

For a politicized multispecies ethnography

Reflections on a feminist geographic pedagogical experiment

KATHRYN A. GILLESPIE

University of Washington, Seattle

This article reflects on the process of designing and teaching an undergraduate course on multi-species ethnography as methodology. Framed through an explicitly geographical, feminist, and politicized lens, the course offered an opportunity to reflect on the ethical complexities of multispecies ethnography, as well as its transformative political potential. The article uses excerpts from student ethnographies to illustrate ideas about geography, positionality, emotion, and embodiment in multi-species ethnography and contributes to literatures on multispecies pedagogies and ethnography.

Keywords:

Multispecies ethnography;
politicized ethnography;
feminist geography; pigs;
sanctuary; pedagogy

INTRODUCTION¹

How can multispecies ethnography as a methodology be centered in undergraduate education? How does an explicitly feminist geographic framing help ethnographers to pay greater politicized attention to differences of embodiment, power relations between and among species, and questions of positionality? What opportunities for political transformation and ethical reflection do multispecies ethnographic pedagogies offer? This article reflects on these questions through a detailed accounting of the process of designing and teaching an undergraduate experiential learning methods course, called “Doing Multispecies Ethnography,” at a sanctuary for pigs. My hope is that this work can have a dual impact: that it can contribute insights both to current scholarship on the role of animals in education (e.g., DeMello, 2010; Dinker & Pedersen, 2016; Lloro-Bidart, 2018a, 2018b; MacCormack, 2013; Pedersen, 2007) and to scholarly explorations of multispecies ethnography as a methodology attentive to “life’s emergence” within multispecies social, political, economic, and cultural contexts (Ogden, Hall, & Tanita, 2013, p. 6; Hamilton & Taylor, 2017; Kirksey & Helmreich, 2010). To this end, I argue that a geographically grounded, feminist, politicized understanding of multispecies ethnography highlights its transformative potential, its relational nature, and its ethical ambiguities.

Recent critiques of the methodology have problematized multispecies ethnography as prioritizing the human (and human interests) over other species, as being overly theoretical and obtuse, and as being depoliticized and unethical in its approach (see, for example, Hamilton & Taylor, 2017; Kopnina, 2017; Watson, 2016). Matthew C. Watson identifies two of the problems with

much existing multispecies ethnography: that it is “(a) not entirely about nonhuman animals and (b) not clearly designed to alter status hierarchies, including interspecies hierarchies perceived from the subject positions of privileged academic humans.” (2016, p. 161) While I do not object to multispecies ethnography’s focus not being entirely on nonhuman animals (more on this later), Watson’s second point is at the core of what I see to be a significant absence in multispecies ethnographic scholarship—perhaps (but not only) because of many individual researchers’ unwillingness to alter their own daily practices of animal consumption and/or to reckon in meaningful ways with their complicity in widespread animal exploitation. Or, put differently, because of individual researchers’ unwillingness to actively work to undo their internalized speciesism.

Helen Kopnina (2017) argues that “[u]nless multispecies ethnography is willing to engage with such [ethical] questions [of what rights and protections animals are due, and how human-animal hierarchies do harm], it is likely to remain apolitical, without realizing the exploitive nature of human–nonhuman relationship” (p. 342); rather, multispecies ethnography must “address multispecies injustice, suffering, and unidirectional violence” (p. 351) and, I would add, that it ought to reckon with and transform researchers’ own complicity and participation in violence against animals. This course, “Doing Multispecies Ethnography,” and the writing of this article is an effort to recuperate multispecies ethnography, to push for gentler, more caring, and ethically attuned ways of doing research involving other animals, and to explore the potentially transformative nature of a

politicized multispecies ethnography, particularly in education.

To briefly explain what I mean by *politicized* here, I am referring primarily to the realm of “small p” politics; this is politics outside of formal political spheres, often based on identities such as race, gender and sexuality [or species], and spearheaded by individuals and non-state groups and institutions” (Srinivasan, 2016, p. 76). Defining political ethnography as more than just a “study of politics” (Schatz, 2009, p. 10), Timothy Pachirat offers another understanding of political ethnography, wherein “the ethnographic process *itself* is political insofar as fieldwork inevitably locates the ethnographer within networks of power.” (2009, p. 144) Recognizing *the political* in ethnographic research attends to webs of power relations that shape, and are shaped by, the research—something feminist ethnographers have highlighted for decades (e.g., Visweswaran, 1994). Following the infamous feminist adage that “the personal is political,” I understand a politicized framework to be one that centers an attention to the way power and privilege operate in relational encounters (relationships themselves, ways of positioning oneself in relation to others, and the spaces and places where structures of power are in friction with lives and bodies) (Massey, 2005; Pratt & Rosner, 2012). This focus on relationality orients the politicization of human-animal relations in an explicitly feminist geographic framework—one where embodied and emotional vulnerabilities to structural processes unfold in geographic places and spaces (e.g., the sanctuary as both a place and space, the body-spaces of both pigs and humans).

I use the term *politicized* rather than *political* in this article not only to emphasize how the ethnographer or the subjects of ethnography are embedded in networks of power, but also to signal the ways in which a politicized ethnography is dedicated to *responding to* and *changing* uneven power relations that may be the subject of study, or that may emerge during the research process. A politicized multispecies ethnography, then—as methodology and as pedagogical tool—resonates with critical methodologies and pedagogies: those that aim to transform conditions of inequality, violence, and value hierarchies in human-animal relations (Andrzejewski, Pedersen, & Wicklund, 2009; Dinker & Pedersen, 2016; Linné & Pedersen, 2014; Lloro-Bidart, 2014, 2017, 2018b; Lloro-Bidart & Banschbach, 2019; Pedersen, 2011a). *Politicized* implies action, movement, transformation of something previously un- or de-politicized—the transformation of the researcher, the methodology, the human-

animal relations that underlie the research and daily life itself. A politicized ethnography acknowledges and even necessitates an openness to being transformed, activated, radicalized by the research.

COURSE BACKGROUND

The course, “Doing Multispecies Ethnography,” was offered as a collaboration between the Comparative History of Ideas Program (CHID) at the University of Washington (UW) in Seattle and Pigs Peace Sanctuary in Stanwood, Washington. I taught the course in the summer of 2014 for the first time through CHID with a focus on animals, ethics, and food, and then again in 2015 (as a cross-listing between CHID and Geography) with a focus on animals, politics, and place. I consulted at length through the design and teaching process with sanctuary director and founder Judy Woods and worked additionally with a student peer facilitator, Sarah Olson, the second summer. Pigs Peace is located roughly an hour north of Seattle and provides sanctuary to approximately 130 pigs (both pot-bellied pigs and “big pig” breeds typically raised in farming) who have been taken in from farming settings and other situations of abuse, neglect, and violence. Woods founded the sanctuary in 1994 with no formal background in pig care and used her career as a longtime emergency room nurse to inform her own learning process about how to provide care that centers pigs’ individual and species needs and allows intra- and inter-species relationships to flourish.

CHID is an interdisciplinary program at UW that prioritizes critical and creative thinking, active engagement with the world, and non-hierarchical pedagogies. At its roots, CHID’s educational model builds from and articulates with critical, transformative, political pedagogies defined by commitments to feminism, anti-racism, Marxism, anti-colonialism, and to decolonial methodological approaches to education (Freire, 2000; hooks, 1994; Shahjahan, Wagner, & Wane, 2009; Smith, 2012). My own experiences teaching a variety of self-designed animal studies courses in CHID since 2010, paired with my volunteer relationship over the years with Pigs Peace and my own experience as a multispecies ethnographic researcher, provided the pedagogical and experiential background to take on designing and teaching an experimental field course of this nature. Although a number of the courses taught at UW have included the finished products of multispecies ethnographic works in the classroom (in the form of published books and articles), this was the first time students

at UW were offered the opportunity to take a course that provided an in-depth exploration of, and chance to practice, multispecies ethnography *as a methodology*.

