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## Vinciane Despret, ‘Domesticating Wild Animals: The Case of Arabian babblers’

The “Arabian babblers” have been observed in the Neguev desert for more than 40 years. These birds live in cooperative groups. They offer presents to feed each other, they endanger themselves by mobbing raptors or by coming to the rescue of group members. They play and they also often dance together. All these behaviours have received various and controversial interpretations in the scientific literature. Following the actual field work, one may observe that these interpretations are closely linked to the way scientists observe the birds, or even deal with them. Different practices not only construe but actually “produce” different birds. Roughly said, some of the observers take a “subjectivist” stance and interact with the birds, others take an “objectivist” stance, and keep distance from them. Each of these practices has different effects, on the birds, and on the theories. These birds therefore appear just at the edge of the categories of wild/domesticated/feral, their identity seeming to change according to the ethologist who observes them.

**Sarah Franklin,** ‘Watching Sheep with Sheepwatchers’

Among the many behaviours Thelma Rowell has elaborated in her extensive corpus of sheep studies is the ways sheep communicate with head movements - a physical, or gestural, vocabulary she has argued may allow us to understand not only the mitigation of competition among sheep groups, but also the process by which groups of sheep decide when and where to move. Using Thelma's descriptions of sheep movements, and putting these into dialogue with the recent work of Donna Haraway, as well as the film based on Thelma Rowell's work made by Vinciane Despret, this paper explores how sheep watching can be put to use as a means of understanding animal communication as a technology.

**PANELS**

**Amelie Bjorck**, ‘Primate portraits. Anthropocentric Versus Negative Mimesis’

Photographed animals are often adored for their ”humanness”. In the kind of semi- commercial/semi-artistic portraits of apes that abound, from photographers like Jill Greenberg ([www.art.jillgreenberg.com/tagged/monkey-portraitsanimals](http://www.art.jillgreenberg.com/tagged/monkey-portraitsanimals)), the animals are often captured in poses that correspond with human conventions and portrait tradition, thereby facilitating comparison and identification. The viewer’s feelings of inter-species intimacy is encouraged, whereas dimensions such as the animal’s own history, and the asymmetries of power in the whole set up, is left out of the picture.

This paper, which makes an excursion from my literary primate studies, will discuss alternative ways of representation. Focus will be on a series of primate portraits by the Finnish photographer Perttu Saksa, called Echo ([www.perttusaksa.com](http://www.perttusaksa.com/)). For the series Saksa searched the closets of a number of natural history museums around Europe, to find discarded taxidermy monkeys and apes, most of them chimpanzees. His portraits of their bodies –sometimes frozen in the same kinds of anthropomorphic poses as mentioned above – evoke feelings in the viewer, but of a more complex kind. The theadbare bodies visualize and make present the histories of the apes, and their earlier relations to the humans that have killed them but also cared for their bodies. Saksas portaits thus become objects of human knowledge – just as the taxitermy apes where originally intended to be – but enriched with the undeniable signs of what human privilege costs. With a term from Martin Puchner, they enact a form of ”negative mimesis”, complicating the feeling of recognition, which is also always there.

**Alastair Hunt, ‘**The Law of Wild Surmise’

The argument in favor of legal personhood for animals, such as great apes, is that these animals possess complex cognitive capacities that entitle them to legal recognition as persons. The argument against such projects is it that complex cognitive capacities or not, animals are by definition not members of the human species, and hence cannot be persons. Against both positions, this paper argues that legal personhood depends not on the intrinsic properties of the entity in question, but on the entity’s appearance before the law. I make this argument by reading a scene from the 2011 film *Rise of the Planet of the Apes*, in which the protagonist, a chimpanzee named Caesar, says to a human being with whom he is engaged in a violent struggle, “No!” In the mute gaze of those witnessing the event, emphasized in the immediately-following close-ups of the witnesses’ faces, we see a Keatsian “wild surmise” of wonder at what surpasses expectation. This disoriented act of looking enacts, I argue, Jacques Rancière’s argument that politics properly speaking happens when those who are viewed as animals, and hence fundamentally rightless, appear in such a way that disrupts the established “distribution of the sensible.” Via a discussion of Hannah Arendt’s theory of revolution, I conclude that claims of any being—a human, a corporation, or an animal—to personhood are epistemologically equal and can be settled only through an aesthetic mode of appearance that itself allows all given legal judgments on personhood to be unsettled.

