

International Conference
Animals in Ethnography: Methods and Ethical Positionings
Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris, France
21 & 22 November 2019

ENGLISH ABSTRACTS

First Keynote Lecture
Vulnerable Animals and Careful Ethnographies
Don Kulick, Uppsala University (Sweden)

The idea of vulnerability is currently undergoing re-evaluation in philosophy, the social sciences and the humanities. From having been perceived as a condition from which subjects should be defended, rescued or liberated, vulnerability has increasingly come to be theorized as a position or experience that invites the possibility to extend understanding, empathy, ethics and theory. Although no single theoretical perspective currently “owns” vulnerability, there is an increasing tendency in the humanities and social sciences for the concept to be associated with the writings of the American philosopher Judith Butler. A problem that I will discuss is the resolutely anthropocentric nature of Butler’s understanding of vulnerability. How relevant is it to non-human animals? What is animal vulnerability and how does it differ (if at all) from human vulnerability? How can careful ethnographies of human-animal relationships contribute to thinking about both the specificity of animal vulnerability, and vulnerability more generally?

Panel 1
Animals and Consumption

When slaughterhouses resuscitate animals: beyond food safety – refocusing on their welfare

Amandine Gautier, INRA/IRISSO Paris Dauphine (France)

Long-term observation in slaughterhouses raises the question of the death of animals, often in small touches. This communication is based on a 5-month field observation mainly in 5 slaughterhouses and 130 semi-directive interviews.

In the 263 French slaughterhouses, 2155 inspectors (representing 1200 FTEs) carry out official controls. The veterinary officials, supervised by an official veterinarian, inspect all carcasses and offal and are responsible for stamping carcasses leaving the slaughterhouse. They are present in slaughterhouses since the beginning of the slaughter, very early in the morning, until the last weighing.

The slaughterhouse refers to a "separate" place, where animals are killed for human consumption. It requires a conversion work from the officials and a form of conditioning. However, once this work is done, the death of the animals is still a taboo with which the agents must deal.

In charge of inspecting live animals and carcasses and offal, veterinary officials question, in half words, the passage between the animal and the meat. In this context of playing with the taboo of the death of animals. The behaviour of the majority of inspectors reflects the

permanent need to "wash" the killing. Like most of their chain neighbours, they regularly spray their stations and themselves, the apron and boots.

This intimacy is reflected at night when, in their dreams, the question of the death of animals is discussed. Dreams - which are not to be analyzed or interpreted - show the striking presence of death.

Since 2016, with the current situation related to animal protection issues in slaughterhouses, animal protection now seems to provide inspectors with a new reason for slaughterhouse inspection. As a counterpoint to the segmentation of their work, they are looking for new entries to capture the overall meaning of the inspection activity, from the legged animal to the carcass. In so doing, they are in line with recent concerns about the humanitarian treatment of animals, which are now being addressed at the regulatory level and which have infused the veterinary services community in recent years.

Proper treatment inspections carried out at the slaughter level directly confront inspectors with the killing of animals. They reflect the uncertainty associated with the ambiguous measurement of loss of animal consciousness and the measurement of animal suffering, but also collective discomfort.

Trade shows dedicated to pets: blurring and paradoxes of animal ethics

Sophie Corbillé, Celsa / GRIPIC, Sorbonne-Université, Paris (France)

Emmanuelle Fantin, Celsa / GRIPIC, Sorbonne-Université, Paris (France)

In Paris, everywhere in France and in the world, trade shows dedicated to pets keep coming and flourishing. Encouraged by private actors of pet industry, these gigantic events offer a multitude of activities: cat shows, exhibitions of pedigree dogs, rodents' or reptiles' pavilion, shows skillfully staged by animal behaviorists, tutorial for learning how to take care of one's pet, and others attractions such as walks on a camel's back.

We focused our attention on two Parisians trade shows: « Animal Expo » (6th and 7th October 2018 at the Parc Floral de Paris) and « Paris Animal Show » (12th et 13th January 2019 at the Paris Expo Porte de Versailles). Each of these trade shows attract lots of people that meet up for a few hours, in a huge hubbub blending the visitor's and the exhibitor's voices with the cries of the animals. The posters of the trade shows highlight the « cute » side of pets, but it appears that the commercial dimension is central to these events : industrialists are pervasive (especially companies like Royal Canin and Animalis) and exhibitors are clearly here to sell, from salesman for products related to pets « management » (food vying to have the most innovative taste, game accessories, resting equipment, clothes, books, etc.) to numerous breeders that display, next to their animals, their prices. Private individuals and professional actors mix in these trade shows that appear to be at the same time places for exhibition, for leisure, for learning, for selling and buying. They are also social places for professional actors of pets' market, as can be seen from the pleasure that some of them seem to have in meeting each other and in chitchatting about (their) beasts, among other things.

Debates and struggles about protection and respect of pets are ancient and recurring, endorsed by associations that had sometimes obtained mediatic and legislative successes. Yet, these questions are vastly absent from these trade shows. Moreover, for researchers observing these places, crucial questions related to animal ethics are aroused: puppies are displayed in tiny enclosures and seem to be sometimes stressed out by disorientation, by the proximity of other dogs, or by visitors constantly asking to pet them; cats are closely huddled together in tiny cages and subjected to the constant look of visitors, waiting to be handled and examined by a jury. Reptiles are locked in boxes so small that they cannot stretch their body, neither move. In short, animals are displayed as if they were goods, waiting to become « pets ».

However, trade shows cannot be reduced to their commercial dimension. They gather people who, beyond their status, share the « love of animals ». These are places where the relationship between men and animals are complex, ambivalent, and even paradoxical.

This initial paradox – the alleged absence of debate on animal ethics in these fairs whereas pets are often in the middle of ethics debates – is the core of our work. Leaning on our observations and a discursive analysis, we explore this hypothesis: animal ethics is not absent but treated by various processes, depending on requalifications (Estebanez, 2014) of animals lead by diverse dispositives of the trade shows, from the « goods-animal » to the « individual-animal », from the « artifact-animal » to the « living animal » (Ferret, 2014). This instability might reveal the status of pets, defined as « each animal possessed by man for its leisure ». But in order to understand this paradox, we also have to discuss the moralities of our study: how can we understand the behavior of animals in these events, and the relationship between human and animals that occur there? Should we focus on the individuality of each animal, or on the contrary, consider that « each being, human or not, is successively or simultaneously subject and object » (Ferret, 2014)?

From a white pup to grey seals : ethnography of seals and sealing in the context of Anthropocene and animal studies. Back on a fieldwork and its ethical or methodological issues (Magdalen Island, Québec, Canada)

Gaëlle Ronsin, Université du Québec à Rimouski (Canada) & Centre Max Weber, UMR 5283, Lyon (France)

Nathalie Lewis, Université du Québec à Rimouski (Canada)

Geneviève Brisson, Université du Québec à Rimouski (Canada)

The contemporary vision of animal ethics - appeared in the 1970s (Delon, 2019) - and the animalist movement owe to harp seals and its hunt. Constructed in the media and politics as a charismatic specie, harp seal acquired a symbolic position in the debates about suffering, killing, commercialization and transformation of wild animals. However, the commercial seal industry remained quite inaccessible to ethnographers (with the exception of men - photographers or videographers - who practice hunting).

A challenge exists to explore and update this controversial subject thanks to ethnography, recent theoretical framework in a context of environmental and social issues that affect collectives composed of seals, fishermen and hunters in the Gulf of St. Lawrence (Newfoundland or the Magdalen Islands in Quebec).

An ethnography, started in February 2019 in the Magdalen Islands, as part of a postdoctoral research, tried to make some shifts with previous works. It aims methodologically, in agreement with *animal studies*, to redistribute the capacities of action between humans and non-humans but also to question the renewal of ethical issues due to increasingly manifestations of Anthropocene consequences in this area. This paradoxically lead to a strong increase of grey seals and a disorder in socio-ecosystems.

This communication proposes to relate the impact of these sifts on the survey, ethical questions that arise and the facilities or difficulties encountered.

Panel 2
Human Vulnerability, Animal Vulnerability

**Human-Animal Relation Challenged by Social Work Practices with Homeless People:
An Ethnography of Absence**

Chloé Couvy, Université de Montréal (Canada)

Canis lupus familiaris. The latin phrase dissociates dogs from their said “wild” congeners by adding the adjective familiaris, related to family and home: they’re domesticated. If human’s relationship to his “best friend” takes roots in sedentary lifestyle and domiciliation, what can we say about those whom, homeless and nomadic, are however co-constructing their daily lives by his side? Despite the important roles that nonhuman animals can take in a context of homelessness, those particular forms of “hybrid communities”¹ seem to transgress the hegemonic representations of legitimate companionship. This transgressive character appears, among other things, with the main exclusion of canine individuals in spaces, practices and issues of social work, historically rooted in an anthropocentric definition of care and assistance modalities^{2,3}.