Pedagogically, the course took as its starting point the notion that, as Laura Ogden, Billy Hall, and Kimiko Tanita (2013) write, “multispecies ethnography is a project that seeks to understand the world as materially real, partially knowable, multicultural and multinatured, magical, and emergent through the contingent relations of multiple beings and entities.” (p. 6) More specifically, the course was formulated through an explicitly feminist geographic lens that asked students to: uncover and reflect on the taken-for-granted power relations embedded in human-farmed animal relations; think critically about hierarchies of human supremacy; and attend to embodiment and emotion as ways of knowing. These areas of focus—power relations, social hierarchies, embodiment, and emotion—are classically feminist concerns and their spatial dimensions have long been theorized by feminist geographers (e.g., Wolch & Emel, 1998; Hovorka, 2015; Seager, 2003). Thus, my approach to teaching the course and the approach to multispecies ethnography that students practiced were both politicized, feminist geographic ways of teaching and doing multispecies ethnography.

The course was offered as a summer intensive, five-week term; we spent one full day a week at the sanctuary in addition to two two-hour weekly sessions in the classroom on UW’s campus. During our classroom time, we read works that theorized ethnography (and multispecies ethnography specifically) and we explored written and film content that detailed the political economy and ethical dimensions of animal use. Both iterations of the course were small in number; in 2014, there were six students enrolled and, in 2015, eleven students took the class. At the sanctuary, students were each paired with a pig, about whom they were tasked with writing an ethnography over the course of the term. The methods students utilized in their ethnographies included participant observation, textual research (about pigs and hog farming), and informal interviewing of Woods. Students were required to keep a journal of informal responses to the material in the course and a field notebook of their ethnographic observations, and to write a formal ethnography at the end of the course (many students also included photos to accompany their writing). The ethnography involved four parts: a geographic analysis of the sanctuary, their positionality as researchers, ethnographic observations of the pig, and reflections on multispecies ethnography as methodology. I have organized this article around these four components, including excerpts

from student ethnographies to guide a discussion of the key issues that emerged from this process. By way of conclusion, I argue—in conversation with student reflections—that multispecies ethnography can be a gentler, more care-ful methodology when it more thoroughly considers its relationality, ethical complexities, and transformative potential.

CENTERING GEOGRAPHY IN MULTISPECIES ETHNOGRAPHY

A distinctly geographical question embedded in multispecies ethnography is *where* to study human-animal relations. There is a long tradition of studying nonhuman animals in spaces of animal use and exploitation, where researchers and teachers in effect become complicit through passive participation in violence against nonhuman animals. I have written elsewhere about the anthropocentrism embedded in studying animals in spaces of use and exploitation—for researchers, there is a troubling expectation to bear witness to violence against animals and do nothing (Gillespie, 2016). As an alternative to these clearly fraught spaces, the sanctuary can offer a site to explore a radically different kind of socio-spatial relationship with farmed animal species (Blattner, Donaldson, & Wilcox, forthcoming). I asked students to consider the following geographic questions in analyzing the sanctuary: *How do you understand the sanctuary as a place? What ethical and political commitments or ambiguities guide life at the sanctuary? How are the spaces designed with the pigs in mind? What role does the sanctuary as a place play in society and in a capitalist economy? Does it challenge your ideas of how animals should/could live?*

In his ethnography for the course, Benjamin² wrote:

Pigs Peace Sanctuary is for pigs, and in a world that is most often for humans, this takes some getting used to. Its 39 acres of fields and forest are dotted with muddy ponds and pig houses too short for a human to stand inside. On hot days, every shady spot holds a lounging pig or two. Parts of the property are wild—if you walk out into the field, the ground is uneven, and the woods are full of brambles, trails that disappear suddenly, and mud that may swallow your shoe. If you’re anything like I was, you’re probably used to thinking of pigs only in terms of their uses to humans, and of their whole lives being lived in neat, hay-lined pens, or even indoors on a cement floor. Those are not

these pigs. These pigs live pigs' lives, and they do it in a pigs' place.

Sanctuaries are not monolithic, and some impose anthropocentric conventions of care and control more than others. Pigs Peace aims to center the pigs and their experiences before education and advocacy, a priority not all sanctuaries share, and Woods has engaged in what might be thought of as pig-led care and knowledge production, letting the pigs instruct and lead her in formulating care practices that most allow them to flourish as individuals and as a species (this resonates with the approach that VINE Sanctuary in Vermont takes to sanctuary work and animal care; see Donaldson & Kymlicka, 2015; Blattner, Donaldson, & Wilcox, forthcoming). Opening the sanctuary to a university collaboration was something Woods thought carefully about, and how we developed the pig-student interactions followed from this intentional attention to the pigs themselves and their demonstrated preferences.

This collaboration at its root posed some serious challenges and ethico-political questions about the potentially intrusive nature of research and teaching involving animals. Rosemary-Claire Collard (2014), for instance, worries over the violence of making animals *encounterable* in spaces of contact; sanctuaries—as spaces of captivity—are often sites of encounter between humans (sanctuary visitors, veterinarians, and staff or volunteers) and sanctuary animals. As Woods and I developed the sanctuary dimension of the course, we worried over the importance, in pedagogical and research contexts, of ensuring that the pigs could be *unencounterable* if they so desired. Fortunately, because this has been a longtime concern for Woods, Pigs Peace itself is already spatially designed to allow pigs to choose to be unencounterable: there is a vast forest that is so densely wooded it is difficult for humans to access, offering a large area to which pigs can retreat for privacy, shade, and time free from human contact. There is also ample housing throughout the sanctuary designed with pigs in mind; often the doors are too low for a human to easily access and humans at the sanctuary are intentional about not disturbing the pigs when they are in their houses (visitors are generally not permitted to go into the main herd where most of the pig houses are situated, and volunteers and staff know to respect pigs' space while they are in their houses, except in circumstances where a pig might be missing, or might need veterinary care). Although a fuller analysis of veterinary care in sanctuaries is beyond the scope of this paper, it is one area of human-animal contact at the sanctuary where ethical tensions around

making animals encounterable are heightened (Blattner, Donaldson, & Wilcox, forthcoming). And yet, for the most part, Pigs Peace strives for a balance that allows pigs to flourish as independently from imposed human contact as possible.

One student, Mary, writes on the independence and relative spatial freedom pigs have at Pigs Peace, noting:

[P]igs are able to avoid human interaction/interruption either by chance or desire. Low-ceilinged barns, doghouses under giant trees, and wild, unpaved woods make human access to the pigs difficult at times. The sanctuary is not designed like a zoo where the animals are constantly on display. The sanctuary provides ample opportunity for the pigs to interact with one another or with humans, but given its vast acreage and strategic pig-inspired design, the animals at the sanctuary also have a means of being amongst themselves.

For the course, we added another layer of thinking about (un)encounterability: as we thought about the selection of pigs who would participate in the study, Woods chose pigs she knew had repeatedly enjoyed meeting new human visitors and who regularly seek out human contact (there are many pigs at the sanctuary for whom this is not the case). The pigs could also choose to not participate in the study at any time; in fact, one pig was paired with a student whom she did not like, and left his company for the forest, indicating to Woods that she should pair the student with a different pig. Attention to the pigs' needs, as well as the sanctuary's spatial design, enabled this kind of care in pig-human research collaborations.