**David Wilson**, ‘“Samson making sport for the Philistines”: ‘wild nature’ in the music hall and circus’

The representation of non-human animals in a specific area of early popular visual culture - that of the music hall and circus - became intensely controversial in early 1920s Britain. A Performing Animals Select Committee met in 1921 and 1922 ‘to inquire into the conditions under which performing animals are trained and exhibited, and to consider whether legislation is desirable to prohibit or regulate such training and exhibition, and, if so, what lines such legislation should follow’. Then in 1925 the Performing Animals (Regulation) Act was finally passed. It was considered inadequate by prohibitionists, and their campaign continued. Some of the questions raised by this controversy provide an opportunity to study spectator behaviour. Relatively unpredictable wild animals such as the bear and even the hippopotamus, but especially the lion and tiger, were seen as the embodiment of nature, and the audience was always reminded of this. But the position of the subjugated wild animal on the stage or in the circus ring was ironic and deceptive. It is probable that the spectators were not supposed to understand what they saw, and did not. Spectator reaction to wild animal performance says something about the way human society’s behaviour and attitudes can be affected by contrived spectacle, and is based on what hundreds of thousands of people saw, enjoyed and then began to criticize at the beginning of the twentieth century.

**Lourdes Orozco,** ‘There and not There: Looking at Animals in Contemporary Performance’

Theatre is famously the place where we go to see and to be seen (from the Greek théatron: a place for looking). But how do we look at animals in the theatre? And what do we look at when they appear on stage? This paper is centrally concerned with visuality in the theatre (Bleeker, 2011) in relation to animal performance – live and otherwise. It aims to investigate how animals affect the ways in which we look and what we look at on stage, and in turn what we see and don’t see in a theatrical production. A journey through contemporary theatre and performance practice including the works of Rodrigo García, Romeo Castellucci, Pan Pan, the National Theatre production of War Horse, amongst others, will allow the paper to explore how the theatre’s means of signification, based on the direction of the gaze, are challenged when animals enter the stage. The paper argues that animals, inhabiting an in-between space amid the real and the theatrical, allow the spectator to look differently; while their imminent materiality expose areas of performance that might otherwise remain unseen.

**Karen Lykke Syse,** ‘Getting close: the sensory experience of deer stalking’

This presentation takes the gaze of a Forest ranger as its starting point. Rangers perform population control through counts, deer stalking, and culling; the job balances species conservation with deer stalking and requires both an aesthetic appreciation of and willingness to kill deer. A single ranger may shoot more than 400 deer per year. Although the ranger is required to use all his senses to perform this job, looking is his main sensory tool. The ranger’s eyes are fixed to the ground registering excrement and  scanning the hillsides looking for deer. Observation of the prey is extended beyond the capabilities of the human eye as it is sharply focused through a telescope, by binoculars, or through the scope of a rifle. Deer stalking has been criticized as a ocular-centric activity, and this paper questions the critique by arguing how deer stalking depends on sight as part of a sensory whole. Although spotting the deer triggers action, a successful stalker has to embody the visual and connect  it to sounds, smells and tactile information. Finally, a swift ethical judgement has to be made; to cull or not to cull.

**Dominic Duckett,** ‘Ubiquitous computing and its implications for livestock disease control’

Diseases of livestock are a perennial challenge but, in addition, new demands on disease prevention and control are emergent including at national and European scales. At the same time the ‘internet of things’ and ‘ubiquitous computing’ (Ubicomp) have opened up novel horizons of surveillance, changing the network of relationships between animals, farmers, regulators and consumers. At a national level whole populations of animals and their keepers have been corralled into regimes of surveillance. Microchips attached to or embedded in animal bodies create virtual identities monitoring movement histories of individual animals ‘from farm to fork’. Farmers are enrolled as intermediaries tasked with tagging livestock and capturing data. Animals have become visible at a population level in ever more detail, altering biopower relationships amongst and between animals and humans. Qualitative research incorporating interviews and focus groups with farmers and other stakeholders in Aberdeenshire and Orkney explores technological features of the beef industry from a cultural perspective. Focusing on livestock disease control the paper examines farmers’ cultural constructions of surveillance technology in particular electronic identification (EID), and investigates technology choices being made at the farm level. What Foucault has identified as ‘a proliferation of techniques directed towards the subjugation of bodies and the control of populations’ is developed as a lens to understand livestock disease control practices revealed in the data.