While working on a master thesis in social sciences, I chose to focus on production and normalisation of human-animal relations (HAR)⁴. The context of homelessness appears as a relevant frame to analyze those dynamics: how and under which conditions can a dog take a role in homelessness experiences, and in related social work practices? During several months, I shared time and activities with users and workers in a community center based in Montreal, being one of the few to open its doors to its users’ nonhuman companions. By a “circulation between voice and looks”⁵, between words and gestures, I tried to encounter both humans and dogs. This quality of ethnography appears as particularly useful to investigate a hybrid field: if we might seize both humans’ discursive and acting modalities, it becomes more difficult to interview dogs with classical methods. Ethnography’s sensitive and patient approach allows us to take time to familiarise with the various communication modes we can perceive. As such, dogs I met did way more than just being passively observed; they took place as actual actors in this work. As “social facilitators in interactions between humans”⁶, they sometimes took key roles in my ability to create contact with people, or in my interpretation of encountered situations. Still, this investigation was confronted to environments resisting dogs’ physical presence. Since then, how is it possible to take them into account? Trying to overcome this resistance, and to understand it, I focused on social workers’ point of view, looking for dogs’ appearances and footsteps in their discourse; in other words, how dogs can shape and be shaped by those narratives. As much in my analytic angles as in my methodological and redactional choices, I tried to give them a central place.

On a larger scale, we can then question the ethical implications of HAR integration and nonhuman animals’ requalification in social work goals and practices. Dogs’ ambivalent status, from pests to pets, and the modalities of their exclusion or inclusion, finally returns to the enactment of HAR normative frames. Discrimination issues that we could qualify as “intraspecific” then appear. It seems that, by sharing humans’ social environment, dogs inherited their stigmas: if some of them can be considered as care partners, others are labelled as pests, illegitimate companions of a social group itself marginalized. It is also in this capacity that ethnography has a role to play: strongly rooted in daily life and experiences, it offers time and space to acknowledge, valorize, and requalify individuals, whether humans or not.

« When do you bring us unicorns ? » : An ethnographic approach of animal presence in jails

Julie Rodriguez-Leite, IRIS, EHESS, Paris (France)

This proposal is going to be a testimony of one way to ethnograph animals based on materials from my socio-anthropological thesis about human-animal interaction (HAI) in prison environments. I will analyze those ethnographical practices that give me a better understanding of animal presence in jails and we will see how those practices are eminently dynamic and can be adapted to the animal's diversity (dogs, horses, rabbits and chinchillas) and also to several study's contexts. Trying to be more and more reflexive, I will analyze some methodological choices and identify certain consequences on my ethnography.

Each fieldwork has its characteristics. In my case, to study HAI in jails raise multiple issues. First of all, the animal presence is often perceived as extra-ordinary by many actors: professionals with their animals, professionals from the penitentiary administration and, of course, inmates. Because the animal presence in jails surprises a lot, dogs, horses, rabbits and so on, become a major topic of discussions and actions.

The title I have chosen for this proposal is extracted from my fieldwork's notebook. A prison guard said that sentence to us (the woman who intervenes in jail with her pets and myself) right before we entered in prison. This shows the extra-ordinary aspect of animal presence in such context. During that proposal, I will also deal with the ordinary animal presence (like rats or pigeons) which emerge into inmates everyday lives.

This proposal is an opportunity to share some techniques and stories about ethnography – how to adjust our bodies in the space with animals, how to approach different species? Is it possible to formalize observations ? How to describe the invisible animals, the ones I heard about, but rarely see ?

The ethnologist and the deraturer. Investigate human-rodent interactions in wartime (Mali, 2018)

Julien Bondaz, LADEC, Université Lumière Lyon 2 (France)

While the metaphor of deratting has been used by several Malian journalists to talk about the conflict in northern Mali and the fighting against jihadists, the fight against rats and other rodents is a daily activity for the local population and refers to different concrete practices. The use of poison or glue boards is particularly successful. Investigating this commonplace activity, these very ordinary animal deaths, provides a better understanding of food and property conservation issues, but also local knowledge about rodents, their behaviour, ways of naming and classifying them and ways of combating their misdeeds. The destruction of rats is hardly the subject of ethical considerations on the part of trappers and deratists. In the field, moral tensions are less about the living conditions of rats or mice than their ambivalent status: perceived as intruders, and very often as strangers, they are transformed into prey (in a sense, they are even prey par excellence, as some magico-ritual uses testify). In such a context, the ethnologist is forced to reflect: what ethical position to adopt during the investigation? is he not himself an intruder in the field? is deratting another way of waging war? This communication, based on ethnographic data collected in Bamako in 2018 and historical data on rodent trapping in West Africa, will review the survey conditions and propose a reflective analysis of the research approach. It thus aims, on the one hand, to examine the relationship between ethnozoology, biopolitics and animal ethics in wartime, and, on the other hand, to question the particular status of rats in ethnography.

Vulnerability, Kinship and Ethics in a Fish Ethnography

Panos Kompatsiaris, Higher School of Economics, Moscow (Russia)

This presentation explores the predicament of kinship towards non-human otherness via the figure of a toxic fish that migrated from the Red Sea into Mediterranean waters over the last decade. The fish with the scientific name *Lagocephalus sceleratus* had been spotted in the wider area of the southeastern Aegean coast of Turkey in 2003 and subsequently in Izmir, the Greek islands and the Israeli coast. In 2018, scientific records verified the presence of the fish on the coasts of Malta, Croatia, Egypt, Italy, and, more recently, Spain. The arrival of this newcomer has alarmed environmentalists, fishermen, and policy-makers in the Eastern Mediterranean and the EU, generating ongoing debates concerning methods for its destruction and/or commercial exploitation (it is currently listed by the European Commission as an 'invasive alien species'). The fish is unwanted because it has no use and exchange value for the local populations and is an irritation for their livelihoods. The brutal media accounts about this migrant fish remind the dehumanizing ways that human migrants, refugees and other unwanted populations appear in far-right public discourse (Kompatsiaris, 2018).

Based on ethnographic research among fishermen and marine biologist communities in the island of Crete, this presentation explores the idea of human/ non-human solidarity, hospitality and kinship in relation to the figure of the alien, the invader and the parasite. According to a radical post human ethics, compassion and kinship should be extended to all nonhuman lives based on their fragile and profoundly vulnerable status in technologically advanced modern societies (Pick, 2011; Braidotti, 2013). While in animals exploited for food and clothing the attribution of 'vulnerability' is straightforward and unproblematic, in the case of nonhumans branded as 'parasites' the question can be complicated. Are parasites vulnerable beings or themselves render other humans and nonhumans vulnerable by rampaging their livelihoods?

On the one hand, insofar as parasites are named as such by 'humans' (who are the biggest parasite on the planet), this qualification has an explicitly anthropocentric orientation. On the other hand, as in the case of Crete and the fish I will be looking, 'parasites' mostly affect working class and poorer populations who are themselves amongst the most vulnerable human beings. This tension becomes obvious in the ways ethnographic research is carried out and the dynamics of the 'privileged researcher' versus the various 'vulnerable others'. The vulnerable status of ethnographic participants is a precondition for research ethics and politics yet, in light of theories of animal kinship, the pest/human divide makes the relationship between the vulnerable and the non-vulnerable being fraught with tensions.

The fish in this context assumes the qualities of 'distributed object' (Chua; Elliott, 2015) marking working class communities and their imaginations of labour, trade and politics. The brutal treatment of this toxic fish by fishing communities in Crete consolidating, rhetorically and materially, a strong dividing line between us and them, the human and the non-human other. The constitutive fragility of this dividing line and its ongoing contestations, it will be argued, harbours the tensions inhabiting post-human ethics, involving questions of class, anthropocentric bias, the possibilities of interspecies communication, and attempts to rearrange species-based hierarchies.

Panel 3
Investigating Animal Ethics

Human meat, animal murder: ethnology of a symbolic boundary in antispeciesist milieux in Alsace

Cristina Romanelli, Université Jean Jaurès, Toulouse (France)

In order to understand the changes in the perception of animals in France, an ethnographic field research was conducted among seven antispeciesist organizations in the French region of Alsace, where activism is particularly intense. Through the equalization of moral consideration among all animal species, the antispeciesist movement defends the end of the boundary that separates us from the "other animals". Therefore, it refutes the opposition between nature and culture or human and animal, that is constitutive of modernity.

This dichotomy is also increasingly deconstructed by the social sciences: the debate has undergone a major renewal with the new interdisciplinary field of animal studies. However, since the "other animals" are virtually absent from antispeciesist activist circles, during this research it was not possible to recognize them as actors or to observe multi-species relations. Their presence is mainly abstract and manifests itself in the activists' speeches or in materials developed by the organizations, for example.