Attention to space helps to attend to the kinds of inter- and intra-species social relations that are possible within that space (Philo & Wilbert, 2000; Wolch & Emel, 1998). Some students observed the way Pigs Peace looks like a picturesque small family farm. For instance, Nicole writes:

Visit Pigs Peace just once, and you will notice that it's very reminiscent of the idealized family farm—rolling grassy hills, lush green trees, red and white painted barns—but look a little closer and you will begin to see some things out of place. Dog houses scattered around, ponds big and small sprinkled here and there, a huge forest taking up half of a forty-acre pen, and boulders placed strategically around the property. The sanctuary is deliberate in its inten-

tions to cater to the pigs' needs rather than the needs of Judy or any of her volunteers or visitors.

Nicole at once notes the subtle-yet-profound difference between Pigs Peace as a sanctuary, and a farm, and she also notes the overt aesthetic similarities. Sue Donaldson and Will Kymlicka (2015), in fact, worry over the subtle ways that these aesthetic similarities “may inadvertently reinforce assumptions about where farmed animals belong, what forms of society and behavior are “natural” for them, and their relationship to humans.” (p. 54)

And yet, beneath this spatial aesthetic, there is a very different form of sociality and care unfolding—relationships that don't (and can't) occur in contexts where animals' lives are dictated by commodity logics, their lives organized around the production of “meat.” One salient illustration of this occurred during the second summer offering of the course when there were two pig families at the sanctuary. Just before the term started, Woods took in two new pot-bellied pigs: one who had recently given birth to a litter of piglets and another who was pregnant and who gave birth shortly after arriving at the sanctuary. These pigs and their piglets lived together in their family units, the pigs nursing their young and watching over them as they explored the sanctuary and grew up. Woods paired several of the students with members of these families—one student with the mother, Hazel, and two students with piglets Morgan and Emmett. In her ethnography, Amira reflected on watching the piglets with their siblings in community with all the other pigs:

I thought of how I went to the Woodland Park Zoo in North Seattle just the year before and of how small the farm animals' pens were. How there was only one or two pigs and a single cow and I thought of how isolated they were and how lonely they must've been and what injustice it was compared to what Morgan was living.

In our discussions about the sanctuary, students noted how unusual it was to see an animal family allowed to live their lives together in one place; they reflected on how even species humans keep as pets, like dogs and cats, are routinely separated from their parents and siblings, gifted or sold to different homes with little consideration for the deep emotional and familial bonds that are being severed (Pierce, 2016). Although the sanctuary does not allow reproduction (unless a pig arrives

pregnant, Pigs Peace avoids reproduction through sterilizing pigs when possible to maximize the number of pigs in need they can take in), Pigs Peace is a space attentive to the social bonds among pigs and the shifting and lasting relationships that form at the sanctuary.

In these ways, Pigs Peace offers a radically different lived imaginary of pig life—it is a spatial manifestation of what it might mean to *make lives livable* for pigs. The sanctuary transforms the lives that are possible for pigs to live by giving them a place to live, as much as possible, on their own terms. But the sanctuary also transformed how students thought about the radical potential of spaces designed for and with pigs. Amira talks about the out-of-placeness of the sanctuary in a legal, social, and political economic system oriented around commodifying farmed animals: “I thought of how Pigs Peace isn't supposed to exist, that it opposes the dominant narrative within capitalism, that the government doesn't believe in the rehabilitation of farmed animals and how [the sanctuary is] only supported through the generosity of others.” This comment touches on both the precariousness of the sanctuary as a model (as a nonprofit funded primarily through donations) and the possibility of the seeming impossibility of a place like Pigs Peace.

Benjamin wrote about the limits of imagination about human-animal relations within the dominant paradigm of farming animals: “If all you've ever seen are pigs in pens or in confinement facilities, you have no idea what's being stolen from them. Here you can see what a good life for a pig looks like, and it becomes much harder to justify denying that life to other pigs. In this way, the sanctuary is for all pigs, not just the pigs that live here.” He articulates a dimension of what Elan Abrell (2016) calls the “symbolic power” of sanctuaries—that they manifest in spatial and material terms “that different ways of living with animals are possible” (pp. vi–vii). Geography itself—the *places* where animals live and die—is a powerful dimension to understandings of animal life and human-animal interactions; places shape and define how care and harm are spatially manifested. Insights like these politicize the sanctuary as a place and as a particular kind of space, asking researchers and students alike to consider “where the political is constituted, . . . how and by whom.” (Hobson, 2007, p. 252) This resonates with Teresa Lloro-Bidart's (2018a) reflections on human-animal interactions and wellbeing in farm contexts; whereas she explores students' ethnographic experiences of animals in spaces of food production, the sanctuary offers a different kind of space for practicing a politicized multispecies ethnography—it

offers a material spatial manifestation that redefines and, in fact, demonstrates what kinds of nonnormative relationships are possible. Within this geographic context, students dedicated part of their ethnographies to reflecting on and articulating their own positionality—as humans with their own unique constellations of life experiences and background—in relation to the pigs they were studying.

(UN)THINKING THE HUMAN? REFLECTIONS ON POSITIONALITY

The ethnographies the students conducted for this course were multispecies in the sense that they were not just studies of pigs in sanctuary; they were about pigs *and* humans, and the relationships formed between the pigs and the students who were studying them. The students, thus, focused not just on the pig they were working with and learning from, they also thought about themselves and their relationship to this pig and to pigs more generally. To catalyze these reflections, I asked students to consider: *What is your relationship to pigs and farmed animals? What limitations and/or advantages do you see in your ability to tell this pig's story? What difficulties are there in interpreting an Other's perspective, especially when that Other is a member of another species?* Implicit in these questions is a request to reflect on the subjects of the students' multispecies ethnographies and the politicized relationships of power and hierarchy embedded in researching and living with farmed animal species.

The question of who *should* be the subject of critical animal pedagogies and multispecies ethnographies is the site of ongoing debate. Karin Gunnarsson Dinker and Helena Pedersen (2016) advocate for “unthinking the human” and write that “the proper teaching and learning object in critical animal pedagogies is *the human*, and human behavior toward animals, rather than the animal herself (who has, indeed, been studied enough; Pedersen & Stanescu, 2014).” (p. 417) To be certain, there are many educational contexts where animals are instrumentalized in often harmful ways for pedagogical ends (Pedersen, 2011b), and this happens so frequently that Patricia MacCormack argues for “leaving the animal alone,” and focusing instead on “learning how to unthink our parasitic selves.” (MacCormack, 2013, p. 17) At the same time, Veronica Pacini-Ketchabaw, Affrica Taylor, and Mindy Blaise (2016) aim to decenter the human in multispecies ethnographic research, advocating for a de-anthropocentric approach to studying other animals. As Lindsay Hamilton and Nik Taylor (2017)

point out, “ethnographers have a tendency to consider what other species mean to humans rather than considering or seeking to understand how humans and animals *co-constitute* the world” (p. 2); in many multispecies ethnographers' unabashed centering of the human, ethically problematic practices emerge that “[prioritize] human knowledge over the material and lived realities of [other animals].” (p. 7; referring to the work of Kirksey, Hannah, Lotterman, & Moore, 2016)