**Isla Forsyth,** ‘Observing the Obscure’

‘So accustomed are we to reject what the eye sees in nature, so dull and dead have we become as a result.’  (Cott, 1940, 2)

For Dr Hugh Cott - zoologist, artist and photographer - patient, painstaking observation was his most rigorous scientific method.  Hours of observing animals in their natural environs led Cott to understand that through near perfect aesthetic adaptations they can evade observation, exposure and capture.  Cott recognised that animals make their bodies obscure, melting into the backdrop through the techniques of cryptic coloration, form and patterning; the art of camouflage.  Due to the essentially visual nature of his science, Cott relied upon recording and analysing the different techniques of camouflage employed across various species, and for this his eyes were his most instrumental scientific tool.  But, as he found out animals can be the masters of obscurity, the eye so easily be fooled by well executed camouflage.  This paper will explore one man’s efforts - through his embodied experiences of observing animals in the field - to grasp the art and nature of biological camouflage.

**Nola Semczyszyn,** ‘Looking both ways: how visual acts alter what it means to see animals’

Looking, gazing, observing, scrutinizing—there are multiple visual acts that people can perform in a viewer position.  In philosophical discussions of looking at animals the focus remains almost exclusively on “the gaze” and its implication of power and control, particularly at zoos. Going to see animals in zoos is often dismissed as entertainment, with the suggestion that the viewing position a zoo-goer takes up is passive, epistemologically vacuous, or exploitative. Yet there is something powerful about our drive to see animals that is not exhausted by the desire to gawp at their otherness or be amused by their antics. In this paper I explore differences among visual acts, drawing from Ziff, Carlson, and Sibley to formulate a variety of viewer positions with divergent relational, epistemic and affective satisfaction conditions. I use this formulation to critique ‘the gaze’ and to analyze the presentation and representation of animals at zoos and in film, the two main ways we satisfy our yearning to see animals. I argue that these different viewer positions challenge our ideas of entertainment and misrepresentation in our visual engagement with animals, and suggest how re-examining these concepts could lead to more fruitful discussions of animals and vision.

**Brett Mills**, ‘Towards a Theory of Television Documentary Representation for Animals’

Animals - whether dead or alive - appear on popular television in a wide range of genres, including cartoon, cookery programmes and dramas. But perhaps the most 'respected' genre they appear in is wildlife documentaries, especially those produced by the BBC and presented by David Attenborough. Television Studies has been consistently interested in exploring issues of representation in documentary, especially as it is assumed that relationship of the viewer and the viewed is one of power. However, this work has consistently worked from a speciesist assumption which has ignored the non-human. This presentation aims to explore work on television documentary and tentatively suggest ways in which such analytical frameworks might be informed and affected by an approach that includes a wider variety of species. What would Television Studies have to do in order to develop ways of exploring the documentary that are not hegemonically anthropocentric?
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**Vinciane Despret** is a member of the Department of Philosophy at the University

of Liège, Belgium. She specializes in human psychology and ethology, the study of

animal behaviour, with a particular interest in humans who work with animals. She received her PhD in 1997 from the University of Liège; the title of her thesis was ‘Savoir des passions et passions des saviors.’ A prolific writer of articles and conference papers, Professor Despret was recently responsible for commissioning the huge exhibition “Bêtes et homes” at the Grande Halle de La Villette in Paris. Professor Despret has also been awarded two prizes: the prize for scientific humanities, granted by ‘Sciences Po’ in Paris in September 2008, and the Wernaers International Fund prize for research and the dissemination of knowledge.

