STUDIES IN SOCIAL JUSTICE
Volume 10, Issue 2, 199-219, 2016

Beyond Human to Humane: A Multispecies Analysis of Care Work, Its Repression, and Its Potential

KENDRA COULTER
Brock University, Canada

ABSTRACT *This paper approaches care work through a multispecies and interspecies lens, and challenges readers to expand both their analysis and their ethical considerations in order to include animals. First I present a conceptual framework to help illuminate and unpack the care work animals do in the wild, in homes, and in formal workplaces. I then highlight the complex ways animals' bodies, minds, and families are involved in the production of commodities for human consumption, and the implications of such practices for animals' own forms of caregiving. Unfortunately, the fact is that for many animals, their primary experiences of care work are its repression. As a result, in the final section, I offer food for thought about the potential for care work to not only involve more empathetic embodied interactions and labour processes, but to be a springboard for expanded visions and projects of social justice which include humane jobs and recognize that "the social" is multispecies.*

KEYWORDS care work; human-animal relations; critical animal studies; gender and work; humane jobs

Care is integral to social justice. Diverse scholars have theorized care, debated its conceptual and practical ethics, and explored how care is and could be interwoven with social and political praxis. As María Puig de la Bellacasa (2012, p. 197) reminds us, care is "inseparably a vital affective state, an ethical obligation and a practical labour." Most research focused on care work has concentrated on people. In this paper, I expand the care work lens in order to include animals and to encourage scholarship and political action that takes their experiences seriously. Care work is understood to be tasks, interactions, labour processes, and occupations involved in taking care of others, physically, psychologically, and emotionally. Care work can be

Correspondence Address: Kendra Coulter, Centre for Labour Studies. Brock University, St. Catharines, ON, L2S 3A1; kendra.coulter@brocku.ca

ISSN: 1911-4788

proactive or reactive, formal or informal, and, when done by people, it may be paid or unpaid.

Much of the care work people do with/for animals has commonalities with human-focused care work, including the daily labour processes required, its feminization, its low pay or lack of pay, its precariousness, and its uneven physical and emotional risks and rewards (Hamilton, 2013; Hamilton & Taylor, 2013; Irvine & Vermilya, 2010; Miller, 2013; Parreñas, 2012). At the same time, additional social and economic devaluation, distinct emotional complexities, and less workplace-based organizing further complicate the realities of care work undertaken with/for animals (Bunderson & Thompson, 2009; Collard, 2014; Miller, 2008; Sanders, 2010; Taylor, 2010). A handful of scholars are also beginning to analyse the interconnections among political work with/for animals and ideals and dynamics of care (Coulter, 2016; Donaldson & Kymlicka, 2015; Winter, 2016).

A full and thorough examination of the intersections of animals and care work is a significant undertaking, one which is beyond the scope of this paper. Here I offer a conceptual contribution that I hope will help propel further analysis and strengthen multispecies intellectual and political work. There is good reason to illuminate, interrogate, and critique the cultural and material processes of many kinds of human labour, particularly if interested in fostering multispecies justice; people's actions (or a lack thereof) have beneficial, harmful, or fatal effects within and across species. In this paper, humans are considered, but I place animals' work-lives at the heart of the discussion. To do so, I build from and expand on labour and care work literatures, feminist political economy, and human-animal and critical animal studies. I also enlist pertinent insights from animal ecofeminism, cognitive ethology, animal welfare research, and some animal rights theories.

I consider animals' involvement in formal, human-focused care work, as well as animals' own caregiving processes. First I present a conceptual framework to help highlight and unpack the care work animals do in the wild, in homes, and in formal workplaces. I then illuminate the intersections, entanglements, and ruptures that come into focus when recognizing care work as more-than-human, and highlight the complex ways animals' bodies, minds, and families are involved in processes of social, economic, and biological production, reproduction, and consumption, particularly in industrial agriculture. Indeed, when we expand our conceptual lenses to include animals, the complexities of commodification and disposability figure in significant and unsettling ways. On the one hand, there is increasing interest in engaging animals in the provisioning of care work for people. Yet, on the other hand, animals' own forms of caregiving are rarely recognized as a kind of care work. Moreover, many animals are also physically prevented from providing care to fellow animals and, in particular, to their own offspring. There is a conceptual denial occurring alongside institutionalized daily practices of literal denial. Unfortunately, the fact is that for many animals, their primary experiences of care work are its repression. As a result,

in the final section, I offer food for thought about the potential for care work to not only involve more empathetic embodied interactions and labour processes, but to be a springboard for expanded visions and projects of social justice which recognize that "the social" is multispecies.