Taking these kinds of concerns into consideration in framing the course, I suggested that decentering or unthinking the human might not mean entirely eliminating the human from analysis, nor does it mean that we necessarily must leave animals fully alone if we are to understand and deconstruct hierarchies between humans and other species. A politicized multispecies ethnography aims to understand these power-laden entanglements among species; humans, too, are a species (indeed, a species that thoroughly and routinely shapes the lives of farmed species) and, as such, have a place in this methodology. Following in a classic feminist tradition, researchers should aim to “write ourselves into the analysis” and into the research process itself through reflections on positionality in the field and in the writing process (Gilgun & McLeod, 1999, p. 185). It is these co-constitutive relationships that we ought to be attentive to in ethnographic research (Hamilton & Taylor, 2017). Especially in the context of a species like pigs in the geographic context of the United States, it is difficult (if not impossible) to disentangle pigs' lives from their relationships with humans. Furthermore, pigs (and other farmed animal species) have been drastically understudied as subjects of their own lives; much research and veterinary medical innovation related to farmed animal species has aimed to understand them within a commodity logic: in other words, how to extract more “meat” from a pig more quickly, or how to increase the volume of milk a cow can produce. Ways of developing knowledge about farmed animal species, then, must involve gentler and more ethically attuned ways of thinking about, conceptualizing, and interacting with them—as well as exploring alternative *sites* of studying, as noted above.

As the students in the class worked to develop multispecies ethnographic forms of knowledge in relationship with the pigs, they reflected on how their own different backgrounds shaped their approaches to this knowledge-making. This task was feminist in the sense that it focused on positionality (a classically feminist praxis) and geographic in the sense that it asked students

to situate their own positionality within their own specific geographic (spatial, locational, and embodied) context. One student was born and raised in the intensely urban context of Shenzhen, China, where she had never encountered farmed animals before. Other students had grown up in Seattle and other US urban centers with few (or no) opportunities to meet farmed animals. Another student grew up in Kuwait and shared in his ethnography how he was embedded in an Islamic context where pig consumption is taboo and he was taught that pigs are dirty and forbidden creatures. Others had experienced pigs in rural US farming contexts, where pigs were conceptualized as food and their lives oriented around that logic. These geographic and rural/urban differences came out in our class discussions as students shared their previous experiences and ideas about pigs and farmed animals, and they were integral in shaping students' reflections on their positionality.

A common theme in the ethnographies was that students found that they had to unlearn what they thought they knew about pigs and how so much of this knowledge is shaped by human supremacy. Amira articulated this sentiment in her own words:

When I began this course, it was with very little knowledge on animals as species and of the political, economic, and cultural forces that shape their lives. Every day was a revelation. Every day was a matter of learning and unlearning and, knowing what I know now, I can never go back to that state of ignorance I was in, of sparing myself the sight of such suffering over and over again.

Part of this reflection may have been prompted by an exercise we did at the start of the term to facilitate some discussion on privilege. Taking the now-classic privilege “checklist” model, developed by Peggy McIntosh (2003), I added *species* to a collaboratively curated (by a group of feminist geographers) series of lists that included more routinely acknowledged sites of privilege and difference (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity, religion, nationality, ability, etc.). Reflecting on their *homo sapiens* privilege prepared students to begin to think about the radically uneven power relations between themselves and other animals and be more attentive to moments when they might inadvertently exercise privilege and dominance in their encounters with the pigs. Some students paid close attention to the anthropocentrism in human-animal relations and in studying other species. One student, for instance, in discussing the intelligence

of pigs, noted that pigs were intelligent based on *human standards of intelligence*, signaling an awareness that humans define the metrics against which other species are measured.

They worked to unlearn this sense of human supremacy and taken-for-granted privilege, and Beatrice wrote about this in a way that highlighted a combination of her own effort at unlearning and the fact that Pigs Peace is organized to demand this kind of reflection:

The experience of being at Pigs Peace is less to learn about pigs than it is to *unlearn* about them, and the sanctuary begins that experience with reversing our sense of dominant human privilege. Unlearning is practiced at the sanctuary by revoking our self-imposed right to the pig's body.

Pigs Peace prioritizes the pigs above all else; their care comes before any other priority at the sanctuary, including education and visitation—if a pig is sick and needs Woods's direct attention, the sanctuary will close to visitors and classes; the sanctuary is also closed to visitors entirely in late fall, winter, and early spring when the days are shorter and the pigs' care needs occupy all daylight hours. Woods also exercises a no-animal-products rule for visitors while at the sanctuary—out of respect for the pigs and other farmed animals; in Beatrice's words, humans' “self-imposed right to the pig's body” is revoked. This revocation enables the possibility of knowing pigs differently—not as food, or as objects of entertainment, but as individuals with distinct personalities and emotions.

Beatrice described her first encounter with big pig Sebastian:

Our first day, I met Sebastian cooling off in the pond caked in mud. I found that we could communicate simply by looking at one another. . . . There is an expressiveness in their gaze . . . It's amazing, it's haunting and it solidified my humble place at the sanctuary—our gazes were equal . . . If I was going to apply the definition of ‘relationship’ that I use with my pets and peers, my relationship with pigs and farmed animals was nonexistent prior to my experience at Pigs Peace. More specifically, my interactions consisted simply of my actions—never offering a chance for their reactions. I've met pigs in restaurants, hanging from walk-in refrigerators, roasting on a rotisserie, renamed in every French term imaginable, and placed

neatly on a plate that I served to VIPs. This led me to the realization that I've met so many pigs, but I've never really *known* any.

Being confronted with a living pig—a pig *living his life*—at the sanctuary made possible a different way of understanding pigs than Beatrice was accustomed to, oriented as dominant US culture is around viewing pigs as food, as pieces of “meat,” and as misunderstood subjects of colloquialisms (e.g., *sweaty as a pig*—pigs don't have sweat glands and so do not sweat). These dominant ways of knowing embedded in students' positionality were destabilized when they were confronted with the reality of the pigs at Pigs Peace. Benjamin was paired with big pig Maggie, but the first pig he met on the first day at the sanctuary was a piglet named Honey: “When I looked at her I clearly saw someone looking back at me, and in an instant I knew I had to question many of the things I thought I knew.”

This shook many students' confidence in what they thought they knew about pigs, farmed animals, and nonhuman animal species generally. And for many of the students, this resulted in a kind of timidity about presuming to know anything about the pig they were studying. Demonstrating surprising humility and caution, the students approached trying to understand the pigs with the utmost care and self-reflexivity. Moved as he was, first by Honey, and then by Maggie and Pigs Peace as a whole, Benjamin wrote:

Since the beginning of this project and my time at the sanctuary, I've wanted to do my very best to do the perspectives and experiences of the pigs justice. Part of doing that is to admit the impossibility of truly understanding what it would be like to be dominated by another species to the degree that most nonhuman animals are by humans.... Of course, I can't know what it's like to be a pig, or know the perspective of any individual pig. However, I can try my best to understand it and to be honest about the limitations of my perspective, which is the best any ethnography can do, multispecies or not.