In any case, this field is exceptional for examining the boundary that separates us from animals, as illustrated by one of the organizations' main strategies, which is precisely to emphasize the arbitrary and socially constructed nature of this boundary (Cherry, 2010). In this sense, activists universalize the victimization of humans and animals, linking oppressions and abuses towards both groups, focusing on the horrors of the acts and highlighting the similar social structural positioning of the victims (ibid: p. 461). Therefore, based on the field data produced during the research, this presentation proposes to discuss the practices that contribute to transforming animals into beings worthy of moral consideration as well as humans.

Blurring the Lines of Animal "Waste" as an Unethical Biomedical Research Practice

Jill A. Fisher, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (USA)

While animal researchers generally express few qualms about using nonhuman animals in biomedical research, they describe the problem of "wasting" research animals in moral terms. Drawing upon 62 semi-structured interviews with animal researchers and members of Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees (IACUCs) in the United States, this paper explores our informants' conceptualizations of wasted animals. Unlike animals that were seen as being used toward more generative research ends, researchers and IACUC members raised concerns about poorly designed animal studies that resulted in unusable data as well as about animals that were unneeded and "sacrificed" without being used in an experiment. In articulating this concern, researchers and IACUC members often drew clear lines between legitimate and illegitimate uses of animals by naming the latter "waste." These perspectives rest on the assumption that standard scientific practices use animals well, meaning that the research meets its stated objectives. However, in the case of translational research in particular, such an assumption might depart radically from the reality. Indeed, there has been an increasing amount of scrutiny regarding the "success" of preclinical science in leveraging discoveries in animals to safe and effective human therapies. By situating our informants' narratives within the context of the "crisis" of rigor and reproducibility characterizing contemporary nonhuman animal science, this paper illustrates how their conceptualizations of

waste are symptomatic of larger concerns about the validity of science that translate on the ground into ethical qualms.

“We are told to treat animals humanely”: balancing animal ethics and biosecurity in the search for Ebola reservoir

Emmanuelle Roth, University of Cambridge (UK)

This presentation is meant to introduce the preliminary results from 16 months of ethnographic research in Guinea on wildlife viral surveillance, from 2017 to September 2019. This zone became known as a zoonotic disease ‘hotspot’ after the emergence of the West African Ebola outbreak in 2013, supposedly through a cross-species transmission event of the virus from a bat to a child (Brown and Kelly 2014; Saez et al. 2015). Until now, research in the epidemiology and microbiology of zoonoses has failed to identify the origin of the outbreak, and more generally to reach conclusions on the identity of the animal reservoir of Ebola. However, specialists see evidence from some microbiological findings that certain bat species might harbour the virus without experiencing any symptoms. Bats have gained thus iconic importance in the strategic search for emergent viruses, an activity meant to contribute to global pandemic preparedness.

In the wake of the West African pandemic, and renewed fears around the Ebola threat to global biosecurity, scientists from around the world have been scrambling to extract biological samples from local wildlife, in the hope of finally isolating live virus in particular species. I currently conduct doctoral fieldwork with the Guinean scientific assistants to such a viral surveillance project. I enquire about human-animal relations in a ‘disease hotspot’, the construction of scientific evidence and the role played by epistemologies of secrecy in the quest for the Ebola reservoir. This presentation however will focus on tensions between different ontologies of nature as they are laid bare by work with potentially contaminated animals. It will argue that as scientific workers care for an animated entanglement of beings, materials and spaces, their practices reconfigure the balance between biosecurity and animal ethics.

‘We are told to treat animals humanely’ (*‘On nous dit de traiter les animaux humainement’*, in French) is the formulaic avowal repeated by those scientific assistants when carefully handling bats potentially contaminated with emergent viruses. When the bats fly down into the net and become trapped, they struggle and snarl up tightly. A scientific agent has to detangle the fragile jumble of hair, bones and claws, which may take several minutes. The task requires much ability and gentleness as one should neither tear the net nor hurt the bat. The wings are especially difficult to separate as they are made of thin stretched skin that, if perforated, would crucially impair their flight and compromise survival. In contrast with earlier research on liminal species seen as pest, current Western endeavours not only refrain from ‘terminating’ the animal, but even place the animal’s safety above their goal of obtaining biological samples. In line with Western animal ontologies centred around biodiversity conservation and animal welfare, bat wellbeing is made a priority, even when using those as ‘disease sentinels’ (Keck 2014).

Yet to local fieldworkers, the animal is a rogue: it pants, squeaks and squirms to break free, its mouth open and ready to bite. Rather than seeing/feeling bats as frail beings, they more readily insist on their aggressiveness. Most of them privately confess feeling disgust and pity for an animal they find ‘ugly’. Their sharp teeth in particular excites much apprehension as they can easily pierce several gloves. Instances where fieldworkers get bitten, or ‘bioaccidents’, are not rare. When they occur, they may trigger an anxious wait for a potential infection to manifest itself and affect the worker’s health. Their experiences with bats combine with biosecurity discourses and practices to shape a singular ontology of the animal

as a proximate threat. Bats themselves play an important role in this through their frenetic moves to escape the workers' grip.

The practical tension between the need to protect oneself and the requirement to protect the animal in biological work with viral agents (Keck 2012) materializes itself in the negotiated use of leather gloves. Resistant gloves are recommended by the sampling protocol for handling larger fruit-eating bats since the bite and scratch risk is deemed higher. Fruit bats were also deemed potentially more threatening than smaller insect bats since Ebola viral material had only been found in certain fruit bat species until very recently. In the sampling lab however, the use of leather gloves above nitrile gloves is individually negotiated. Some feel that their expert handling skills are enough to safely contain the animal; one indeed loses much sensitivity and dexterity with robust gloves and risks hurting the bat. These take pride in their technique, that they say come from their training as professional veterinarians in Guinea. Animal welfare and performance objectives may thus prevail over biosecurity. The foreign concern for animal welfare expressed in locutions such as 'We are told to treat animals humanely' gains local traction through its practical implications in terms of materials and *savoir-faire*.

Such ethnographic descriptions are meant to deliver preliminary analyses regarding professional understandings of animal ethics when dealing with wildlife 'sentinel species'. They show what the combination of biosecurity and 'One Health' principles does in the field of outbreak preparedness, where scientific fieldworkers are invited to literally care for the rogue as a disease sentinel that must be preserved if one wishes to anticipate the emergence of pathogens.

Anthropozoological relations and political sciences. To be or not to be normative: strategies of negotiation and epistemological issues

Helen Ha, CERAPS, Université de Lille (France)

Is it possible to be both scientific and normative ?

This proposal is a reflexive analysis of the consequences on my PhD research¹ of my ethical positioning. Its purpose is to shed light on the difficult and ambivalent task of constructing its object of research and its scientific positioning. Reflexivity is absolutely necessary in any kind of social science research. Furthermore when the subject goes off the beaten track of its discipline and when you are a PhD student who has everything to prove. Not to mention the current context of increasing politicisation of animal matters and the fact that academic and activist fields are more and more connected.

First, I will describe and contextualize the difficulties I have encountered since the beginning of the thesis, working on the construction and affirmation of my positioning. These difficulties, related to the fact that my social values, experiences and representations are close to the antispecist ideas, become obvious inside the scientific community or during research interviews. I will show how I had to set up different strategies of negotiation or avoidance, in situation of suspicion from researchers or distrust from people during the fieldwork.

Then, I will demonstrate how, year after year, from one awkward experience to another and based on the reflexive analysis of the scientific implications of an ambivalent normativity, I have finally chosen a definite and no longer ambiguous positioning. Because any activity of knowledge aims more or less to act on social reality, I will share my epistemological considerations and doubts that pushed me little by little to opt for a sociological approach

which assume being critical but above all observe an understanding fieldwork that seeks to report a diversity of opinions.

Finally, I will propose different ways of reflection in order to discuss the possible connections between the study of anthropozoological interactions and political sciences. For example, how analysis of social problems and public policies can increase the understanding of human/animal relations in our societies ? On the contrary, how focusing on anthropozoological interactions and/or on the place given to animals in contemporary societies, can shed a new light on the political and institutional mechanisms, logics and stereotypes of public action ?

Panel 4A Sensitive Bodies in Motion
--

The participating observation: an immersive methodology in anthropo-zoology

Patrice Régnier, VIPS2, Université Rennes 2 (France)

While we observe animal ethic issues (Jeangene Vilmer, 2015) in various French or international media, the question of the relationship between humans and other species takes on a new dimension. In the doctoral research we carried out, (Regnier, 2014), the anthropo-equine relationship has been widely questioned. With the participating observation (Vanpouille, 2011), I came across the field with “Body and soul” (Wacquant, 2002) in order to understand how are constituted the human-horse interaction. The whole categorizes the communicational modes that were the object of a book in which they were exposed (2016). I will now discuss the methodology employed and focus on what it allows us to evoke the different kinds of possible actions between horseriders and the horses they meet, far from a unique domination kind of relationship.

