you can never really go into the same farm twice. Yet, farms are, arguably, amongst the most defining sites of contemporary human/animal relations. The vast majority of the 24 or so billion terrestrial farm animals that are kept and grown for human and other consumption at any one time, do so on farms, with an increasing proportion of them on large scale, industrial farm units. Here is where kingdoms most emphatically meet, collide, intertwine, entangle, respond; the sovereign and the beast, the beast and the sovereign. Three questions: who meets who on the farm, as what do they meet, and how does such meeting matter?

Mara Miele, ‘A version of emotions: the brave sheep’

Can a sheep be brave? Can we ‘discover’ which specific events might cause stress and fear in sheep when they live outdoors? Can sheep be trained to overcome these negative emotions? Can they become ‘braver’ and experience positive emotions when living outdoors? Emotions are difficult to define, to locate and, in the case of nonhuman animals, to measure. Their very existence is animating burning controversies among animal scientists. In this paper I will look at an experiment to measure sheep emotions: how they become an object of enquiry despite their elusiveness, how they gave rise to a version of emotions that was the product of a specific set of practices in an animal science laboratory in France in 2010. In the paper I will look at the choreography of animal science research and I will argue that the sheep *braveness* (or positive emotion) is the effect of the research practice where the sheep is enacted as a competent and learning subject. Then I will propose that the ‘brave sheep’ in her/his corporeal but also political, social, spatial and temporal complexity and multiplicity emerges in relation to the research design, researchers’ intuitions and capacity to be affected, as well as the artefacts, procedures and places when the research is conducted and I will conclude that the *authenticity* of animals’ emotions is best thought of as an accomplishment.

Rhoda Wilkie, ‘Working with Food Animals: Ambiguous Encounters and Neglected Labour at the Byre-Face’

How do people working with livestock think, feel and relate to the animals they breed, store, fatten, market and slaughter? To what extent are livestock just ‘walking larders’ and ‘tools of the trade’? Attending to the experiences of livestock handlers (e.g. commercial and hobby farmers, stockpeople, auctioneers and mart workers, vets and slaughter workers) has highlighted the ambiguous nature of and neglected labour associated with producing ‘food with a face’. This paper will draw on ethnographic and interview data to explore three emerging insights from the byre-face. Firstly, the commodity status of farm animals can be unstable in practice. Secondly, producing livestock for human consumption appears to rely on a number of productive and emotional paradoxes. Finally, byre-face workers also grapple with and may distance themselves from the ‘dirty work’ of turning animals-into-meat. Since such findings afford a more nuanced understanding of human-livestock relations and productive contexts, this may shed additional light on longstanding dilemmas and discussions about the production and slaughter of farm animals in contemporary society.

Panel 1

Richard Thomas, '“How you ought to keep your beasts….”: livestock healthcare and welfare in archaeological perspective'

Husbandry manuals of the medieval and early modern period provide tantalising glimpses of the concerns faced by livestock farmers when their charges became sick and provide advice on both curative and preventive healthcare. Such concern is not surprising, if one considers how fundamental domestic livestock were to the economy of households and communities in these periods. While such sources provide us with important insights, they are not unproblematic: in periods when levels of literacy were low and published media had a limited circulation (or were non-existent!), it is likely that most of the knowledge regarding animal healthcare was transferred as part of oral culture and is, thus, invisible to the historian. There is, however, another source of direct evidence that can make a contribution to this subject: the remains of animal bones from archaeological sites. Animal bones are ubiquitous archaeological finds, and from the Neolithic period onwards, most of the bones that are excavated come from domestic livestock. The study of these remains (zooarchaeology or archaeozoology) has long been used to reconstruct the nature of husbandry systems in the prehistoric and historic past and how these changed over time; however, they can also provide evidence of healthcare through the study of the signs of disease and injury (palaeopathology). The purpose of this contribution is to flag up the potential and limits of this line of enquiry: this will be achieved through the presentation of a series of case studies.