As Benjamin aptly points out, careful reflection on one's own positionality as a researcher and a meaningful acknowledgement of the limitations of representing another's perspective is embedded in many ethnographic research contexts. Worrying over this issue, Mary wrote in her ethnography about Honey: “Writing about the Other is always sensitive terrain as there are *always* rami-

fications for speaking for Others. Especially given the language barrier between the subject of my ethnography, Honey, and myself, I am concerned with misrepresenting her and more broadly, her species.” We talked extensively in class about representation and the dangers of misrepresenting the pigs they were working with and looked at ethnographic works that aimed to represent members of another species. As Hamilton and Taylor worry over, “most [ethnographers] do not interrogate what it means that it is *us* who are watching *them* and that it is *us* who assert the power to speak for *them*.” (2017, p. 3)

APPROACHING THE ETHNOGRAPHY

In teaching multispecies ethnography, it was a challenge to know what texts to use as samples of multispecies ethnographies. One of the primary texts we used was Elizabeth Tova Bailey's *The Sound of a Wild Snail Eating* (2010). Bailey writes about her experience with an illness that renders her immobile; in the midst of her illness, a friend brings her a potted violet from the woods with a snail on the plant to sit on her bedside table. The memoir follows her observations of the snail, for whom they build a terrarium, and her experience learning about and being in relationship with the snail. Not framed as an ethnography as such (or even as an academic work), the ethnographic detail about the snail and about Bailey's own embodiment in relation to the snail offers a powerful and moving guide for what multispecies ethnography might aspire to. The book is an emotionally engaged personal narrative; it is attentive to embodiment and different ways of being in the world; it offers careful textual research and observation of another species; and it turns ideas of evolution, intelligence, and human supremacy upside down. It also raises troubling ethical questions about human entitlement to animals' bodies and lives (e.g., the snail is plucked from the forest and held captive for a time in Bailey's terrarium). These were all features I wanted students to consider for their own ethnographies as ways of “(un)thinking the human” and learning about pigs and about themselves (see Lockwood, 2016 for a powerful reflection on one's own body and self in relation to nonhuman others).

I asked students to explore the following questions to elicit ethnographic observations of the pigs with whom they were paired: *Who is this pig? What does she like and dislike? What things are meaningful to her? How does she spend her time? What is her background? Does she carry any lasting trauma from her time before the sanctuary? How does the sanc-*

tuary allow pigs to flourish and what are your ethical concerns about pigs at the sanctuary? I also suggested that they should supplement their own observations with independent review of literature on pig behavior and I urged them to utilize Woods for her extensive expertise in pig behavior and care, especially since such pig-led understandings of care and knowledge-making are not yet recorded in writing.

One of the first insights students shared about pigs was their total surprise at who these pigs were and how many assumptions they had made about pigs as a species. Benjamin wrote:

My first time at Pigs Peace, everything surprised me. The space surprised me—I had never considered a pig in the woods, or a social group of pigs. What really turned my thinking upside-down were the pigs themselves, though. I don't know what I had expected them to be, maybe mindless, unthinking machines that lay in pens and grow meat. And I certainly hadn't even considered a single, individual pig. I'd only thought of pigs: a homogenous, abstract idea of an entire species.

This is a routine way of thinking about pigs and other farmed animals—not as individuals, but as abstracted species. Even in animal studies and multispecies ethnography the individual is often obscured, replaced by abstracted and generalized observation and population management at the species level (Bear, 2011; Srinivasan, 2014).

After spending a few days with Sebastian, Beatrice lamented:

Everything I anticipated about a pig seemed inaccurate. It made obvious that these were cultural assumptions rather than actual knowledge. The parts of pigs you think will be soft are firm. They're nimble and quick on their hooves. Most had no discernible scent but some smelled inexplicably pleasant. Their homes were cleaner than my room was for many years of my life, yet most people would call them dirty. Why had I decided so many things about him before we ever met?

Engaging in ethnographic observation, and drawing on Bailey's focus on a single snail as inspiration, these reflections on the assumptions made about species prompted the students to take greater care in their thinking about the individual pigs and pigs as a species. They

attended to the embodied lives of the pigs, their individual ways of inhabiting Pigs Peace, and their relationships with each other. Combining textual research and observation, Benjamin wrote at length about Maggie:

Pigs are olfactory animals – they can smell several feet into the ground and a mile away.... Maggie had no smell to me, except maybe that of sun-heated hay. Her ears, like fleshy satellite dishes, twitched and flicked flies away. Her blue eyes kept watching me, and when I did pet her, she closed her eyes and stuck her legs out to give me better access to her belly. The top of her body was thick-skinned and covered in wiry hairs, while her belly was softer, pinker and had two rows of nipples like double-breasted suit buttons. I wondered when I was looking at her: what is it like to live inside that body, and how much of that experience is that way because this animal was bred to be eaten?

Benjamin signals an awareness of Maggie's embeddedness in a political economy of "meat" production, whereby pigs and other farmed animals are bred specifically to maximize commodity production and consumption (Blanchette, 2015; Wise, 2009). He couldn't help but connect her embodied self at the sanctuary with the fate of so many others of her species, connecting the intimate with global processes of commodification (Gillespie, 2014; Ogden et al., 2013; Pratt & Rosner, 2012). Beatrice also noted this connection, and how it affected her ability to view Sebastian as an individual:

Upon meeting Sebastian, my pig ineptness felt amplified. His intimidating size and my unfamiliarity with pigs left me feeling unsure of how to interact with him. I felt limited in my ability to understand him due to the fact that I had just begun considering him as an entity, let alone a personality with distinct markings, habits and friends. I felt limited in my ability to re-attach myself to the idea that pigs like him became pigs like the ones I used to serve disjointed versions of to diners at restaurants.

Beatrice's acknowledgement of this difficulty ended up helping her to connect to and observe Sebastian in a heightened way, suturing her previous ideas of pigs-as-food together with her new experiences with pigs-as-pigs. This worked to push back against the tendency some people have to think that certain members of a species are exceptional—the way that people can, for in-

stance, feel empathy for a cow who escapes slaughter, rooting for them to make it to sanctuary and live out their days, while still continuing to eat other cows who did not have the opportunity to escape. Meeting an individual pig like Sebastian *could* have the effect of viewing Sebastian as exceptional—as unlike other pigs—and, indeed, during our final presentations of the ethnographies, every student noted how the pig they had written about was exceptional, an observation that we came to understand as an attention to the singularity of members of other species.

Benjamin articulated the relationship he and Maggie developed together (in fact, Maggie enjoyed Benjamin's company so much, she would often wait at the gate closest to the entrance to the sanctuary each Friday for Benjamin to arrive—something she had never done before):

Over our time together Maggie and I lost our fear towards each other, and I spent a lot of time sitting with her in the shade on hot days. She'd doze while I pet her, and nudge my arm with her snout if I stopped for too long. On one particularly hot day, when I got to the sanctuary, she was sitting with the front half of her body inside a giant water bucket, trying to cool off. When she made her way into the shade of a small pig house, I sat next to her head and she fell asleep leaning against me. It was a beautiful sunny day and a swallow darted in and out of a nest over our heads. I kept looking at Maggie's body and thinking: what part of her would be bacon, or chops, or ham? How many pigs like this have been killed so that Americans can have bacon on their burger or ham in their omelet, and how important is that in comparison to this pig being able to sleep peacefully in the shade on a summer day? When I looked down at her she was dreaming; her eye moved around under its lid, which was lined with a perfect row of blonde eyelashes. Her eyes looked like a sleeping child's, and I was overcome with emotion. My guilt over being human was almost unbearable, and I felt so much grief for all of the animals that suffer needlessly in our food system. That moment changed me permanently, and I haven't found a way to talk about it. How do you explain that you felt a bottomless well of sorrow over a pig's eyelashes?