**Sarah Franklin** has published extensively on the social aspects of new reproductive technologies. She has conducted fieldwork on IVF, cloning, preimplantation genetic diagnosis (PGD), and stem cells. Her work combines traditional anthropological approaches, including both ethnographic methods and kinship theory, with more recent approaches from science studies, gender theory, and cultural studies. From 2004 she she was Professor of Social Studies of Biomedicine and Associate Director of the BIOS Centre at the LSE until 2011. In June of 2011 she was elected to the Professorship of Sociology at Cambridge. Sarah has held Visiting professorships in teaching and research at the University of California, the University of Tarragona, the University of Hannover, and The University of Sydney. Her research has been supported by the ESRC, Leverhulme Trust, MRC, Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, Carnegie Foundation, European Commission, and the Wellcome Trust. Throughout her career she has worked closely with clinicians, patients, scientists and policymakers in an attempt to widen sociological engagement with emerging issues in bioscience and biomedicine. Since 2005, she has worked on a major project investigating the history of mammalian developmental biology in the UK in the post war period, with Professor Martin Johnson and Dr Nick Hopwood at Cambridge. Through her ethnographic studies and other writings, Sarah has contributed to a number of emergent fields in social theory including the ‘new kinship studies’, the feminist analysis of science, the anthropology of biomedicine, and the cultural analysis of new reproductive technologies.

**Chris T-T**

‘A national gem of a songwriter.’  
**THE INDEPENDENT**

‘Outstanding, indispensable genius. A modern-day Blake.’  
**THE SUNDAY TIMES**

Over the past decade, writer and music maker Chris T-T has been one of the most consistently acclaimed artists in British underground music. Emerging from psych-folk roots in the late 1990s, Chris first gained acclaim for sarcastic, city-obsessed urban folk. More recently he has developed into an influential figure of UK song; crossing barriers between punk, psych-pop and English folk, inspiring a generation of successful home-grown artists. Chris has released eight albums. He is particularly known for songs about animals, as well as his recently Edinburgh Fringe show, performing updated musical versions of A.A. Milne's classic childrens' poetry. Based in Brighton but restlessly mobile, he writes a column in national left-wing newspaper **The Morning Star** and has contributed to a range of books and magazines including **Huffington Post, NME, Dark Mountain**, **Louder Than War**, **Tooting Free Press** and **New Public Thinkers**. Alongside writing and touring, Chris also speaks regularly at conferences and runs seminars and workshops. Chris’ website is <http://christt.com>.

**Panelists**

**Amelie Björck** holds a PhD in comparative literature from Lund University, Sweden. Her research adopts intersectional and critical animal studies perspectives, mainly on modern and contemporary literature and drama. Since 2011 she has been pursuing post doc research on the relations between apes and humans in western literature after Darwin. Her studies have concerned primate metaphors versus materializations; primate novels and temporality construction; human-ape-relations in children’s literature, and the role of the face in literary primate encounters.

**Dominic Duckett** is a social researcher in risk at the James Hutton Institute in Aberdeen working within the [Socio-Economics and Geographical Sciences Group (SEGS)](http://www.hutton.ac.uk/research/groups/social-economic-and-geographical-sciences) and specialising in social theories of risk particularly as applied to livestock diseases. He joined the institute in 2012 to pursue his interest in the sociology of epidemiological risk and to contribute to the Scottish Government’s [Centre for Excellence in Epidemiology, Population Health and Disease Control](http://www.sac.ac.uk/epic/). Dominic’s focus is on farmer behaviour in relation to animal disease risk. Currently he is investigating technological dimensions of farmer risk management. Dominic gained a PhD from Lancaster University Management School where he studied ‘the social amplification of risk’ in the context of zoonotic disease. Previously he gained a Masters in Organisation Work and Technology also from Lancaster University. His first degree was in Philosophy from Exeter University. In addition to an academic career Dominic enjoyed a successful and varied career in information technology. He has worked in different sectors including the civil service, financial services and the technology sector. As an information systems specialist he became involved in risk management, risk audit and business continuity gaining professional certification through the Information Systems Audit and Control Association. This technology background is reflected in an on-going interest in the role of modern technology in the shaping of risk in society.

**Isla Forsyth:** As a lecturer in human geography her research interests in cultural and historical geography are wide-ranging and she seeks to explore the geographical dimensions of a series of themes, including biography, technology, fieldwork, conflict and visual cultures. Her doctoral thesis focused on the historical geography of modern camouflage in the British military.  This research explored the intersection between natural history, art, science and militarism in order to chart a multi-faceted biography of camouflage technology.  Through considering the more-than-human spatialities of camouflage's development, in nature and in war, the history of an ambiguous invention was uncovered, subverting a long dominant narrative of camouflage as benign, revealing a jarring technology, combining aesthetic and artistic appreciation with complex scientific theory, to guileful or most deadly effect.