Abigail Woods, ‘Dairy farming, veterinary science and the bovine mastitis problem in Britain, 1930-2010’

Using bovine mastitis as a case study, this paper analyses the historical relationship between dairy cow production, disease and veterinary medicine. Mastitis is currently regarded as one of the most economically significant diseases of dairy cows. Around 40% of cows experience symptoms each year, a statistic identical to that recorded in the 1930s. In the intervening years, the disease attracted substantial attention in veterinary research and practice. This raises the question of why veterinary efforts apparently achieved so little. I address this question by analysing three interlinked developments: the evolving disease ecology of mastitis; the development of new antibiotic and environmental solutions; and efforts to intensify dairying through changes in breeding, husbandry and herd size. I show how, in favouring the emergence, spread, and problematisation of mastitis, intensification stimulated veterinary research, practice and the development of pharmaceutical products. In devising and applying methods of combating the more important elements of this complex disease, vets enabled intensification to progress, with unintended consequences for the ecology of mastitis. Dairy cow productivity and veterinary scientific efforts increased, but mastitis incidence remained the same. I conclude by reflecting on the implications of this finding for dairy farming, past and present.

Angela Cassidy, 'Representations and risks of humans and other animals in the One Health movement(s)'

My research in progress traces the emergence of “One World, One Medicine, One Health” as the latest in a long history of attempts to bring research and practice in human and animal disease together.  Increasingly visible in international media, policy and research funding, One Health aims to overcome disciplinary barriers in order to study and treat disease across the human/nonhuman divide, but questions remain about how this ambitious global rhetoric relates to research, policy and clinical practices in their local contexts. This paper analyses the representations of humans and other animals to ask “whose health” is prioritised in One Health? The imagery of One Health portrays particular versions of human-animal relations in different parts of the world as the implied sources, targets and solutions to disease risks. In particular, small scale farming involving direct human-animal contact, usually in the global South are contrasted with large scale, high-technology methods of intensive food production and distribution. However, within the alliances formed under the banner of One Health, contradictory versions of ‘health’, 'disease’, ‘medicine’ and ‘farming’ for both humans and animals are articulated, many of which directly question this implied hierarchy of risk and risk management. Finally, what are the implications for research, management and treatment of health/disease across the broader domains of the ‘human’; the ‘owned’ (including pets, farmed and food animals); and the ‘wild’?

Panel 2

Emma Roe, ‘The farm animal as a visceral “object”’

This paper argues for conceiving the farm animal as a visceral Œobject¹. This manoeuvre serves two purposes. Firstly, it develops further the study of the emotional lives of animals through approaching their bodies as materially affected through their personal lived-in embodied experiences. We already witness examples of how the farm animal production and processing industry recognises how meat quality is affected by the stress-levels an animal experiences. Equally, consumers are engaging with a material aesthetic ethics when purchasing food from higher welfare animals. Secondly, the agentive capacity of the farm animal body as a body of fleshy-parts becoming food is often not engaged with in this transgression from living animal to carcass to meat products. The viscera as various organs, tissues and muscles become meaningful in relation to comparative growth-rates, size, shape, colour and the tastes of different cultural appetites. Alternative perspectives on meat production, processing and consumption practices and how we study farm animal lives in relation to these will be offered through tracking how body matters and meanings are articulated and situated through the visceral ‘object’. This work develops ideas from the Œnew materialism¹ (Coole and Frost 2011) literature.

Roxanna Lynch, 'Caring for Farm Animals?'

In this paper I shall address the question ‘could we care for farm animals?’ from a care ethics perspective. The question can be read in one of two ways. It could mean, given the arguably larger epistemic gap between humans and other animals, could we ever treat *any* animals in a way that constitutes care (on a care ethics construal of ‘care’)? Alternatively, the question could mean, could we care for farm animals, given factors such as the number of other caring commitments that we have to members of our own species and the likely conflict of interests between humans and farm animals? Both forms of interpreting the question ‘can we care for *animals*?’ have generated answers in the negative from care ethicists. On Noddings’ account, animal’s alleged inability to reciprocate care renders them for the most part outside of the moral sphere. Furthermore, the partialistic stance of most care ethicists causes them to rank the needs of other species consistently below the needs of our own. I will aim to challenge these assumptions made by care ethicists and then attempt to describe what I see as some more promising routes for care ethics and farm animal welfare.