One of the core frameworks in the course was a focused attention on emotion—we read about animals' emotional lives and we also talked at length about what we can learn from our own emotional responses to things. As feminists have repeatedly noted (e.g., Ahmed, 2004; Butler, 2004), the emotional becomes political—a way of signaling how our entanglements with one another matter, cause harm, manifest care, and transform. I encouraged the students to be honest about and attentive to their emotions in their time at Pigs Peace; as feminist multispecies ethnographies, the role of emotion became one central way of knowing and thinking about the pigs. As illustrated in Benjamin's comments above, emotion was palpable in many of the students' writing. Guilt and shame were common reflections, both because of their own participation in food traditions that breed, confine, and slaughter pigs for “meat” and because of their more general membership as part of the human species. Beatrice shared a flurry of emotions, connecting shame, apathy, and love in trying to understand her relationship to Sebastian:

Years of desensitization to dead animals feels insurmountable and shameful; but I believe this says more about the powers of violence than it does about my love for animals. I felt like I didn't know Sebastian and I felt like I didn't deserve to sit in his hay after 26 years of indifference and get to infer what his feelings were when he snorted or watched me. What was the most intimidating was that he clearly knew me, read my movements, and understood my mannerisms much better than I did his. His life clearly held many human acquaintances, and mine had just encountered its first live pig. He was never allowed the choice to be apathetic towards my species, yet I had chosen to become this way towards his.

These emotions were instructive; they catalyzed new ways of knowing, and prompted deep personal reflection about ways of being in relation with other species. Emotional responses became sites of potential transformation for the students and points of connection between the students and pigs, highlighting one dimension of the transformative possibilities of multispecies ethnography.

FINAL THOUGHTS: ON ETHICS AND TRANSFORMATION IN MULTISPECIES ETHNOGRAPHY

I would like to end by drawing together students' discussions of multispecies ethnography as methodology with my own reflections on this approach. I shared with the students that multispecies ethnography is a new kind of methodology and there is much room for exploration and creativity in how this ethnographic work is done. We also discussed the fact that multispecies ethnography raises many troubling (and under-considered) ethical questions about research and human-animal encounter. I asked students to reflect on several questions related to multispecies ethnography: *What have you learned from this process? What aspects of your research should be essential aspects of multispecies ethnographies in the future? How would you change your ethnographic approach if you did this project again? Why are multispecies ethnographies important?*

At the forefront of a number of the students' ethnographies were ethical questions about the doing of multispecies ethnographies. They talked about trust, intrusion and imposition, and leaving. Underlying their ethical concerns was an awareness of multispecies ethnography as a *relational process*—a site of “connection” and “contact” (Ogden et al., 2013, p. 10)—manifesting through collaboration between the pigs and the students, and they noted that this process takes time and effort.

Explaining her thoughts on trust, Alice wrote:

Trust goes both ways, and takes a lot of effort, if I am feeling awkward and not willing to pet her, what will she feel, probably the same thing, since no one will like strangers staring at them and following them around.

Alice was very timid and even fearful of the pigs at the beginning of the course. She kept her distance and observed Clementine (the pig with whom she was paired) from afar, sitting on a little folding stool in the field. Over time, though, the two interacted more with each other. She describes a turning point in their relationship; it was during a time when Judy brought a large load of pea vines into the main herd area as a treat for the pigs. She dumped a large pile of the greens and many pigs crowded around to eat. Alice noted how Clementine was not assertive in getting some of the vines and writes:

And that was the point I decided to step into the situation and help her. I started to pull out food from the big pile and give it to her. I

wasn't sure if I should have done that. But it worked! This is the time that I finally started to feel I'm building a relationship with her. I started to feel that she started to like me, trust me, and finally I'm not just there to observe her.... Trust is hard to build but when you are trusted by someone, that is the best feeling in the world.

Other students wrote about trust in their own ways, and were concerned with inserting themselves into the pigs' lives and space without explicit consent. Each student navigated their careful approach with the pigs differently. Benjamin wrote:

I also wanted to give Maggie space, especially that first day. I had been noticing how often humans impose themselves on other animals, even in friendly interactions, and where they often pet and grab an animal's body without considering their autonomy. I had a feeling that before coming here, Maggie had mostly had interactions with people who imposed themselves on her, and I didn't want to do that.

As our class imposed ourselves—albeit as carefully as possible—on the lives and home of the pigs at Pigs Peace, there were also ethical issues the students worried over about how to *end* the multispecies ethnography. Here, we had spent much of the term concerned with acting ethically in the *doing* of multispecies ethnography, and in this preoccupation, the end of the course came abruptly. We ruminated over what our leaving might mean. Alice reflected on how to say goodbye to Clementine at the end of the course:

I started to wonder if this [researching and then leaving] is ethical. We think we are doing the good thing to spend time interacting with them ... but this will only make them feel abandoned again and I started to feel bad about helping Clementine get food last time, because it will be much easier for both of us, if we stayed distant for the entire time.... Some of them [the pigs] probably won't realize things have changed after the fifth Friday comes and no one has showed up to spend time with them. So at the end of the day what I really want to say is not just goodbye, but thank you and I'm sorry. Thank you for showing me your world, and I'm sorry to interrupt it.

Because multispecies ethnography (as I conceive of it and teach it) is a relational methodology, built on interactions, moments of contact, emotional entanglement, and ethical consideration, the severing of these relationships at the end of the course was fraught. Did the pigs experience the students' departure as a loss? As abandonment (as Alice worried over)? Did this severing heighten the extractive nature of the research and generate what might be very real experiences of harm? All of the students were invited to come back to Pigs Peace to volunteer and visit any time, and several of them have maintained years-long relationships with the pigs they worked with, and with the sanctuary more generally. But most of the students did not return to Pigs Peace, and this is cause for some ethical pause.

In the midst of this worry, the experience of engaging in multispecies ethnography at Pigs Peace was transformative for a number of the students, and they wrote movingly about how it shifted their own modes of thinking and feeling. Benjamin wrote:

Like I've said, the sanctuary is for pigs first, and the pigs there get great lives, maybe the best they could have in this country and this time. It's not perfect: they're still managed by a human, they have to be sterilized, and they can't leave, though who knows if they would if they could. But the sanctuary is also valuable for people.... The time I spent with Maggie taught me and affected me so much more than any PETA brochure could have. I've seen the most disturbing pictures of cruel factory farm conditions and somehow push them out of my mind and eat meat for years without considering its origin. But connecting with another being and seeing her decide the course of her own days and know that she will get to live out her life, and that if she wasn't here she wouldn't get any of that, and that that fact is driven by the consumption of meat—that's a lot harder to forget, and a lot more likely to change how I live.

Benjamin highlights some of the ethical complexities of sanctuaries (e.g., sterilization, captivity, human oversight), acknowledging the limitations of pig-centered world-making in a world so thoroughly dominated by humans. He also articulates the affective power of relationality in multispecies research—that it was his *relationship* with Maggie that transformed him, changing his thinking and the way he lives. Emerging from these rela-

tionships, students developed an awareness of who the pigs are—not in relation to humans, but who they are themselves, as singular beings living in community with other pigs. Beatrice wrote:

Sharing personal anecdotes or stories of intimate experiences with animals 'humanizes' them in a way. It is the removal of their personhood—personality traits, emotions, wants—that is tantamount to disassembling their bodies. As intimate ethnographers, it is our responsibility to reassemble these pieces not only for the animals, but also for one another. They've always had it, they've always been completely authentic, vividly emotional beings—we've just decided it would be easier to look away.

As a method of recognition, multispecies ethnography has the potential to focus human attention on actual animals and their relationships, and to reconceptualize animals' lives and beings through observation and interaction with individuals, and less through assumption and preconceived ideas about particular species.