Jocelyne Porcher (2014) has also argued for "recognizing" animals' work, but I conceptualize recognition in a different way, and see this as only one part of a broader intellectual and ethical project. I borrow, expand, and reshape Nancy Fraser's (1995) intertwined concepts of recognition and redistribution as both an organizing framework for this paper, and as a kind of political engine for approaching the complexities of animals and care work. The crux of Fraser's argument is that neither a cultural or identity-based politics which seeks to counter discursive and symbolic erasure and legitimize diverse experiences (recognition), nor a political project concentrating on tangible valuation and compensation (redistribution) is sufficient on its own, but rather that both threads are necessary for justice and that they ought to be interwoven. Fraser's analysis stems from examination of human-focused social justice struggles (and particularly those in the United States in recent decades). She does not write about animals or employ a multispecies lens. Moreover, although some animals are materially compensated for their labour in certain ways (through food, affection, tangible rewards, etc.) they do not receive monetary pay, nor would they be interested in that kind of literal financial redistribution.

Yet I wish to enlist the spirit of this argument – the need to see *and* to change what is provided to whom – as part of thinking about the intersections of animals, care, and work. Accordingly, this paper will begin to illuminate and unpack the different kinds of care work performed by animals to recognize their labours as work. This means confronting the presence and absence of care work, including what Thomas van Dooren (2014, p. 91) calls "regimes of violent-care." Such processes can include the withdrawal or highly constrained and merely instrumental provisioning of care or partial care, or the active suppression and prohibition of caregiving labours. Then to conclude, I will explore the complexities and possibilities of thinking about what redistribution might mean if animals are taken seriously as sentient beings, as social actors, as workers, and as providers of care.

Given the focus of this discussion, a brief comment on language and categories is in order before delving into the substantive material. Humans evolved on earth and are also animals. As a result of this fact and for political reasons, within the growing body of human-animal studies and related literatures, there are scholars who consistently refer to other animals as nonhuman animals. For linguistic efficiency, to recognize heterogeneity among both humans and animals, and to avoid continuously identifying others in relation to but one of the species they are not, I use terms like people, humans, women, men, and so forth for *homo sapiens*, and refer to nonhuman animals as animals, or by their species or common name. I consider wild, farmed, and companion animals to varying degrees throughout

the paper, and raise particular concerns about farmed animals. Crucially, in all cases, animals are still understood to be sentient beings who possess consciousness and an ability to think and feel, physically and emotionally. Consequently, sexed pronouns are used for all who are considered in this paper; terms like "it" are not relevant, regardless of species membership.

Recognizing Animals' Care Work

I propose three organizational categories as a starting place to highlight the breadth of animals' work: (a) subsistence work; (b) voluntary work; and (c) work that is mandated by humans (Coulter, 2016). Subsistence work is that which is done by animals for themselves and often for/with others in order to survive. Voluntary work refers to that which is usually done for humans in homes, although there are also animals who voluntarily assist other animals, even across species lines, including those who are physically disabled. The work mandated by humans includes a broad range of formal tasks and occupations. Given the focus of this paper, here I will concentrate on how care work is involved in each of these three categories of work.

Subsistence work is the life-sustaining labour that living beings must perform in order to subsist. Even though human societies were dependent on subsistence work for the large majority of our history (and many people still are), much contemporary labour research downplays its importance, or fails to see it as work, an omission challenged by historical, anthropological, feminist, and other cross-cultural scholarship. Therefore by building on my anthropological training, enlisting a feminist political economy lens, and recognizing the realities of many animals' lives, I challenge this overly narrow perception of work. For wild animals, daily life involves rigorous and multi-faceted challenges – from finding food and water sources in all seasons and regardless of the weather, to avoiding or escaping predators. These processes require and are work. I do not refer to these animals as "workers" but subsistence labour is nevertheless labour.

The details are context-specific, and shaped by human behaviour and infrastructure, environmental factors, and animals' position within their multispecies community and ecosystem. The work needed for mice in Canada to subsist has similarities as well as differences with what elephants in Tanzania need to do, for example. Moreover, even within these geographic spaces, different regions would involve distinct hurdles and dangers. Human actions, including "sport" and livelihood patterns (hunting, trapping, etc.), the erection of buildings, cities, and dams, and the creation and use of roads, train tracks, and so forth all affect animals' abilities to engage in subsistence work. The effects of climate change, including dried-up rivers, droughts, and floods also create significant and increasing challenges for animals' abilities to engage in life-sustaining subsistence work. Subsistence will always include some care work, particularly intergenerational care work. Of course,

competition for resources and carnivorous or omnivorous animals' subsistence work (including hunting or scavenging from nests) infringes on other animals' abilities to survive and care for their young; this is driven by biological necessity not profit or greed, however.

The (often but not exclusively unpaid) work done by people to ensure the wellbeing and future of younger generations can be understood as social reproduction. Social reproduction is a set of tasks and a process, a daily and a generational dynamic, and an individual and collective project (Bezanson, 2006; Luxton & Bezanson, 2006). Specific tasks are continuously required: cooking, cleaning, laundry, and so on, to care for others as they are educated, empowered, entertained, healed; care work is one component of social reproduction. The cumulative effect of these individual and localized efforts is the larger social process of reproducing people, and of ensuring present and future generations of workers. In other words, social reproduction makes all other forms of economic and social activity possible. Although most analysts of social reproduction have theorized it within a capitalist economic context, arguably, social reproduction has been essential to all human societies and forms of social organization, including subsistence-based foraging and farming communities. So far, social reproduction has been used to highlight and understand *people's* work; I posit that the concept is also applicable to animals and helps us to see both domesticated and wild animals' forms of care work (Coulter, 2016).