From 2010 to 2013, four equestrian centres have been investigated. Three of them had a « classic form » (that means they provided the technique widely taught to obtain the levels named « gallops », meaning of a confirmed level by the centre teacher). They were all located in the centre of Brittany. Another centre is included, called in French “ethologic”. All of them were in the field which the body methodology took place. Ethnographic papers have been written in which were described sensations, relations and increase of level or technical difficulties during the enquiry.

One of the most specific facts of this initial enquiry is that I was not a horserider when I started it. This is an important fact. Indeed, Chevalier and Le Mancq say in an article (2013) that the horse riders body disappears in this activity. As far as possible, from an objective fact, I think that is a « blind » focus, a specific representation of equestrian people of which the two authors are a part. This could cause them to make a social reproduction (Passeron, Bourdieu, 1964) of the kind of thinking of “their” population, such as what Le Mancq says in her thesis (2008): “the horse is the athlete”. The body investment produced by the participating observation as the principal methodology allows us to confirm widely that this idea of a disappearance of the horse riders body. Following the work of Wacquant (2015), who thinks that being here allows us to meet intimately a social practice, I experimented with the strong body feelings that equestrian activities permit.

This methodology also made me meet the other body, the horse, with whom interacting shows a proper human technical knowledge (Mauss, 1936), and also a knowledge, elaborated over a long time with the horses you interact with. It also appears that the conditions of the

interactions depend widely on the way one considers horses, and on the morality of the teachers who permit these relations.

Thus, if the domination can obviously exist in the anthropo-equine society, it is not the one and only way to be in a relationship. The more interest focused on the horse, the less the domination aspect of the relationship exists, and the partnership gets bigger. We also can observe, for the “ethologic” horse riding (aka “natural” horsemanship), a more important use of scientific references in ethology, while the other teachers focus on their own experience of horsemanship, as an “empiric ethology”.

Ethnography of the horseman-mounting body in Central Asia: Methodological approaches and reflection on animal agency

Tom Fournaux, LADEC, Université Lumière Lyon 2 (France)

In Central Asia, the most popular traditional game is played on horseback. If the rules of the kök-borü differ, from Kyrgyzstan to Mongolia, from Afghanistan to Kazakhstan (Ferret, 2018), it is often a matter of beheading a goat, amputating its legs, and arguing his carcass to throw it away for a purpose in the ground. Dozens of riders collided, to form a half-human, half-animal melee, where almost anything is possible. Neighing, biting, trampling and whipping are required to win the game. Yes, it is, at first glance, the kök-borü is as impressive as it is intriguing because of its singularity, the spectators imbued with animal values quickly come to wonder about the condition of animals. Are they willing to play the game, or only victims of whims? of their rider (Wendling, 2018)? Are they considered as simple means of locomotion, or as real game partners? The use of kamcha ("Камча" in Kyrgyzstan, Central Asian whip) has a repressive/punitive function, or simply stimulating and informative? In short, should we see ill-treatment of the share of humans towards animals, or thinking the community of players "humanimal". (Estebanez et al., 2013) as the same moving mass, following a common objective: to win the victory? Indeed, the kök-borü remains a playground where the human-animal border merges, blurs, renegotiates and where the two beings seem to merge in order not to become only one player with the figure of a centaur. In such a figurative combat situation, at Both playful and violent, the presence or absence of animal agency is not always obvious to see. However, many parameters determine the willingness or refusal of the horse to jump into the equestrian melee (age of the horse, gelding or whole, morphology important or not, knowledge/unknowledge of the rider, energy/fatigue accumulated on the rider's previous days, recent food, etc.), and only the elite of equidae is considered suitable to participate to the kök-borü game. Taking into account animal biography (Baratay, 2017) takes everything into account here its interest, since the history of the horse, its natural character (is it fearful, stubborn, impulsive?), as well as his relationship of trust with his rider are elements that can be found during interviews with players, trainers and horse owners. A subtle game of initiatives on the part of equidae is observable, so that the (human) players do not have the monopoly of action decisions. The endangering or protection of the cavaliermontage body(ies) is the result of a multitude of microactions proposed by one of the entities of the hybrid torque (turn, accelerate, slow down, pitch up, collide...), and validated or rejected by the other. Thus, it is by measuring the agentivity of the horses during the kök-borü, that we will attempt to deconstruct the figure of the animal-object and examine the constant, non-verbal and often intuitive dialogue between the rider's body and that of his mount: communication by mass (centre of gravity, posture, support point), jolt communication (whiplash, talonnage, equine bite, ruade), sound communication (human scream, neighing), visual communication (agitation of the kamcha towards the eyes of the horse, position of the neck and the ears of the equine animal), etc. The aim here is therefore to question the methodological issues a simultaneous multi-species ethnography, proposing descriptive tracks of the body rider-mounting. Addressing such methodological issues will shed light on the layout of the horses participating in the kök-borü, and then adjust an ethical

posture on their animal condition, i. e. their degree of voluntary or involuntary commitment - acts or sudden - in the violence of the game. This work is part of a thesis in anthropology conducted at the Lumière Lyon 2 University, within the LADEC. The scientific data is based on a survey ethnographic study conducted in Kyrgyzstan over a five-month period in 2018, during which descriptions, interviews and photographs were collected.

“That’s just my projection”: Emotional residues and “clean communication” in the study of horse behaviour at an Equine Assisted Personal Development site.

Maisie Tomlinson, University of Manchester (UK)

Equine Assisted Personal Development facilitates human interaction with horses, usually from the ground, in order to explore and reflect on clients’ emotional responses to the encounter for the purposes of human self-growth. The site at which I conducted my research also taught horse behaviour and communication, teaching participants to ‘listen’ to the horse and respect their needs. In this talk I explore the relationship between these two aims through a consideration of what was meant by a “clean communication” with the horse. A clean communication was conceived as the outcome of sufficient training in both self-awareness and careful, multi-sensory attunement to the other. It meant encountering the horse in a calm, “present-moment” state, and the ‘authenticity’ of this approach was believed to open up the possibility of trusting and mutually legible encounters. It also meant becoming aware of how one’s own underlying emotional resonances were likely to impact on the horse in that moment. In this talk I’ll explore the idea of “clean communication” with animals and its relationship to methodological “reflexivity” in ethnography, with particular reference to Raymond Madden’s idea of ‘ethnographic trust’ in multi-species research.

<p style="text-align: center;">Panel 4B Ontological Perspectives</p>
--

Dialogue between Samis, Reindeer and Anthropologists

Marie Roué, Laboratoire d’eco-anthropologie et ethnobiologie, Museum national d’histoire naturelle (Paris, France)

This reflexive communication will allow me to come back to a missing part in my ethnology, and the modification of the centre of gravity in ethnology. Indeed, I have never published or deepened the part of the direct communication between reindeer herders and their reindeer: how and why reindeer herders talk to reindeer, what they say to each other and what the Sámi people say about them. The announced debate allows for a dialogue between young researchers and researchers of the generations preceding them. From a transmission perspective on the method, it can be enlightened, not only by what we have done and how, but also by what we have not done. How can a technological, ethnoscientific and Maussian perspective, centred on the flexibility of social organization, conceal the crucial part of communication between "existing" human and non-human beings?

From the data I have collected without systematic collection on the circumstances in which reindeer herders talk to their reindeer, I will analyse several testimonies on a crucial moment for reindeer herding, that of migration, when it is a question of taking very large reindeer herds in the right direction, to avoid that they get lost in a wrong direction. Whether by giving them direction orally, singing or talking to a very old, faded reindeer and asking them to take their comrades down a difficult path that the herd is reluctant to take, herders speak well to the ears of their reindeer who hear them, act accordingly and are later thanked for it. Orders are given here to supplication, but communication does not seem to be perfectly reciprocal.

What do reindeer say about it and how do they talk to their herders? Do they do so only by their silent presence and acceptance of the breeder's suggestions, and the signs they leave, duly interpreted by a breeder endowed with the omnipotence of his human knowledge?

Yet in the field of perceptions and knowledge, the Sami recognize the limits of their own understanding, while recognizing the abilities of reindeer. Herders know that grazing under snow is good or bad through their own observations, but also by observing the behaviour of their reindeer. Sometimes in winter, they refuse to go to, let alone feed, pastures that pastoralists considered good. Sami herders are nomadic and do not frequent the territory in winter in summer. Yet, intrigued by the behaviour of their reindeer in winter, they sometimes had the opportunity to observe these pastures when the lack of snow allowed them to see the vegetation, and concluded that a refusal to graze reindeer could be linked to the cover of the forest floor by debris left by the timber industry. How had the reindeer seen what men didn't see under the snow? Recently, interdisciplinary research has made it possible to go further by demonstrating that reindeer have the decisive and mysterious ability to see through snow thanks to their ultraviolet vision. In conclusion, we will discuss this link between highly innovative scientific research on the vision of several species, in conjunction with local knowledge and anthropological research. To conclude, we hope to add to our interviews with Sami breeders an interview with our fellow optometrists and ophthalmologists who are the authors of this innovative research, if they accept it, in order to understand if and how their representations of the animals studied are changing (before or after these results are obtained).