**Alaistair Hunt** is Assistant Professor in the English Department at Portland State University in Oregon, USA, where he teaches British romanticism, literary theory, and animal studies. He has published articles on Friedrich Schlegel, Hannah Arendt, Vercors, and the US Presidential Turkey Pardon. He is co-editor of two essay collections: *Romanticism and Biopolitics* (a special issue of *Romantic Circles Praxis,* December 2012) and *Against Life* (forthcoming through Northwestern University Press). He is currently completing a manuscript titled *Rights of Romanticism*, which explores European romanticism’s posthumanist reinterpretation of human rights as an instance of ‘the right to have rights.’

**Brett Mills** is Head of the School of Film, Television and Media Studies at the University of East Anglia. One strand of his work explores television comedy; he is the author of Television Sitcom (BFI, 2005) and The Sitcom (Edinburgh, 2009), and he is currently running the 3-year AHRC-funded project 'Make Me Laugh: Creativity in the British Television Comedy Industry' ([www.makemelaugh.org.uk](http://www.makemelaugh.org.uk)). Another strand of his work explores the representations of animals on television and he has published and forthcoming work on this in M/C Journal, In Media Res, Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies, Journal of Literary and Cultural Disability Studies, Journal of European Cultural Studies, and Environmental Communication.

**Lourdes Orozco** is Lecturer in Theatre Studies at the Workshop Theatre, University of Leeds. Her research interests are in Contemporary Theatre and Performance in Europe and the Americas. Her recent publications focus largely on contemporary Western European performance practice with special focus on the material conditions of performance and its relationship with politics, ethics and identity. She is particularly interested in the international festival circuit and how it affects practitioners, performance and the way in which theatre is disseminated and received in that context.

Her most research focuses on the presence of animals and children in theatre and performance contexts. She is the author of the forthcoming book Theatre & Animals (Palgrave, 2013), is currently preparing an edited collection: Performing Animality: Animals in Performance Practices, and has published various articles/book chapters on the intersection between Theatre and Performance Studies and Animal Studies.

**Nola Semczyszyn** is a philosopher who works primarily on visual representation, and our use of representations in epistemic and aesthetic engagement with the world. As much as possible she likes her research to include looking at things and thinking about what that means. She has written on a range of representational artifacts including zoo and aquarium exhibits, nature documentaries, and medical imaging (which was her dissertation topic). She did her PhD at the University of British Columbia before taking up a Mellon Postdoc in Environmental Philosophy at Franklin & Marshall College in Lancaster PA. Her current research is examining differences between visual media, and their roles in scientific practice, public science, and environmental thought. She is particularly interested in ways that media can reflect, shape, and extend our cognitive capacities and our understanding of phenomena. Part of her research this year included curating an exhibition of visual representations of nature, which allowed her to indulge her obsession with taxidermy and micrographs.

**Karen Lykke Syse** is an agronomist, ethnologist and holds a PhD in cultural history. Her research interests pivot around the histories and ideologies of nature, focusing on environmental discourse and practice; agrarian and arboreal landscape studies; social and cultural aspects of hunting and angling, and nature in early modern thought. Her ongoing projects are on contemporary relationships to animals as food. She is associate professor at the Centre for Development and the Environment at University of Oslo.  
  
**David Wilson** is an honorary research fellow in the School of Historical Studies at the University of Leicester, where in 1999 he completed his PhD in the history of British comparative psychology. His specialist research areas and publications concern historical anthrozoology as well as the history of comparative psychology and other studies of animal behaviour (pure and applied) especially in Britain, including interdisciplinary, institutional, professional, ethical, recreational, literary and military aspects. He serves on the editorial board of Anthrozoös.

**Chairs**

**Steve Baker** is Emeritus Professor of Art History at the University of Central Lancashire.  Now based in Norwich, and working as an independent writer, researcher and artist, his new book *ARTIST|ANIMAL* (published early in 2013 in the ‘Posthumanities’ series from the University of Minnesota Press) has been praised by the artist Mark Dion for its ‘deep understanding of the nuance, intricacy, and contradictions in how artists work today.’ Chapters from Baker’s earlier books *The Postmodern Animal* and *Picturing the Beast* have been translated into French, German, Dutch, Swedish and Italian. His forthcoming writings include the essay ‘Dead, dead, dead, dead, dead’ for *The Routledge Handbook of Human-Animal Studies* (ed. Garry Marvin and Susan McHugh). Examples of his recent roadkill imagery have been included in group exhibitions in Norwich, London, New Orleans and Melbourne, and have been reproduced and discussed in the journals *Art & Research*, *Antennae* and *Tierstudien*, as well as in Giovanni Aloi’s *Art and Animals*.