In the wild, animals engage in individual and collective strategies to sustain themselves, their offspring, other family members, friends, and their entire species. Animals' subsistence work in the wild is not only about basic survival, but also about health, safety, and as the growing body of cognitive ethology suggests, social and cultural practices as well. Animals teach others and youngsters are socialized into their families and communities as they learn how to interact, resolve disputes, and understand social patterns. Animals in the wild are not reproducing future workers for a capitalist economic system, yet they too engage in a kind of social reproduction. Moreover, they engage in what I call *ecosocial reproduction*: wild animals' subsistence and caring work is necessary for the reproduction of ecosystems (Coulter, 2016). At the same time, it is important to note that humans benefit economically from certain wild animals' social and ecosocial reproductive work, as is the case with bees. As bees collect nectar to feed their young, they pollinate over two thirds of all flowering plants, which allows those plants to reproduce. Many of these plants are used by humans for food and other products. Bees also make honey to serve as food for their hives during the winter, and some humans also take that honey to consume and sell.

Animals who live in people's homes and as part of human families are the recipients and beneficiaries of humans' care work and social reproductive labour. Domesticated animals may also perform different kinds of voluntary labour in such contexts; some of it is a form of informal care work. Animals can choose to provide care work for the people with whom they share homes

thereby illustrating my second category: voluntary labour. Many companion animals continuously assess the people with whom they live, physically and emotionally, and proactively or responsively provide care of various kinds, especially emotional support, through their presence, behaviours, interactions, and touch. It will not surprise most dog lovers to learn that ethological research has found that dogs experience a physiological response and even "emotional contagion" when hearing or seeing people cry, and that they seek to express empathy and provide comfort in response by approaching and touching those in distress (Custance & Mayer, 2012; Yong & Ruffman, 2014).

Much of this is informal and may not widely be conceptualized as work. At the same time, such labour is increasingly being recognized and formalized through the employment and certification of emotional support animals. The care work animals do providing joy, kindness, and comfort is extensive and often crucial. This kind of interactive care work is especially important for seniors, marginalized or vulnerable people, and women who are confronting domestic violence, are homeless, or are precariously housed. Dogs in particular can provide life-sustaining emotional support and motivation, companionship, as well as literal protection (Fitzgerald, 2007; Irvine, 2013a, 2013b; Labrecque & Walsh, 2011; Lem, Coe, Haley, Stone, & O'Grady, 2013).

Care work is also implicated in the broad cross-section of work animals do that is mandated by humans. Across space and time, humans have required that animals perform various kinds of work. Animals' labour was essential to the ascendancy of societies, the erection and functioning of communities, and the lives of individual people. Although not called care work, such expectations were commonplace even in war zones; some animals were regularly used for hauling labour or weaponized, while others were kept specifically for companionship and emotional support. As noted, today there is growing use of animals for therapeutic and service work that benefits people. Animals' abilities to guide, assist, comfort, calm, and detect physical challenges like seizures before they happen are being enlisted in a range of places, including in homes, schools, libraries, long term care facilities, and courthouses. Animals may be tasked with care work round the clock, or brought into the pertinent site for shorter shifts. There is a growing body of evidence documenting how different (human) individuals and groups benefit in physical, psychological, and emotional ways from animal-assisted therapy, service, and other activities. People often identify the animals and their contributions as life-saving, transformative, and essential (e.g., Burgon, 2011; Fine, 2010).

The work necessary for the delivery of care in these ways requires great skill and multi-faceted communication work, which includes understanding, reacting, and conveying many kinds of information (Coulter, 2016). It is psychologically and emotionally challenging for animals, and they are required to suppress their personal feelings, reactions, and instincts in order

to behave in the proper way regardless of what is going on around them. For example, a service dog providing care to a person with a disability must not become distracted by people, other animals, or food. Similarly, equine-assisted therapy programs are noteworthy for a number of reasons, including because horses are sensitive animals who read feelings that people communicate intentionally or implicitly by their bodies (such as through an increased heart rate). Yet even though the people involved may be anxious, especially initially, the horses are required to maintain a sense of calmness. I posit that this illustrates animals' performance of the internal emotion work necessary to successfully perform the emotional labour requirements of their jobs (see also Coulter, 2016). We ask a lot of furry and even some feathered care workers in such contexts, and these jobs require particular kinds of temperaments, intelligences, and attitudes. Some animals excel, but not all are able or willing to engage in this kind of care work. Whether and to what degree animals are able to express their disinterest or to refuse to participate is affected by people's choices and attentiveness, the structures of the workplaces or programs, and the specifics of the animals in question – and their socially-constructed roles.