The many faces of human-dog socio-cultural and socio-spatial relations in 4 Aboriginal communities in Northern Quebec

Laine Chanteloup, IGD, Université de Lausanne (Suisse)

Thora Herrmann, Université de Montréal (Canada)

Elisa Cohen-Bucher, Université de Montréal (Canada)

Dogs are at the centre of the cultural, societal and economic relationships of Inuit and First Nations. In the past, dogs have been used for travelling or as working dog by various northern indigenous nations. Yet the human-dogs relationships have been profoundly altered due to settler colonialism. Today dogs are still in the heart of Indigenous identities and cultures, but they represent also a source of risk for health and well-being (e.g. zoonoses such as rabies, risks of bites). The lack or limited access to veterinary services and issues related to canine overpopulation worsens such problems. We examine these issues through the development of a collaborative project built with 4 indigenous communities in Northern Quebec : Kuujuaapik (Inuit), Whapmagoostui (Cree), Kawawachikamach (Naskapi) and Matimekush- Lac John (Innu). Participatory mapping and photovoice methods were used in addition to semi-structured interviews conducted with dog owners and non-owners, and decision makers in order to show the diversity of human-dog interlinkages, and identify the differences and similarities in perceptions, values, attitudes, and uses related to dogs in each community.

Human knowledge, elephant knowledge: Methods and epistemology for a desanthropocentric anthropology

Nicolas Lainé, LAS, EHESS, Paris (France)

My intervention aims to open up epistemological and methodological reflections to access and take into account animal knowledge. It is based on a field survey conducted in Laos, the purpose of which is to study the medical knowledge possessed by mahouts and domestication specialists, put into perspective with self-medication practices observed among pachyderms.

By studying the links between animal self-medication and local pharmacopoeia, the objective was to highlight the convergence of plant uses between humans and pachyderms which, from a human health perspective, have been able to participate in the construction of local medicinal practices. In the field, the approach was divided into three parts.

The first task was to collect information on the health of the pachyderms from their mahouts or domestication specialists. From a methodological point of view, this first part mobilized the tools specific to ethnographic research, which involves immersion among the population concerned, repeated observation of practices (and their variants), or the conduct of semi-directive interviews and life stories. This component also mobilized tools and methods from the ethnosciences (ethnobotany and ethnozoology) to shed light on the local vision of diseases, and to update local registers of diseases and their treatment.

The next step was to carry out field trips with animals and the people in charge, with the intention of collecting information on the plants or any other plant resource (root, branch, fruit, leaf, vine, bark) consumed by the animals. From a methodological point of view, this component was based on the ethno-ethnological approach (Brunois 2005). Access to the knowledge and understanding of the pachyderms about their environment has been provided through the mediation of the mahouts, in particular on how they perceive the behaviour of the animals.

Finally, it was a question of putting local knowledge about pachyderms into perspective with the self-medication practices of elephants. Thus, the plants collected by observing animals were presented to the specialists of this pharmacopoeia; others were more directly related to the data collected on veterinary knowledge on these animals.

The detailed presentation of the approach and the first results of the survey will open a reflection on how to consider animals as objects and subjects of anthropological research. Indeed, supposing that in Laos human groups have been able to draw on the observation and knowledge of pachyderms implies rethinking the way local knowledge is considered. From an epistemological point of view, this reversal implies that the primacy of knowledge over biodiversity should no longer be given to humans alone, giving priority to interspecies interaction and its mutually thought-out dynamics. Proposing an extension of the notion of local knowledge to animals, it will therefore be a question of proposing a truly de-anthropocentric anthropology taking into account different points of view on the world.

<p style="text-align: center;">Panel 5A TechnoZoologies</p>

Rolling! Filming the points of view and telling the routines in human-machine breeding.

Séverine Lagneaux, Université Catholique de Louvain (Belgium)

Joffrey Becker, LAS (Paris)

This project started badly: we had to deal with a black box! It was impossible to ethnographize, as projected, a company producing milking robots in the field for which a subsidy was granted to us. Our goal was to capture the machine factory and the logic behind it from the inside, in order to understand the conception of dairy farming (of the farmer's profession, animals and their ethology, milk) underlying the design and scripts of this tool. Unfortunately, we were quickly confronted with deadlock. Sometimes the absence of time to devote ourselves, sometimes the professional secret sometimes a commercial speech well prowled and analyzed elsewhere interposed in research. We then tested the remote

communication by conducting skype interviews with one or the other engineer of the firm. This "source" quickly dries up for the same reasons as before. The project took water. Yet, like a lifebuoy, it is to a small box that we hung up. The latter gave birth to an ethnographic writing and an experience of the points of view that we wish to discuss.

New exploratory tracks have opened up to us thanks to the use of a GoPro camera. Reoriented towards the space of a robotic dairy farm, it is the interweaving of the routines of different protagonists integrated into this system that we are now investigating under the name "humanimachine". This was done to circumvent the lack of understanding from the point of view of the designer of the robot, the inaccessibility of the algorithm and the internalization, supposed by the firm, of the prescriptions of its use by grasping how the device "rolls" in the words of the breeder frequented in Wallonia. We would then describe and analyze the effects of the robot's "presence" in daily life in a dairy stall. We wanted to give a clearer picture of routines but how? It is impossible, for example, to follow a cow for a whole day: fearful, they turn away; in the heart of the herd, they are elusive. The only overhanging view from the terrace of the stall limits their observation when they graze. How to track and report the information flows generated by the milking robot? We had to capture and tell the rhythm of the main protagonists of this specific breeding, to give an account of their points of view, of their routines and their interweavings which do not go without the interlocking of the diversity of their preoccupations. The visual transcription tested leads us today to reflect on the writing in which it presides and the notion of points of view induced by this device that has made the adaptations and multiple participations at the heart of this humanimachine system salient.

From the bird's sonic stance. Reflections on human-animal sound interactions

Patricia Jüggi, Lucerne University of Applied Sciences and Arts (Switzerland)

Matthias Lewy, Lucerne University of Applied Sciences and Arts (Switzerland)

Our presentation focuses on the role of sound and listening in human-bird relations based on examples from ethnographic research in South America and Europe.

The first part discusses two examples of how ornithologists and composer-musicians in Europe interact sonically with birds. Based on an ornithologist's investigation of Song-Stop-Distance of nightingales we will show how physical-spatial distance or closeness to humans influences birds' sonic behavior. The second example focuses on musician and composer David Rothenberg's musical interaction with birds in zoos and parks. We ask whether humans and animals really make music together, as claimed by Rothenberg. Or do the birds perceive Rothenberg's clarinet as another background noise and, thus, as disturbance? These questions lead to some critical reflections on ethics in sonic human-bird interactions.

The second part is based on Lewy's research with Pemón specialists of Southern Venezuela (Gran Sabana), asking about their relationship to birds. For instance, when hearing the voice of the *wantoto* bird, indigenous specialists explain that the sound is made by the *maikok*, human-spirit beings, that are invisible but audible beings. When Pemón people hear the *wantoto* sound, they know that they have entered *maikok* territory and, thus, have to either leave food offerings or take another route. In comparison, the tawny owl has long been considered a messenger of death in the European context. Although when playing its call to a number of (European) interviewees during a listening experiment, the sound triggered different associations: it was mostly perceived as eerie, but also described in the context of a happy campfire-romanticism.

When using sounds in listening ethnographies, imaginative associations arise spontaneously showing how bird sounds trigger emotions and also influence human behavior. While the *wantoto* sound is considered an agent that prompts an everyday trans-specific behavior based on Pemóns' and ontological bias, the sonic perception of the tawny owl in Europe nowadays seems more ambivalent and individualized: The happy campfire-romanticism, embedded in concepts of pastoral rock and fantasy literature, contrasts with the reaction of one interviewee who, recalling the stories of his grandmother she shared with him during childhood, felt uncomfortable when hearing the owl sound.

Sound and listening are distinct forms of interaction between different species. Our ethnographic research about European and Amazonian human-bird interaction demonstrates how humans generate specific sonic and listening-related concepts when approaching the "animal's point of view". Sonic human-bird interaction shows to be deeply related to body distance 'rules' (and ethics) as well as to human associations and imaginations about animals and the meaning of their sonic utterances. Thus, from a comparative point of view, people's perceptual traditions differ in their ontological bias and ethics.