It also enabled a different understanding of space and inter-species relationality. Amira wrote:

Before our thank you lunch with Judy, we fed the pigs carrots for the very last time and my last sight of Morgan was watching him eat lunch amongst his friends. What Morgan and Pigs Peace Sanctuary did for me was teach me about a rare and powerful form of resistance.

Framing what is unfolding at Pigs Peace as resistance highlights the power of disrupting dominant norms of *where* and *how* other species live, enlivening the possibilities for new relationships to form—between individuals and between species.

These insights prompted transformation in some of the students' personal lives, most obviously in their dietary behaviors. While I have not conducted a longitudinal study of all students who took the course and their ongoing behaviors after the course's end, I have been informed by at least half of the students themselves (either during the course, or in the years following) that the experience motivated them to adopt a vegan lifestyle. The process of engaging in a politicized multispecies ethnography caused them to reflect in deeply personal ways on how their own lives were entangled in relationships of harm with other species, and prompted them to imagine gentler and more caring ways to live their own lives.

But the possibilities of how this approach to multispecies ethnography can be a catalyst for change might also extend beyond individual consumption practices. Benjamin (who was also one of the students who changed his diet) highlights a sense of responsibility to do more with his experience—to share his experience and new ways of thinking and knowing with others with the aim of transforming human-animal relations more broadly:

Though I didn't know it in the beginning, this ethnography also turned out to be critical, and to have a certain political stance. I want people to think about meat eating, to think about the commodification of non-human lives, and to think about the ways their habits affect the suffering of others. Being around Maggie and the other pigs taught me this, and it only feels right to share it here in the interest of telling their stories.

Benjamin's multispecies ethnography with Maggie ignited a commitment to more public forms of political action—to sharing the pigs' stories, and going on to advocate for animals in his life and work since the ending of the course. Indeed, although most students in the course did not do more with their ethnographies after the course ended (this would be an important consideration going forward in teaching this course again—*what work will these ethnographies do in the world?*), Benjamin built on his ethnography for further academic work as he developed an interest in animal studies as an undergraduate, and later as a grad student. Sarah Olson, the peer facilitator for the course, has gone on to pursue a master's in environmental education with a focus on critical animal studies.

One way of thinking about transformation as an endpoint (beginning?) in the politicized multispecies ethnographic process is to consider the potential this process has to instrumentalize connection and relationships between the researcher (students) and the animal (pigs)—in other words, a politicized multispecies methodology *does* have the potential to use the pigs to facilitate researcher/student growth and transformation. Educational contexts routinely instrumentalize animals in forms of what Teresa Lloro-Bidart terms “edutainment”—for instance, in educational programs in zoos and aquaria (Lloro-Bidart, 2014). Or educational contexts can, in fact, be wholly dedicated to learning the routine and ongoing instrumentalization of animals, as in agricultural science education (Gillespie, 2018; Peder-

sen, 2015). In the context of the potential for instrumentalization in multispecies ethnography pedagogy, the pigs could easily become a foil against whom the researcher/student better defines themselves and their work. This is an ongoing ethical concern for both teaching and practicing multispecies ethnography as a methodology, and researchers/educators/students should be constantly attentive to how easily this instrumentalization might occur. Perhaps a politicized approach can work to ameliorate this possibility.

As I worried over this with Woods after the course, she shared that she had witnessed the pigs also getting something valuable out of this exchange: Maggie would wait for Benjamin, clearly eager to enjoy his company; Honey grunted excitedly and scooted over to the fence every time Mary showed up to spend time with her; Morgan flopped down against Amira for naps and belly rubs in the sun. The relational dimension of the research appeared to be important to the pigs—getting to know the students over time spent together in the pigs' space contrasted with the nature of relationships built with other humans at the sanctuary. For instance, it is rare for humans at the sanctuary to sit and observe or spend long periods of time socializing with the pigs; most of the humans are tasked with chores to manage the upkeep of the sanctuary (e.g., feeding and water, scooping manure, tending the garden). To be sure, Woods and long-term volunteers at the sanctuary have loving and meaningful relationships with the pigs, built over time and much more extensive than the relationships my students developed; and yet, these are often built while going about the daily work of the sanctuary. Just the mere fact of humans there solely to interact with and learn from the pigs in a research context was a new and curious phenomenon for the pigs to encounter. Perhaps, then, to focus only on the possibility of the pigs being instrumentalized by the students would be to deny the pigs' agency and their own unique experiences of these research partnerships (for a fuller discussion of agency exercised in sanctuaries, see Blattner, Donaldson, & Wilcox, forthcoming).

In this sense, too, the politicized dimension of multispecies ethnography emerges—in the effort to recognize and respond to animals' agency, their personalities, their individual ways of being (embodied) in the world. What did these pigs experience during the research, and how might this be more adequately assessed, as Helena Pedersen has done in her work on what she terms *critical avian education* (Pedersen, 2011a)? How could a politicized multispecies ethnography work to uncover more

about the effects of multispecies ethnographic research on the pigs? How can the spaces and bodies in research be imagined in more caring and beneficial ways for the pigs? In what ways could the methodology itself be further politicized, more collaborative across species lines, more caring, less anthropocentric? These questions drive my own thinking on evolving both multispecies pedagogies and multispecies ethnography as methodology. Questions like these also presuppose—necessitate—a feminist geographic approach to politicized multispecies ethnography—an attention to the spaces and places where research is carried out, the bodies in research, the structures that cause friction for these bodies, the emotions that flood the practice of research, and the relationships forged, severed, carried forward beyond the confines of the research context. Thus, in this call for a politicized multispecies ethnography, there is much more work to be done: more questions to be asked, answered, and asked again; more ethical quandaries to worry over; more reflection on what might come of these ethnographies and what form they might take; and more rumination on ways of being in relation with members of other species that can and should evolve with practice and with new knowledge-making.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS AND NOTE

¹ Warmest thanks to Judy Woods and the pigs at Pigs Peace Sanctuary and to the students in Doing Multispecies Ethnography (Summer 2014 & 2015) for their knowledge, care, and openness that made this course possible. The second year of this course was enriched so much by the brilliance and careful thinking of Sarah Olson. Thanks also to the Comparative History of Ideas Program at the University of Washington for supporting the creation and instruction of this course. I am also very grateful to Sue Donaldson, Will Kymlicka, and members of the animal studies group at Queen's University, and the Kingston Interspecies Community Research Group, for their really helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper. Finally, thank you to Wesleyan Animal Studies and VINE Sanctuary for providing a space where I could present this paper at the Sanctuary: Reflecting on Refuge Conference in September 2017.

² In accordance with IRB human subjects ethics review process, all students' names are pseudonyms to protect their anonymity and all student quotations come from their ethnography assignments, submitted for the course in either summer 2014 or 2015. The students whose ethnographies are quoted herein are those who granted permission to have their work included in the paper; as such, this article does not reflect every student's experiences in the class. This self-selection perhaps has the effect of skewing the overall assessment of how students were affected by the course; students who were most

enthusiastic about the course were likely more willing to have their ethnographies quoted than others.