I propose a continuum of suffering and enjoyment as a concept and framework for seeking to understand animals' work from their perspectives, across contexts (Coulter, 2016). Where the work fits on the continuum is affected by the occupation and labour required, the co-workers or employers, the species, social relations and interactions, and individual animals' own personalities, moods, health, preferences, and agency, among other factors. Indeed when talking about animals and care work, it is important to note that "animals" refers to a very heterogeneous group, and that there are vast differences among the lives and labours of distinct species, and individual members of the same species (Coulter, 2014).

Care Work and Its Repression

Farmed animals are the largest group of land animals on earth (excluding invertebrates), and their experiences raise crucial questions for understanding care work within and across species. Notably, some of the concepts and processes discussed here can be relevant to other contexts and industries, including animal experimentation and testing facilities. Because many people currently choose to consume products made by or from animals' bodies, this means that animals are being required to physically produce babies, milk, and eggs for human use. The increasing industrialization, corporatization, and consolidation of agriculture has affected human workers' experiences, conditions, and health in significant ways, as well as the work they are required to do or prevented from doing. Industrialization also has serious and intense impacts on animals. Of course, regardless of the size or structure of a farm raising animals for food, those animals will be killed. Farmed animals

are trapped within a perpetual cycle of disposability, the specifics, degree, and length of which vary. The patterns endemic to industrialized agriculture have exacerbated and changed a number of practices, however, many of which have a substantial and deleterious effect on the animals' engagement with care work at every stage of their shortened lives.

Farmed animals' bodies and parts thereof are used to create meat, leather, fur, food for companion animals, and other commodities, generally within one to a few years of birth. The practices on many contemporary farms and especially industrialized facilities have been well-documented by researchers and investigators, and I offer only a brief synthesis of the larger patterns here. Human provisioning of care work is often instrumentalized, minimized, or fully eliminated in industrial animal agriculture. For example, in a barn with a thousand pigs or more (a common size today), if one becomes ill, the likelihood of a farm operator paying money for the animal's medical care is low, particularly if she or he is scheduled to be slaughtered within a few months anyway. Instead, the animals may be allowed to die, killed immediately and thrown out, or put onto the truck bound for the slaughterhouse in poor health. It is not uncommon for animals to arrive at slaughterhouses dead, ill, or with broken bones or other injuries.

Some kinds of animals are also deemed disposable very quickly simply because of their sex. Some farmed animals are killed mere hours after their births, in fact. For example, in the mainstream egg industry, male chicks are killed promptly after birth because they cannot produce eggs. Male calves within the dairy industry face a similarly dire future. In order for cows to physically produce milk, females must be impregnated regularly; like all mammals, cows only produce milk prior to and after giving birth as it is intended to feed their offspring (not be consumed by other species). In general, calves born will be 50/50 male/female. Female calves are usually kept to become future milk producers. Males, however, are not useful for the production of milk, so they are used to create veal. They are thus kept largely immobile, usually in individual crates or small hutches, for only three to four months, after which they are sent to slaughter. Notably, whether the calves are male or female, they are normally taken away from their mothers within a few hours of birth so the milk can immediately begin being collected for human consumption. Cows used for milk production are usually able to interact with other adult females to some degree, but prohibited from interacting with and raising their own babies. Cows used to produce milk are also usually slaughtered for meat after a few years as their bodies become exhausted from repeated impregnation and milking, so they are seen as no longer useful. A similar process is true for hens, whether their eggs are non-fertilized and eaten or hatched then consumed as meat, and many are only kept alive for one to two years. Chickens born to become meat are kept alive on average for eight to ten weeks and 600 million chickens are killed for meat each year in Canada alone. Cows' natural life expectancy is 15 to 20 years; chickens' would range from six to15 years.

Overall, both female and male animals face dire fates, and have common as well as distinct experiences in such contexts. As Carol J. Adams (2010), Karen Davis (1995), and Lori Gruen (1993) rightly point out, animal agriculture involves the particularly intense use and manipulation of females' bodily processes and emotions.[1] Virtually all domesticated animals born under human control will be "weaned" by humans, as mothers and offspring are separated; such processes are trying for dogs and horses, too, unless allowed to proceed naturally and at animals' own pace. Yet, in most cases, companion animal mothers are first permitted to provide care work for their own babies for multiple weeks or months.

The ability for farmed animals to provide care to their own offspring varies, but is often deeply constrained or entirely eliminated through literal separation and physical structures, some of which prevent all forms of social interaction. On farms raising cows for beef, females raise their own offspring before they are sent to slaughter after one to two years. Yet many other animal mothers (such as cows and goats used for dairy production) are normally prevented from interacting with their infants for more than a few hours. Female pigs on most North American operations are kept in gestation crates for most or all of the time they are used as breeders (i.e., for two to three years) within which they can only stand up or lie down. Similarly-designed farrowing pens house mothers who have recently given birth. Piglets can nurse and be beside their mother for a few weeks or months (before being sent to a "finishing barn" to fatten for slaughter), but the mothers cannot turn or move to interact with and care for their piglets. Instead, they are kept largely immobilized as mere milk providers. Of this process, Dave Wager, the communications director for the National Pork Producers Council in the United States, said the following: "So our animals can't turn around for the 2.5 years that they are in the stalls producing piglets. I don't know who asked the sow if she wanted to turn around" (Friedrich, 2012, n.p.). The crates are often justified as "protecting" the piglets from their mothers who may accidentally lie down on them in cramped quarters (a few months before they will be sent to slaughter), yet are not used everywhere, are banned or being phased-out in many countries, and are restricted in future barn construction within Canada.