On Cats' Photographs

Jessica Austin, University of Colorado Boulder (USA)

In 2019, Austin and Irvine conducted a study following up on a project by Arluke and Rolfe (2013) analyzing personal photographs of cats shared in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. For their research, Austin and Irvine gathered data from Reddit, a social media website dedicated to sharing content within defined subject-matter communities known as 'subreddits.' The authors analyzed the most popular content from the primary subreddit for sharing photographs of one's own cats, considering the photographs themselves as well as their attached captions. These data resulted in findings germane to sociological understandings of the human-cat relationship: assignation of cats' identities; construction of the cat as family member; and gender performativity through cat guardianship.

While this study was informed by static data, Reddit's specialized communities and diverse membership are promising for its potential as a virtual field site for multi-species ethnography. As Darwin (2017:322) contends, "Reddit qualifies for ethnographic study because the interface fosters virtual communities." Through Reddit, the ethnographic researcher has access to numerous communities dedicated to individual species as well as larger groups of animals and animal behavior. A particular benefit of Reddit, as a virtual space, is the possibility of gaining insight into human-animal interactions that may remain understudied due to lack of physical gathering space. For example, human-dog interactions are highly visible, and are aided by institutions such as dog parks and adoption shelters. However, even given the ubiquity of cats as companions, human-cat interactions are most frequently situated within the private home. Still less visible are human interactions with animals less commonly kept as companions. Even commonplace interactions, however, may benefit from detailed examination of how people construct their relationship with other species through the written word.

Virtual ethnography encounters some methodological criticism. Some charge that lack of physical, face-to-face participant observation is not consistent with ethnographic methods. However, after gaining entry to the virtual space, Hine (2008:259) contends, "The key ethnographic principle, of developing understanding through participation and through a progressive collection of data and focusing of enquiry, remains consistent with more traditional approaches." Engagement in the online community—such as posting comments in asynchronous forums, participating in real-time chat, or conducting in-depth interviews—allows the ethnographer to achieve personal understanding of the setting's culture, norms, and

social structure just as readily as a physical site. Internet-based research has also long been subject to questions about participant authenticity, given the anonymity afforded by computer-mediated communication. However, as Hine (2008:264) points out, “Face-to-face interaction is often taken as a ‘gold standard’ for rich and truthful interaction, despite all of our experiences to the contrary.” Sharing a physical space with an informant does not guarantee honesty, nor is it the ethnographer’s charge to decipher truth from fiction. Pitting physical and virtual space against each other is ultimately futile, given the reality that all interactions are locally and contextually specific, and must be analyzed as such.

Having established the viability of the online space as a field site, is a *multi-species* virtual ethnography possible? From one perspective, such a project would be inherently human-centered, containing no access to the animal subject. Analysis of human language, meaning, and interpretation—as filtered through the human ethnographer’s standpoint—erases the visibility of the animal actor. On the other hand, a written account of nonhuman intersubjectivity constitutes the ethnographer’s observed reality in these spaces, while it remains an indispensable aspect of the online community’s very existence.

Furthermore, is there truly a difference between an individual’s written description of their relationship to an animal versus the researcher’s assurance that the relationship is mutually constituted via direct observation? Even in the case of the latter, the researcher’s projected interpretation of animal selves could result in charges of anthropocentrism. Madden (2014:288) ponders this question when considering traditional multi-species ethnographies, such as Alger and Alger’s (1999) in-depth study of a cat shelter: “I wonder if such ethnographies are continuing to wrestle with the ‘problem’ of anthropomorphism, allowing us to appreciate what it is like for a human to be a cat rather than what it is like for a cat to be a cat.”

Ethnography does not depend on what objectively “is”—and it cannot do so. Instead, it aims to capture the richness of a given community: beliefs, practices, social structures, and, most importantly, the meaning-making associated with all of the above. Multi-species ethnographies aim to “sensitize us to the wonders and contradictions of multi-species encounters” (Ogden, Hall, and Tanita 2013:9). While direct observation of these wonders and contradictions may be informative, it is not always practical. I contend that the virtual space may thus be a valuable substitute, and propose a discussion of the possibilities of and barriers to conducting multi-species virtual ethnography. The subject’s and researcher’s gazes may be through the human lens, but this reality is immutable. Anthropocentrism can be minimized so long as the researcher remains cognizant of the fact that, as Irvine (2004:15) states, “Animals’ subjectivity becomes available to us because elements of a core self become visible through interaction.” It is these animals’ core selves that humans are eager to share online in pursuing the goal of meaningful relationships with other species.

Panel 5B Clues, Traces, Artefacts
--

Making the boar visible: Comparing methods of multi-species ethnographies on human-wild boar relations in Europe and chicken/reindeer sacrifice in Brazil and Siberia

Giovanna Capponi, CEFRES, Prague (Czech Rep.)
Virginie Vaté, EPHE, CNRS, Paris (France)

The TANDEM/Bewildering Boar project (<http://www.cefres.cz/fr/7747;https://boar.hypotheses.org/>) explores how the wild boar (*Sus scrofa*) features in human lives, and, vice versa, how humans play a role in boar lives. More broadly, it provides a study of

how human-boars interactions have shaped and are still shaping socio-environmental contexts. Particular attention is paid to the multiple controversies swirling around wild boars. Indeed, having experienced unprecedented growth over the last decades, Eurasian wild pigs appear regularly in public discourse, as humans see them as the cause of multiple “problems” (C. Mounet 2008). These include extensive damages to crops, car accidents, and encroachment into suburban and urban areas, where boars have become familiar (but unwanted) “residents,” for example in cities such as Barcelona and Berlin. Boars are also seen (in particular by forest rangers) as a threat to biodiversity, contributing to the eradication of other species, such as ground-nesting birds. Finally, boars are known reservoirs for a number of bacteria, parasites and viruses (Meng, Lindsay & Sriranganathan 2009). The recent outbreak of African Swine Fever (ASF) in Eastern Europe and, last autumn, in Belgium at the border with France is one of the main reasons why wild boars have made the headlines over the last two years: the ASF that the boars may carry is seen as a terrible threat to the pig industry. For all of these reasons, boars clearly belong in the category of “divisive animals” (“animal de la discorde”, Manceron et Roué 2009).

While wild boars are omnipresent in discourse, it is not easy for anthropologists in the field to observe their interactions with humans. Boars tend to be nocturnal, particularly if they are disturbed by humans (Etienne 2016), and they are encountered, usually, in unexpected circumstances (with the exception of hunting, but, even in this case, there is no guarantee that boars will be where hunters expect them to be). What the anthropologist can see is traces of the presence of the boars: footsteps in the mud, earth dug up by boars’ snouts, crop damage, excrement, paths the animals use regularly, places where they scratch their back, etc. For this reason, the anthropologist’s knowledge of the life of the boar and of human-boar interactions is mostly informed by human discourse. If the anthropologist is not a hunter himself/herself, the contact with the body of the animal is usually limited to his/her consumption of meat and pâtés – which is no longer an exceptional privilege, since one can buy these in many shops today. For the authors opening a new field research on the topic of human-boar relations in Europe (Capponi in Italy, Vaté in France) this is an unprecedented experience.

Indeed, the authors had exactly the opposite experience during their previous research on animal sacrifice (chicken in Afro-Brazilian rituals for Capponi, reindeer sacrifice among the Chukchi in Siberia for Vaté). In these contexts, the very presence of the animal is at the heart of the ritual. People revolve around the animal, engaging in elaborate practices, turning the dead body into a spiritually meaningful actor. Whereas practices and gestures are abundant and multifaceted in sacrificial rituals, discourse is largely absent. Anthropologists studying rituals often encountered methodological problems in interpreting its symbols and meanings, which are not necessarily consensual and which may change over time, being constantly invested of new connotations that are rarely addressed as such (Lewis 1980). While the animal was always present as a participant in the rituals we studied in Brazil and Chukotka, it was not the subject of extensive verbal commentary, remaining practically invisible in discourse.

Given these varying circumstances, the anthropologists face a methodological conundrum: the sacrificial chicken or reindeer is visible in the ritual but invisible in the interlocutors’ words; while the wild boar is omnipresent in the debates but almost invisible in the landscape. This paper aims to promote a discussion about the methodological issues raised by the comparison of these two types of multi-species ethnographies. What kind of information about human-animal relations do these contrasting situations of visibility/invisibility provide? What are the strategies that anthropologists employ in order to make the animal visible, either in the words of their interlocutors or in descriptions of actual encounters? Can a set of methods be defined for a multi-species ethnography, taking into account all the different possibilities of human-animal interaction?