REFERENCES

- Abrell, E. (2016). *Saving animals: Everyday practices of care and rescue in the US animal sanctuary movement* (Doctoral dissertation, City University of New York).
- Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion*. New York: Routledge.
- Andrzejewski, J., Pedersen, H., & Wicklund, F. (2009). Interspecies education for humans, animals, and the earth. In J. Andrzejewski, M.P. Baltodano, & L. Symcox (Eds.), *Social justice, peace, and environmental education* (pp. 136–154). New York: Routledge.
- Bailey, E. (2010). *The sound of a wild snail eating* (First ed.). Chapel Hill, North Carolina: Algonquin Books of Chapel Hill.
- Bear, C. (2011). Being Angelica? Exploring individual animal geographies. *Area*, 43(3), 297–304.
- Blanchette, A. (2015). Herding species: Biosecurity, posthuman labor, and the American industrial pig. *Cultural Anthropology*, 30(4), 640–669.
- Blattner, C., Donaldson, S., & Wilcox, R. (forthcoming). Animal agency in community: A political multispecies ethnography of VINE Sanctuary.
- Butler, J. (2004). *Precarious life: The powers of mourning and violence*. London; New York: Verso.
- Collard, R. (2014). Putting animals back together, taking commodities apart. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 104(1), 151–165.
- DeMello, M. (Ed.). (2010). *Teaching the animal: Human-animal studies across the disciplines*. Brooklyn, NY: Lantern Books.
- Dinker, K. G., & Pedersen, H. (2016). Critical animal pedagogies: Re-learning our relations with animal others. In H. E. Lees & N. Noddings (Eds.), *The Palgrave International Handbook of Alternative Education* (pp. 415–430). London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Donaldson, S., & Kymlicka, W. (2015). Farmed animal sanctuaries: The heart of the movement? A socio-political perspective. *Politics and Animals* 1, 50–74.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th Anniversary ed.). New York; London: Bloomsbury.
- Gilgun, J. F., & McLeod, L. (1999). Gendering violence. *Studies in Symbolic Interactionism*, 22, 167–193.
- Gillespie, K. (2014). Sexualized violence and the gendered commodification of the animal body in Pacific Northwest US dairy production. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 21(10), 1321–1337.

- Gillespie, K. (2016). Witnessing animal others: Bearing witness, grief, and the political function of emotion. *Hypatia*, 31(3), 572–588.
- Gillespie, K. (2018). *The cow with ear tag #1389*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gillespie, K., & Collard, R.-C. (Eds.). (2015). *Critical animal geographies: Politics, intersections, and hierarchies in a multispecies world* (Routledge Human-Animal Studies Series). Abingdon, Oxon; New York: Routledge.
- Hamilton, L., & Taylor, N. (2017). *Ethnography after humanism: Power, politics and method in multi-species research*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hobson, K. (2007). Political animals? On animals as subjects in an enlarged political geography. *Political Geography*, 26, 250–267.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. London: Routledge.
- Hovorka, H. J. (2015). The Gender, Place and Culture Jan Monk Distinguished Annual Lecture: Feminism and animals: exploring interspecies relations through intersectionality, performativity and standpoint. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 22(1), 1–19.
- Kirksey, S., & Helmreich, S. (2010). The emergence of multispecies ethnography. *Cultural Anthropology*, 25(4), 545–576.
- Kirksey, S., Hannah, D., Lotterman, C., & Moore, L. J. (2016). The *Xenopus* pregnancy test: A performative experiment. *Environmental Humanities*, 8(1), 37–56.
- Kopnina, H. (2017). Beyond multispecies ethnography: Engaging with violence and animal rights in anthropology. *Critique of Anthropology*, 37(3), 333–357.
- Linné, T., & Pedersen, H. (2014). “Expanding my universe:” Critical animal studies education as theory, politics, and practice. In J. Sorenson (Ed.), *Critical animal studies: Thinking the unthinkable* (pp. 268–282). Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press.
- Lloro-Bidart, T. (2014). They call them ‘good-luck polka dots’: Disciplining bodies, bird biopower, and human-animal relationships at the Aquarium of the Pacific. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 21(1), 389–407.
- Lloro-Bidart, T. (2017). A feminist posthumanist political ecology of education for theorizing human-animal relations/relationships. *Environmental Education Research*, 23(1), 111–130.
- Lloro-Bidart, T. (2018a). A feminist posthumanist ecopedagogy in/for/with animalscapes. *Journal of Environmental Education*, 49(2), 152–163.
- Lloro-Bidart, T. (2018b). A feminist posthumanist multispecies ethnography for educational studies. *Educational Studies*, 54(3), 253–270.
- Lloro-Bidart, T., & Banschbach, V. (Eds.). (2019). *Animals in environmental education: Interdisciplinary approaches to curriculum and pedagogy*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lockwood, A. (2016). *The pig in thin air*. Brooklyn, NY: Lantern Books.
- MacCormack, P. (2013). Gracious pedagogy. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 10(1), 13–17.
- Massey, D. (2005). *For space*. London: SAGE Publications.
- McIntosh, P. (2003). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. In S. Plous (Ed.), *Understanding prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 191–196). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ogden, L., Hall, B., & Tanita, K. (2013). Animals, plants, people, and things: A review of multispecies ethnography. *Environment and Society*, 4(1), 5–24.
- Pachirat, T. (2009). The political in political ethnography: Dispatches from the kill floor. In E. Schatz (Ed.), *Political Ethnography* (pp. 143–161). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pacini-Ketchabaw, V., Taylor, A., & Blaise, M. (2016). Decentering the human in multispecies ethnographies. In C. Taylor & C. Hughes (Eds.), *Posthuman Research Practices* (pp. 149–167). Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pedersen, H. (2007). *The school and the animal other. An ethnography of human-animal relations in education*. Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Pedersen, H. (2011a). Counting affects: Mo(ve)ments of intensity in critical avian education. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 16, 14–28.
- Pedersen, H. (2011b). Learning to measure the value of life? Animal experimentation, pedagogy, and (ECO) feminist critique. In *Global Harms: Ecological Crime and Speciesism* (pp. 131–150). Nova Science.
- Pedersen, H. (2015). Parasitic pedagogies and materialities of affect in veterinary education. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 14, 50–56.
- Pedersen, H., & Stanescu, V. (2014). Conclusion: Future directions for critical animal studies. In N. Taylor & R. Twine (Eds.), *The rise of critical animal studies: From the margins to the centre* (pp. 262–276). London: Routledge.
- Philo, C., & Wilbert, C. (2000). *Animal spaces, beastly places: New geographies of human-animal relations* (Critical Geographies). London; New York: Routledge.
- Pierce, J. (2016). *Run, Spot, run: The ethics of keeping pets*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

- Pratt, G., & Rosner, V. (2012). *The global and the intimate: Feminism in our time* (Gender and culture). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Schatz, E. (Ed.). (2009). *Political ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Seager, J. (2003). Pepperoni or broccoli? On the cutting wedge of feminist environmentalism. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 10(2), 167–174.
- Shahjahan, R., Wagner, A., & Wane, N. (2009). Rekindling the sacred: Toward a decolonizing pedagogy in higher education. *Journal of Thought*, 44(1–2), 59–75.
- Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples* (2nd ed.). London: Zed Books.
- Srinivasan, K. (2014). Caring for the collective: Biopower and agential subjectification in wildlife conservation. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 32(3), 501–517.
- Srinivasan, K. (2016). Towards a politics animal geography? *Political Geography*, 50, 76–78.
- Visweswaran, K. (1994). *Fictions of Feminist Ethnography*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Watson, M. C. (2016). On multispecies mythology: A critique of animal anthropology. *Theory, Culture, & Society*, 33(5), 159–172.
- Wise, S. (2009). *An American trilogy: Death, slavery, and dominion on the banks of the Cape Fear River* (1st Da Capo Press ed., a Merloyd Lawrence book). Philadelphia, PA: Da Capo Press.
- Wolch, J. & Emel, J. (1998). *Animal geographies: Place, politics, and identity in the nature-culture borderlands*. London; New York: Verso.