Animal mothers (and often fathers, siblings, aunts, and so on) wish to interact with young individuals through many kinds of touch as well as oral communication, in order to provide sustenance, affection, warmth, reassurance, healing, protection, correction, and instruction, when they are allowed to do so. Farmed animals engage in care work, when they are not isolated, separated, immobilized, or otherwise prevented from interacting with their own offspring and own kind. The fact remains, however, that many animals are not permitted to provide care to others.

[1] For a larger exploration of the potential and challenges of using the term body work in such contexts, see Coulter (2016).

Given these realities, Barbara Noske (1989, 1997) enlists Marx's concept of alienated labour and applies it across species lines in a compelling way (see also Stuart, Schewe, & Gunderson, 2013). Alienated or estranged labour highlights the process through which workers are materially and spiritually separated from the products, results, and/or rewards of their labour, as well as from their own desires. Noske (1989, pp. 18-20) argues that animals in industrial agriculture are alienated labour, kept estranged from (a) the product (their own offspring or parts of their body); (b) productive activity (not being able to turn around, move, or spread their wings); (c) fellow animals and their social nature; (d) surrounding nature; and (e) their species life. Indeed, these animals are required to produce babies, milk, and eggs, not for their own or species-specific reasons, but entirely so that these can be taken and transformed into commodities for human profit and consumption.

Many of the animals are both literally and figuratively locked into processes of social dislocation, dis-aggregation, and estrangement. By enlisting the term alienation, we are forced to not only consider physical harm, but to recognize emotional and psychological effects. The growing bodies of cognitive ethology and evolutionary cognition research reveal that animals of all kinds have rich and complex social, emotional, and even moral, lives. Humans are just beginning to understand the depth of animals' inner-worlds, relationships, and experiences. Pigs, for example, are cognitively and emotionally complex and share many traits with widely loved and respected species like dogs (see e.g., Marino & Colvin, 2015). Chickens are socially dynamic, exploratory, and intelligent, and, as Barbara J. King (2013, p. 6) explains, they "grieve… like chimpanzees, elephants, and goats" (among other animals). Only recently have researchers learned that cows have a broad range of context-specific calls for their offspring (de la Torre, Briefer, Reader, & McElligott, 2015). Some of those calls express sorrow, and mothers are forced to use those calls often, because of human choices.

It is difficult to overstate the physical, psychological, emotional, and intergenerational suffering perpetuated behind such terms as "factory farms" and "industrialized agriculture." Indeed, Noske (1989) proposes the term animal-industrial complex to capture the larger political economic structures which fuel such patterns, and which have been exacerbated in the "necro-economic" realities of the neoliberal capitalist context (Drew, 2016). There is now a simultaneous institutionalized and industrialized exploitation of the processes of reproduction, alongside the repression or complete elimination of the caring and social reproductive labours that should follow once babies are born. To add insult to injury, the suffering animals experience as a result is widely denied, ignored, or simply condoned.

Confronting Repression, Fostering Multispecies Care

The realities of animals' care work are complex and diverse. Animals are not widely recognized as providers of care work, yet the formal programs that task animals with providing care (through therapy, physical and emotional assistance, etc.) are gaining more attention and being expanded in many places. The research that has been done on such programs suggests that most scholars and people outside the academy alike accept that animals are providing care work in these cases, and there is greater interest in and comfort with these kinds of therapeutic and presumably positive dynamics. Moreover, the effects and benefits of these forms of care work for human patients are of most interest to researchers. Animals' experiences and working conditions within human-focused care programs are not well-studied. Encouragingly, however, there is a growing awareness of the need to take these animals' wellbeing seriously and to employ a multispecies lens in both research and practice (Evans & Gray, 2011; Matsuoka & Sorenson, 2013; Ryan, 2014; Rock & Degeling, 2015; Serpell, Coppinger, & Fine, 2006; Weisberg, 2014; Zamir, 2006). Further work is needed to develop the most accurate, effective, and ethical multispecies standards for such contexts. I believe that some animals can justifiably be engaged in the provisioning of care work in these kinds of ways if relationships and daily labour are characterized by respect and reciprocity, and if both human and nonhuman workers are afforded protections and positive entitlements underscored by interspecies solidarity (Coulter, 2016; Donaldson & Kymlicka, 2011). Most animals are not engaged in these kinds of formal care work occupations, however.