An approach for a multi-species anthropology: the lure

Hélène Artaud, PALOC, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris (France)

The question of hybrid communities has been the subject of careful examination in anthropology in recent years. More than ever before, it involves conceiving the animal and human worlds in their porosity. More than ever before, methodologies are being improvised to trap shared communication spaces. Research conducted with animals in captivity, in zoos or laboratories, such as the ethnography of societies of breeders, hunters or fishermen, has made it possible to document the plasticity of specific habits, while at the same time questioning the transformations that this interspecific neighbourhood is undergoing on human societies. In many cases, the isolated analysis of specific semiotic knowledge or universes seems ineffective, as mutual inspirations between humans and non-humans seem to have stimulated hybrid practices, spaces of shared meanings. If these forms of co-constructions therefore imply understanding that "none of the partners exists before their relationship is established" (Haraway), the methodological means of highlighting these mutual borrowings, the new forms of co-constructions that these interspecific connivances engage, however, remain insufficient. We intend to participate in this debate by favouring a discreet entry: the one of the lure. LeroiGourhan, who gave the most complete definition, identified as decoys "all processes, objects or parts of objects which, by creating in the coveted animal the image of a prey or the impression of safety, attract it to a capture device. "It will be less a question here of considering it as an "object" or an artifact, than as a complex relational process between humans and non-humans. If, as I have previously demonstrated, the effectiveness of the lure seems to be suspended on the ability of the human to borrow the animal's point of view to imitate the significant elements of its world (Umwelt), this imitation always seems to have to remain deliberately inaccurate. The examples are endless. In the case of « huchement » techniques practiced by pastoralist communities in inland Asia, such as the bird call hunting strategies practiced by Aka hunters, imitation is deliberately biased. Whether deliberately made to avoid a shift into the non-human world, or resulting from the impossibility of understanding or imitating the animal world, this inaccuracy essentially seems to characterize the very technique of the lure. It is this inaccuracy that makes the lure a space for interlocking, rather than substituting, human and non-human perspectives. It is this inaccuracy that makes his study a means of restoring, instead of an isolated point of view, the premises of a shared world. 2 In view of the extraordinary diversity of thinking stimulated by the analysis of this complex and polysemous system, of the place assigned to it in fields as diverse as hunting, domestication, trafficking, shamanic rituals or art, this communication must be based on the analysis of a circumscribed corpus. The ethnographic cases that we will mobilize here draw mainly from a relatively unexplored register despite the extraordinary fertility of the reflections that their study allows: maritime lures. It is on the basis of a comparative analysis, specifying the principles, rational or emotional, on which the effectiveness of the lure depends for each of the human collectives studied, that we will indicate its methodological exemplarity in order to understand the relationships between humans and animals.

In the case of crop pollination what does bee and what does she makes people do? Methodological and ethnographical tools to describe multi-species production practices

Robin Mugnier, Centre Alexandre Koyré, Muséum national d'histoire naturelle, Paris (France)

If we might adapt ethnography to each fieldwork, the question is : which kind of ethnographies should we develop for which animals? This paper will focus on the case study of honey bees, based on the ethnographic material of my thesis. This work was about the use of honey bees and their management by beekeepers and farmers in the crop pollination

context in France. Attached to describe the common involvement between insects and people in a production act, I would like to show that some ethnographic tools allow us to make bees exist as "protagonists of an interaction, [...] during which everyone has the capacity to make others act and to transform their ways of doing things" (Manceron 2016, 289). In the absence of access to their "point of view", the meaning they give to life, or even their intentionality, I consider anthropology has different means to implement: at least at one condition that is to look to what the bee does and what she makes people do. Analyzing the pollination "chaîne opératoire" (Coupaye 2015), from bee rearing to their uses in the crop, will thus make it possible to expose the coordination of agentivities. It will then allow us to describe these multispecies practices, despite the communication difficulties existing between their main protagonists (Stépanoff 2012). This shift towards entomophilous and human practices ultimately follows the predominant question stated on the fieldwork : 'what are bees doing?'. It can be seen has as a way to make them exist as an autonomous agent, to get in touch with them, to adapt their actions and to act in an agricultural environment.

Combined with this framework, three methodological tools can be used to conduct an ethnography with bees, I propose to summarize:

Firstly, the description. Beginning with a return to my field notebooks, I want to emphasize how ethnographic descriptions can also be applied to what bees do. During the time in which the hive is open, a contact zone is created with the beekeepers which shows an interweaving between human and bee practices. Following these situations and describing them, bring to light the fact that bees are not only enacted, but they also create and put in action a multitude of human practices.

Secondly, getting the bees talking through beekeepers can not escape the inherent anthropocentrism in the use of spokespersons. Paradoxically, the interest is to multiply this (beekeepers, farmers, technical institute scientists...) in order to amplify the repertoire of skills, agentivities and bees ways of existence.

Finally, bee and pollination offer a particularly relevant case for not limiting the description to a dual relationship human-animal. Introducing the insect into a plot of rapeseed or in a apple orchard, the presence of another pollinator, a chemical molecule or a hedge with ivy are all situations that model 'agentivity-producing assemblies' (Despret 2013). Added to the description, these ecosystemic relationship put in light the animal in contact with what make it act and what conditions its uses. Knowing the animal through other living being is often underestimated, while it is one of the relevant contributions of multi-species studies.

Without weakening ethnography essentials, entering in it by the animal practices is a relevant answer to make bees exist in anthropology. This is mostly what I want to say during this paper.

<p>Panel 6 Wild, Contagious and Proliferating</p>

Migratory chickens, immigrant birds: the wild/domestic borderland in the context of avian influenza in Hong Kong

Frédéric Keck, CNRS, LAS, EHESS, Paris (France)

Since 1997, when the H5N1 virus emerged among poultry in Hong Kong and successfully transmitted to humans, relations between the former British colony and the People's Republic of China have been expressed through concerns about avian influenza. Domestic chickens are

inspected at the border to check that they don't carry the influenza virus. Migratory birds are considered as the reservoir of the virus, which means that they carry it without symptoms, and illustrate the often quoted sentence that « viruses know no borders ».

The border between Hong Kong and mainland China is one of the most often crossed by human and non-human animals, since Hong Kong is dependent from the Chinese economy, but also one of the most inspected, since avian influenza is only one instance of a series of public and environmental health issues which entertained mistrust toward Chinese products.

I will show that the wild/domestic distinction between birds allows Hong Kong officials to make a distinction between refugees, endowed with value in the colonial past, and immigrants, considered with suspicion in the post-colonial present. However, this doesn't mean that birds are only passive bearers of symbols that humans project upon them. Using the concept of sentinel, I will show that birds send early warning signals of a pandemic threat in modalities that vary depending on their position in borders between species and between territories.

Wild areas and multispecies collectives

Paride Bollettin, Federal University of Bahia (Brazil) & Durham University (UK)
Martina Forti, Leipzig University (Germany) & Max Planck Institute (Germany)

The contemporary public debate shows increasing attention to the role of “wild areas” in the conservation and restoration of the environment. The presence of wild animals is often described as a defining factor for the inclusion of specific environments in this political and semantic category. This notwithstanding areas described as “wild” are characterized by diverse kinds of human-wildlife interactions. Somewhere this definition is used to delimitate areas in which native fauna still maintain a certain degree of free ranging. Somewhere else it is used to map areas for the reintroduction of previously expelled species. Mostly, the interest in the wild fauna is grounded on the classification of some of these species as “endangered”. In this direction, a specific categorization of wild fauna emerges as the masterpiece in the recognition of a certain area as properly “wild”. In the meanwhile, the definition of an area as “wild” determines double hand consequences on the land use destination and usages. For example, the recognition of an environment as protected area for the conservation of a flagship species often implies the limitation of human access to land and resources. On the counterpart, the touristic destination of such areas is promoted as an alternative income source for local populations. Moreover, educational policies oriented to include the contact with wild nature to promote children development are increase in various countries. The impacts of the recognition of a specific area as “wild”, consequently, produce complex and dynamic controversies about the status of wildlife and concomitantly diverse interspecific assemblages with human populations living in these areas. This panorama indicates toward the difficulty to produce a unitary definition of wilderness as a category for describing specific situated forms of producing multispecies collectives.