**Erica Fudge** is Professor of English Studies at the University of Strathclyde. She has written on both contemporary and early modern human-animal relations. Her books are *Perceiving Animals: Humans and Beasts in Early Modern English Culture, Animal, Brutal Reasoning: Animals, Rationality and Humanity in Early Modern England,* and *Pets*. She has had articles in, among other journals, *Angelaki, Oxford Literary Review,* *Textual Practice* and *New Formations.* Forthcoming work will be in *History and Theory* and *Theory, Culture and Society.* Her current research is on human-livestock relations in early modern England. She is the director of the British Animal Studies Network.

**Franklin Ginn**’s work focuses on geographies of nature, the more-than-human and the environment. His forthcoming book, *Domestic Wild: Nature, memory and gardening in suburbia* argues for a new micropolitics of the wild. It explores how history and time are implicated in ecological consciousness, based empirically on the lives of everyday gardeners in London, and brings together existing concerns within geography on more-than-human relations, memory, and landscape temporality. Currently, Franklin is exploring how geographies of apocalypse, both imaginary and real, work at various scales, from the planetary to the local, to generate new relations between culture and nature. This involves collaborative work on geo-engineering and radical urban gardening, funded by the Carnegie Trust and the RGS/IBG. He has published on plants, animals and alternative gardening practices in North America and the UK, as well as on eco-nationalism in Aotearoa New Zealand, in journals including *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, Environment and Planning D, The Journal of Historical Geography* and *Cultural Geographies*. Franklin has a background in environmental policy, having worked at NGOs including Global Action Plan and Forum for the Future. He joined the University of Edinburgh as a Lecturer in Human Geography in 2011, after being awarded his PhD from King’s College London in 2010. Before taking up his appointment at Edinburgh he cycled from London to Singapore.

**Anat Pick** teaches Film at Queen Mary, University of London. Her book *Creaturely Poetics: Animality and Vulnerability in Literature and Film* is published by Columbia University Press (2011). She is coeditor of *Screening Nature: Cinema Beyond the Human* (Berghahn 2013, forthcoming), and runs the Screening Nature Network, an AHRC-funded project on nature, animals and the moving image <http://screeningnature.com/about/>.

**Madeleine Rooney** is one of the University of Strathclyde’s Strategic Research & Knowledge Exchange Development Managers. Her main role lies in helping academic colleagues forge new multidisciplinary collaborations and put together larger-scale research funding bids. More recently, she has championed the University’s public engagement strategy, which aims to help connect members of the public, community groups and policy makers with academic research. As part of this programme, she is currently working on a 3-year RCUK-funded project which enables colleagues from across Strathclyde - from undergraduate to Professorial level - to involve a number of schools in their research.

**Tom Tyler** is Senior Lecturer in Philosophy and Culture at Oxford Brookes University, UK. His research concerns the use of animals, and the persistent expression of anthropocentric assumptions, within philosophy, critical theory, and popular culture. He has written on horses and hands, anthropomorphism and anthroponormativity, the human chimpanzee, Nietzsche’s animal epistemology, Aesop’s animals, medieval monsters and bestiaries, Jekyll and Hyde, Foucault’s deviants, rules of thumb, McLuhan’s media probes, filmic interpellation, inhuman identities, dolphin sex, video games, digital dogs, and virtual boar. He has published in *Society & Animals, Journal for Cultural Research, Parallax, Journal of Visual Culture, Mosaic, Frieze, Configurations, Culture, Theory & Critique, Game Studies, JAC, Angelaki*, and elsewhere. He is the editor of *Animal Beings* (*Parallax* 38, 2006), the co-editor of *Animal Encounters* (Brill, 2009), and the author of *CIFERAE: A Bestiary in Five Fingers* (Minnesota University Press, 2012). He was an *Animals and Society Institute* fellow in 2007 and peer scholar in 2012. Further details of his research can be found at <http://www.cyberchimp.co.uk/research/>.