Far more animals are kept in agricultural contexts where the realities of care work are more complex. Animals' animal-focused caregiving work is rarely recognized as such regardless of where it takes place, and it is often constrained or prohibited, particularly when the animals are to be physically consumed as commodities. Animals' pain, misery, and socially-constructed disposability in a number of human-controlled settings are widely rendered invisible to those outside, and are viewed in different ways by the people directly involved ranging from disciplined concern to dispassion to cold indifference (Ellis, 2013, 2014; Wilkie 2010). Rhoda Wilkie (2010) argues that farmers place animals on a commodity-companion continuum, which is usually shaped by the animal's role and time on the farm (breeder, offspring, etc.). She also proposes the concept of "sentient commodity" to capture the tension that some farmers feel who recognize that the animals are simultaneously considered property and products to be bought, sold, killed, and consumed, yet also individuals with personalities and feelings.

Wilkie (2010, p.135) rightly points out that people in these kinds of work experience ambivalence "not because of their idiosyncratic history or their distinctive personality but because the ambivalence is inherent in the social positions they occupy." They are not exclusively or specifically care workers;

they are farmers and farm workers, and care is to be provided within the specific expectations and determinations of their material conditions. Agency is always possible and this must be recognized, but the structure of multispecies spaces directs perceptions and actions in specific ways and influences what is done and not done (Arluke & Sanders, 1996; Blanchette, 2015). As Peter Dickens (1996) argues, industrialized capitalist reorganization of agricultural practices and labour has fundamentally changed the way people understand and know nature. Workplaces that hold thousands of largely immobilized chickens in battery cages within which they cannot even spread their wings, or pigs in gestation crates where they cannot turn or move, create and perpetuate not only suffering but intense commodification and devaluation. Turnover rates are high, as many people are unable to tolerate the daily practices and work requirements, and are unwilling to participate in such patterns. It is especially those with few options who must stay, although certain people are comfortable with these hierarchies, conditions, and workplace requirements for a number of reasons, including their perceptions of animals as unfeeling commodities unworthy of basic dignity.

There is some heterogeneity among agricultural approaches and more considerate farming does exist, though any farm raising animals for consumption will ultimately mean death for the animals, and likely lead to limits on how animals are permitted to interact with and care for their offspring. Animal agriculture is increasingly industrialized however, and the physical placement and construction of buildings, alongside the discursive obfuscation perpetuated through mass nouns like "meat" mean individual animals and their personal and shared experiences are pushed out of public view, and are infrequently considered worthy of consideration or care (Adams, 2010). Indeed, the strategic allocation or withdrawal of human caregiving labours, and the repression of animals' abilities to engage in care work, both result from human choices and actions. These dynamics are socially-constructed; they stem from humans' political, economic, and ethical choices, not from innate, automatic, or essential processes. They will be continued or changed based on people's decisions. Repression is an active process.

Many of the patterns that harm animals also endanger humans and the environment, and these interconnections are particularly salient when exploring the intersections of care work and social justice. Claire Jean Kim's (2015) call for multi-optic vision is particularly relevant. Indigenous peoples and indigenous wildlife are both affected when rainforests are cleared for palm oil production or to make fields for cattle to graze before they are killed for meat. There is alarming public health research on the risks that stem from the live animal trade and industrialized agriculture, among other practices, and the risks are inequitably distributed along racialized, national, and classed lines. Dangers include water, air, and soil pollution, increased greenhouse gas production, zoonoses (diseases spreading from animals to humans), and

antibiotic and microbial resistance (e.g., Akhtar, 2012; Cutler, Fooks, & Van Der Poel, 2010; Landers, Cohen, Wittum, & Larson, 2012; World Health Organization, 2010). Moreover, factory farming is one of the largest contributors of climate change-propelling greenhouse gases (Caro, Davis, Bastianoni, & Caldeira, 2014; Gerber et al., 2013; Lin et al., 2011; Steinfeld et al., 2006). In factory farming and similar industries, animals suffer the most, but among humans, it is working class communities and people, women, racialized workers, indigenous peoples, and poor people who are disproportionately harmed (Halley, 2012; Nibert, 2014). As the effects of climate change deepen and expand, it is also these very people who will continue to be most seriously affected. By employing intersectional and multi-optic vision, it is clear that there are persuasive multispecies ethical, environmental, and political reasons for anyone who cares about social justice to take these entangled oppressions seriously.

Indeed, although driven by powerful economic interests, people of all kinds are implicated in these animal-worker-environmental harming processes in different ways. Some are directly involved as workers who have varying degrees of control over their jobs and where they work (see e.g., Blanchette, 2015; Nibert, 2014; Stull & Broadway, 2013). Other people are passively complicit, but make active choices about their consumption. An uncomfortable but undeniable fact is that, at present, so much human caregiving and social reproductive labour includes the purchasing, preparation, and consumption of commodities made from the bodily processes and dead bodies of animals who have been denied the opportunity to engage in their own care work, prevented from having autonomy over their lives and families, and given no opportunity to decline to participate in processes that cause them harm and death. Humans choose to consume the very milk produced by animal mothers' bodies that is intended to feed their own young.