This paper aims at discussing how is it possible to include wild animals as effective actors in the definition of “wild areas”. It will concentrate on two ethnographic cases where the definition of “wilderness” plays a core role in redefining human-animal collectives. The first example is the Bijilo Monkey Park (The Gambia). This is a protected forest patch situated in the coastline of West Africa. This protected area, surrounded by five-stars hotels, is famous among ornithologists for the presence of a big number of birds' species, as well as for the presence of two primate species, one of them classified as “critically endangered”. It attracts a great number of tourists in the area every year. In the meanwhile, the constitution of this Park determined that the most part of local workers, previously occupied in fishing, are now employed in hotels and other touristic services. Also in this case, however, the recognition of

the area as “wild life” house, affected animals lives. The presence of numerous tourists, whom offer food to primates despite this is a forbidden practice, determined the increasing habitus of these to move inside hotels and to feed from human sources. The second example is Siribinha village in the estuary of Itapicuru River (Brazil). This is a community mostly living from fishing in the river estuary and in the sea. The area is characterized by the presence of one of the most well-maintained mangrove area of the region, in which there are various birds’ endangered species, as well as a “critically endangered” primate specie. Ethnographic data highlight how local inhabitants are inserted in interspecific collectives, in which human and animals share communicative and social relations. Actually the area is not officially protected, however an on-going project developed by a team of biologists from the Universidade Federal da Bahia is promoting such classification of the area. This work is being developed in close connection with local community and authorities, as a form to stimulate environmental preservation and economic development through tourism.

These ethnographic examples offer stimulating elements for discussing how non-human animals could be recognized as a proper actors in the definition of “wild areas”. The thesis is the discussed ethnographic cases will offer the possibility to observe wild animals not as a symbol or a tool for humans’ finalities, but as active subjects in the definition of shared lives, as demonstrated by behavioural changes of native species. Moreover, such active work of animals can be recognized at both, local and global level, because of their international touristic projection. In the meanwhile, the paper will discuss how to include an effective dialogue between native species, local inhabitants, life and social scientists in a common reflection on “multispecies wild areas”. The symmetrisation of alternative approaches toward non-human animals produced by the interdisciplinary dialogue between social and life scientists should be expanded toward alternative epistemologies. The inclusion of non-human in the ethnographic work, consequently, appears as necessary in the direction of a wider comprehension of what does it mean “wild area”.

What to do and what to think about bats of the archbishopric of Conakry (Guinea)?

Benjamin Frérot, Université Lumière Lyon 2 & IRD (France)

During the 2014-2016 Ebola virus outbreak in Guinea, the bats were suspected to be responsible for the initial transmission of the virus to the human population in the forest area. By taking zoonosis as subject, anthropology works on reconsidering the relations between humans and animals. In keeping with preparedness, the anthropology participates to assess risks of contamination and improve the development of health policy that will be better adjusted to realities. This communication deals with an ethnographic fieldwork in the archbishopric of Conakry in 2019.

The biggest colony of bats in the capital are sheltered by the trees in the yard of the archbishopric. By focusing on the diversity of perceptions, representations and interspecific meetings, the study highlights the debate about the place given to bats. Many strategies are established with the intention of causing escape of bats: for example pruning of trees, burning tires, disturbing with noise pollution. I question the reasons given about these practices in connection with the roles and the status assigned to bats. Most discourses of inhabitants describe the bats as pests. They spearhead sensorial nuisances like noises, smells, faeces, buildings or trees deteriorations or making fruits inedible. They are often represented as a liminal being, difficult to describe or categorize, on the borders between dog, bird, rodent and human. They embody the dialogue between worlds, diurnal and nocturnal, visible and invisible in engaging dangerously sometimes with others humans and nonhumans.

Nevertheless some people seem to take advantage of this cohabitation by using bats as an alimentary and therapeutic resource. The yard of the archbishopric turns discreetly into a

hunting area in the town. But this activity is showed at the student in anthropology with distrust. Since the last Ebola virus outbreak in West Africa, bats hunting, the consumption and any practice of connecting bats and humans are considered as an endangerment of human health, animal health and environmental health. This approach is embodied by the collector team's samples who explore the viral and ecologic roles of bats. At the interface of these discourses, the ethnographic attention enables an ethical reflection about the impacts of the scientific investigations on the human-animal sociality.

Of respondents and compassion: Being in the field with non-human animal workers

Leonie Cornips, Meertens Institute & Maastricht University (The Netherlands)

Harry Wels, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam & African Studies Centre Leiden (The Netherlands)

Cows in intensive animal farming in the Netherlands and white lions in a rewilding project in South Africa can be perceived as co-workers in these two respective organizations (cf. Despret 2016: 177-183; Wels 2018). In order to study them ethnographically as co-workers, next and in various relations to their human-animal colleagues as the respective authors do, poses serious methodological challenges. Especially when you, like the authors, were academically raised within the methodological approaches within the social sciences and humanities, with its focus and combinations of anthropocentrism, logo- and language- (Meijer 2017; Cornips 2019) centrism. How to go methodologically with "new modes of experience" (Locke 2017: 358; McTavish 2015) including compassion (Friese 2019; Nieuwland and Meijboom forthc.) about taking non-human respondents in an organization on board (cf. Locke 2016; Motamedi-Fraser 2019); how to methodologically 'learn with them' (Despret 2016: 45), and 'co-produce science' (Latimer and Gómez 2019: 251) in organizational ethnography.

This paper will explore our attempts-in-the-field to find possible answers to the above raised questions. We will do that from the perspective of being in our respective fieldwork situations with our non-human respondents.

No philosophical exposés, no theoretical considerations, no conceptual smooth grinding, but our trials and tribulations of actually Being In The Field with non-human respondents in the organizational settings in which they are participating and get priority in trying to find our ways to learn with- and from our non-human respondents.

<p style="text-align: center;">Second Keynote Lecture Ethnography of Animals, with Ethologists <i>Véronique Servais, Université de Liège (Belgium)</i></p>
--

There is currently very strong pressure for the social sciences to consider animals for themselves and not as objects on which representations are made, and to document the active role they play in our social dynamics. This implies recognizing some kind of agentivity to them, or in other words seeing them as "acting" rather than simply "acted" through physiological determinisms. There are moral, scientific, and probably also aesthetic reasons for this. Indeed, even if it is more difficult to argue in a scientific presentation, I think we are many to sense that a purely human world is much less interesting than a world populated by trees, gluttons, dirty animals, weeds, dolphins and mosquitoes, and all the relationships between these species and between organisms and their environments, which are co-evolving. There are many objective reasons to be concerned about biodiversity loss and climate change - for example, the loss of forests could lead to a significant drying up of continents, because

forests are responsible, through their perspiration, for the creation of real aerial rivers, but I do not agree with Bruno Latour when he says that, in the end, we should only be interested in our survival, because Gaïa will always get away with it - for a few billion years in any case.

Personally, I am one of those people for whom "the observation of what is 'there, outside' - animals, plants, stars and time - helps to correct, at least in part, what is wrong 'here inside'". (Bateson, 1996, p. 364). For me, knowledge of natural history is a source of wonder, and I am one of those people for whom observing the living world, or a walk in the woods, is beneficial. Observing the intricacies of the living world and connecting with it in a way that I do not control thus "corrects" certain neurotic tendencies maintained by my life as an intellectual and academic – But I am terribly suspicious of the therapeutic "uses" of the forest or animals, although this is one aspect of my research. I think that this intuition, according to which the multivers are richer and more interesting than the uni-vers, if one can say so, is shared by a large number of researchers among those who try to symmetrize their work, who seek to take animals out of the fortress in which a certain biology has locked them, by trying in particular to carry out ethnographies - or ethographies, to use the term Leblan & Roustan (2017) have coined, of animals.

The methodological and conceptual challenges of such an undertaking are enormous and I will only discuss a few aspects here. They are equal to the scientific and societal changes involved in treating the living as agents, in ceasing to think of them as separate from human beings, and in believing that they are "mere animals". There is no such thing as "mere animals".

I am not going to pretend to speak from a neutral or objective point of view. On the contrary, I fully acknowledge that animals affect me, that their suffering and exploitation is a problem for me, and that I wish, through my work, to contribute (with many others) to changing the present situation. It would be absurd to believe that we can separate things. Whether we like it or not, doing animal ethnographies, because it makes it possible to make them exist and to "speak well" about them or "describe them well", makes them moral agents (Hache, 2001) and thus participates in a committed theory, likely to support, directly or indirectly, social change (Taylor & Twine, 2014, 6). However, animals ethnographies, as I will try to show, cannot be done in ignorance of the natural sciences, and therefore of ethology. I will therefore argue in favour of incorporating the natural sciences into our ethnographies, but not at any cost. The presentation will be structured in three parts:

1. *The blue blood of the limula*, aesthetics and morals. Starting with the case of horseshoe crabs, whose blood is an essential ingredient in the biomedical industry, I will discuss the role of ethnography and the natural sciences in putting our shared history into perspective, with a view to making these animals moral agents, as defined by E. Hache, that is, deserving of good treatment.
2. *Take animal subjectivities seriously*. This second part starts from the case of "delinquent elephants" to argue in favour of the constitution of an animal social science.
3. *Research devices that do not make animals dumb*. This last part is about the research relationship with animals. How can they be accommodated in research devices that do not reproduce relationship patterns in which they are treated as objects? How to see animals' personhood?

The lecture will conclude with a discussion of scientific, aesthetic and moral contributions generated by animal ethnographies.