Panel 3

Lewis Holloway, Christopher Bear and Katy Wilkinson, ‘Robotic milking technologies and the renegotiation of situated ethical relationships on UK dairy farms’

Robotic milking machines are novel technologies that take over the labour of dairy farming. Replacing ‘conventional’ milking with a system that supposedly allows cows the freedom to be milked automatically whenever they choose, it is claimed that robotic milking has health and welfare benefits for cows, increases productivity, and has lifestyle advantages for dairy farmers. Such claims are contested, but the installation of robots establishes new forms of relationships between cows, technologies and farmers. This paper shows that established ethical relations on dairy farms are unsettled by this radically different technology, and that renegotiation of ethical relationships is an important dimension of how actors involved are re-assembled around a new technology. The paper draws on in-depth research on UK dairy farms, including interviews with farmers and other farm workers, and on-farm observational research. We explore the situated ethical relations which are negotiated in practice on dairy farms which have installed robotic milkers, focusing on the contingent and contested nature of human-animal-technology interactions. Industry approaches to assessing the ethical status of agricultural human-animal relations take a welfarist perspective, focusing on measuring animals’ behaviour and performance, using a predetermined framework of criteria against which any situation can be measured. We argue that ethical relations are situated and emergent, showing that ethical relations shift as the identities, roles and subjectivities of humans and animals are unsettled through the intervention of a new technology.

Richard Twine, 'Animals on Drugs – Understanding the role of pharmaceutical companies in the animal-industrial complex'

In this paper I want to revisit three previous critiques that I have made of much, though by no means all, bioethical discourse. These pertain to a faithfulness to dualistic ontology, a taken for granted normative anthropocentrism and the exclusion of a consideration of how political economy shapes the conditions for bioethical discourse. Since then others have also added to debates around bioethical humanism and the exclusion of political economy. Part of my argument around bioethical dualist ontology is to critique the assumption of a division between the ‘medical’ (human) and ‘agricultural’ (nonhuman) and to show various ways in which they are interrelated.  In this paper I deepen this analysis with a focus on transnational pharmaceutical companies with specific attention to their role in enhancing agricultural production through animal drug administration. Through reference to specific examples I argue that this case study underlines the importance to bioethics of taking the activities of such corporations seriously and of stressing a relational ethics that understands human health non-anthropocentrically but also takes animal ethics seriously. Indeed a failure to do so would leave the field of bioethics out of step with other similar contemporary ontological reworkings, for example, as found in the emerging One Health movement. More generally the animal-industrial complex is underlined as a highly relevant bioethical object that deserves more conceptual and empirical attention.

Panel 4

John Miller, ‘In Vitro Meat and Environmental Aesthetics’

Recent progress in research into the production of in vitro meat (IVM) has stimulated a significant volume of media reports and opinion pieces on this potentially transformative addition to the global diet. For the most part, commentators have been inclined to look optimistically towards an innovation that could be commercially viable within a decade. The promise of high-yield, cruelty-free meat with a substantially reduced output of green house gases seems like a magic bullet to many of our most pressing problems. From an animal rights perspective, however, IVM is perhaps not the ideal solution it at first appears. Animal products, specifically a growth serum ‘harvested’ from calves, are currently an integral part of a process that ultimately perpetuates the idea of animals as resource. Rather than addressing IVM’s ethical credentials head on, this paper takes a tangential approach by looking at the ways in which this postmodernization of meat production paradoxically serves to encourage a nostalgic attachment to traditional farming methods, often associated with a particular vision of environmental aesthetics. Consequently, IVM should be understood as part of complex cultural dynamics in which animal rights and environmental discourses intertwine uneasily around the question of how to eat well in the Anthropocene.

Kim Baker, ‘Picturing Pigs, Depicting Pigmen: how pig industry advertising strategies reveal the unseen idioms of farm animal production’

Over the last six decades British agriculture has embraced the paradigms of industrialisation and technologisation: both have been crucial to increasing the productivity of livestock farming. Against the backdrop of a highly competitive global marketplace contemporary pig farmers are offered a huge array of efficiency-boosting products with innumerable pharmaceutical, feedstuff and genetics companies vying for the attention, and cash, of would-be customers. But commercial advertisements placed in pig industry journals do more than just sell - to an anthropological eye they reveal the unspoken preoccupations of pig farmers and the stockmen who manage pigs. This paper provides analysis and discussion of several typical examples of advertising visuals. By drawing together a selection of advertisements derived from farming journals and ethnographic data collected during long term fieldwork on a large scale industrial pig unit it offers an account of the obscured idioms of pig production. I show how  the imagery embedded in advertisements provides unexpected insights into the way that the farm and the pigs themselves are understood by farmers and pigmen. In exploring the prevalent idioms of gender and professional performance, I propose that the farm is both more than, and other than, an exclusively technocratic locus.
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