Correcting these injustices requires questioning some of the most normalized hegemonic processes and beliefs about who is included in our ethical deliberations and webs of care (Donovan, 2007; Fitzgerald & Taylor, 2014). Animal advocates enlist the slogans "someone not something" and "friends not food" in order to challenge the commodification and de-subjectivization of animals. Indeed, if interested in thoroughly understanding care work, we ought to first acknowledge the social, economic, cultural, and interpersonal contributions animals make by working to improve the lives of others. We ought to recognize their labours, and that they are both sentient beings and social actors (see also Cochrane, 2016). Yet recognition of the repression of care and the troubling facts about how animals are seen and treated in the production of unnecessary commodities for human use is as essential, if not more important. Moreover, the conditions of animals' – and many people's – lives also demand that we move beyond seeing, and even beyond critique; we need to develop solutions and alternatives. Here the principle of redistribution I am adapting from Nancy Fraser comes into play.

If recognizing animals' care work and its widespread repression is the first step, what is to be done?

The answers to this question are many, and a rich and heterogeneous collection of animal studies and critical animal studies literatures offer different insights, viewpoints, and arguments about animals' rights, property status, and the best routes forward, which I cannot effectively synthesize here. What I offer is complementary, and at times divergent, food for thought about the place of animals and care work in the present and future of not only our scholarship, but also our communities and lives.

Towards Interspecies Solidarity and Humane Jobs

I propose the concept of interspecies solidarity as an idea, a goal, an ethical commitment, and an essential addition to theories and projects of social justice (Coulter, 2016). Solidarity is the political expression of empathy and compassion, and involves support despite differences. As Val Plumwood (2002, pp. 200-202) writes in her call for solidarity with nature, "both continuity with and difference from self can be sources of value and consideration, and both usually play a role." In other words, someone does not need to be the same as you in order for you to feel and foster solidarity. There are clear connections among the exploitation of women, racialized peoples, and nature, including animals, and these can help forge connectivity, as well as bolster the case for change (e.g., Adams, 2010; Gaard, 2011; Halley, 2012; Kim, 2015). Interspecies and multispecies solidarity should be promoted not simply because animals are like us and we are like animals, however, but because it is the ethical thing to do. Others should not have to be like us for us to care about their wellbeing.

Interspecies solidarity can and should intersect with care, and care work. Joan Tronto compellingly argues that care can become "a tool for critical political analysis when we use this concept to reveal relationships of power" (1993, p. 172). This argument challenges us to move beyond instrumental approaches to care, into a more politicized, holistic vision. Caring, empathy, and compassion can mobilize feelings and projects of solidarity, but solidaristic sentiments cannot remain internalized or individualized. As Josephine Donovan argues:

> Understanding that an animal is in pain or distress – even empathizing or sympathizing with him [or her] – doesn't ensure, however, that the human will act ethically towards the animal. Thus, the originary emotional empathetic response must be supplemented with a political perspective . . . that enables the human to analyze the situation critically so as to determine who [or what] is responsible for the animal suffering, and how that suffering may best be alleviated. (Donovan, 2007, p. 364)

Sally Scholz (2008, p. 61) points out that solidarity encourages "not just personal transformation but social transformation." Put concisely, caring can be and can become political (Briskin, 2013; Cobble, 2010; Herd & Meyer, 2002) and can be the basis for creating more caring societies (e.g., Glenn, 2000; Tronto, 2013). This argument is not rooted in a naïve romanticization of caring, and without question dynamics of care can be coercive or contradictory. As Thom van Dooren (2014, p. 92) argues, "caring is not achieved through abstract well-wishing, but is an embodied and often fraught, complex, and compromised practice." Both recognition and redistribution are needed.

Thus, more ambitious visions which foster a political expansion of care cannot exclude other animals. Animals are inextricably and intimately interwoven with our work, lives, and futures. A just and caring society cannot condone the exploitation and oppression of others, and cannot be built atop a mass, unmarked animal graveyard. As Claire Jean Kim writes:

> Most social justice struggles mobilize around a single-optic frame of vision. The process of political conflict then generates a zero-sum dynamic . . . a *posture of mutual avowal* – an explicit dismissal of and denial of connection with the other form of injustice being raised. This posture . . . is both ethically and politically troubling. (Kim, 2015, p. 19; emphasis in original)

Interspecies solidarity and a multispecies approach to care work and social justice challenge us to strengthen and expand our thinking to overcome alleged divides, including species membership. Humans are but one species on this planet. Moreover, our actions have significant, lasting, and often fatal effects on other beings and on our shared world.

Accordingly, the idea of interspecies solidarity is not a monolithic blueprint, but rather it is an invitation to broaden how labour as a daily process and a political relationship is understood and approached, by emphasizing empathy, dignity, and reciprocity, and by seeing care as not only a practice or type of work, but also as the lifeblood of society and of this earth. How interspecies solidarity is used will be shaped by multispecies social actors and their contexts. In fact, in some communities, interspecies solidarity or comparable principles already exist (see Rock & Degeling, 2015). Indigenous cultures are diverse, as are the views of people within them, yet many envision different kinds of multispecies interconnectedness. It is important to recognize these approaches and actors, what lessons they offer and wish to share, as well as how human-animal relations are being actively debated, adapted, and remade in indigenous communities today (e.g., Beckford, Jacobs, Williams, & Nahdee, 2010; Robinson, 2010, 2014; Robinson & Wallington, 2012). Moreover, there are non-indigenous communities, including in rural spaces, committed to visions and practices of multispecies respect (including for migrant workers), and these too can offer insights for alternate paths forward. Indeed, as Melanie J. Rock and Chris Degeling argue, "many people care deeply about places, plants and non-

human animals, to the extent of offering assistance, expecting others to provide assistance, and codifying this expectation in contracts, policies, and laws" (2015, p. 4). Scandinavian and Nordic sociopolitical models can also offer lessons about the potential of social solidarity (Lister, 2009; Sandberg, 2013), and these ideals could be strengthened and expanded across species lines through the thoughtful use of interspecies solidarity.

The respectful and the many damaging ways animals are conceptualized and treated are all instructive if seeking to cultivate interspecies solidarity and foster a more holistic approach to care work. Sue Donaldson and Will Kymlicka write:

> The challenge to developing non-exploitative cooperative relationships is most acutely posed by the case of domesticated animals who are significantly dependent on humans for basic care. . . . [People] must foster the circumstances and trusting relationships within which animals can exercise agency, and then interpret the signals that animals give regarding their subjective good, preferences, or choices. (Donaldson & Kymlicka, 2012, pp. 2-4)

By understanding both normalized oppression and relations of genuine care, we can glean insights about how to end suffering, improve humans' and animals' lives, and foster humane action. In this crucial task, Lori Gruen's (2014) concept of entangled empathy is particularly instructive and helpful. She defines it is as:

> [Action] focused on attending to another's experience of wellbeing. [It is] an experiential process involving a blend of emotion and cognition in which we recognize we are in relationships with others and are called upon to be responsive and responsible in these relationships by attending to another's needs, interests, desires, vulnerabilities, hopes, and sensitivities (Gruen 2014, p. 3).

Gruen conceptualizes entangled empathy as a multispecies process, one underscored by active, ongoing intellectual, emotional, and political engagement within and across species. Succinctly, we must strive to consider our actions and patterns from the perspectives of other animals. In this spirit, perhaps what we should redistribute to many animals is autonomy over their own bodies and lives, and the right to engage in their own social reproductive and caregiving labours.

Health care researchers and practitioners have begun developing an approach called the One Health Model, which recognizes and promotes the interconnectedness of human, animal, and environmental health (see, for example, Fitzgerald, 2010; Lerner & Berg, 2015; Mackenzie, Jeggo, Daszak, & Richt, 2013; Woldehanna & Zimicki, 2015). This approach may offer conceptual and practical lessons for worlds of work and could serve as another foundational axis for a more ambitious, holistic approach to care work. Indeed, the concept of interspecies solidarity ought to be expanded and integrated into both spheres of practice and into political projects. Reciprocal

relationships along with political economic structures that help cultivate an ethically-rigorous multispecies approach to care work are necessary.

Essential to this challenge are what I call humane jobs: jobs that benefit both people and animals (Coulter, 2016, forthcoming). In order to move workforces and economies away from damaging and destructive practices and industries, humane alternatives must be created which are about helping, not harming others. Some existing jobs can be strengthened and expanded. Others cannot be, and should be replaced with more empathetic and ethical areas of work; new humane jobs and employment sectors should be created. Care work occupations and programs, particularly in health care for animals and in health care with animals (therapeutic engagements with nature and animals), offer good possibilities that warrant more examination and thoughtful consideration. Without question, care work and workers are at the heart of a future with humane jobs. At the same time, there is potential in other areas as well, including in cruelty investigations and prevention, humane education, conservation, recreation, and agriculture and food production. We can create more humane jobs to grow, create, make, sell, and serve nutritious, sustainable food that does not involve violence, the exploitation of humans or animals, or the denial of care work.

This discussion is only beginning to illuminate and interrogate the intersections of animals and care work. More thought, work, and care are sorely needed. Some types of animals such as farmed animals are among the most oppressed social groups on earth. If we pay attention to spaces and relations of work, what should be changed and what should be nurtured both become clearer. Animals are sentient beings who think and feel. They have minds, bodies, personalities, feelings, desires, and relationships that matter. We have an ethical obligation to think seriously about care work, its repression, and its potential and possibilities, from their perspectives. Animals deserve to receive care and provide care – and they want to live.

Acknowledgements

Feedback from anonymous reviewers and thoughtful suggestions from Andrea Doucet helped strengthen and refine this article. I am grateful for the financial support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

References

Adams, C. J. (2010). *The sexual politics of meat: A feminist-vegetarian critical theory*. New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group.

Akhtar, A. (2012). *Animals and public health: Why treating animals better is critical to human welfare*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Arluke, A., & Sanders, C. R. (1996). *Regarding animals.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Beckford, C. L., Jacobs, C., Williams, N., & Nahdee, R. (2010). Aboriginal environmental wisdom, stewardship, and sustainability: Lessons from the Walpole Island First Nations, Ontario, Canada. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, *41*(4), 239-248.

Bezanson, K. (2006). *Gender, the state, and social reproduction: Household insecurity in neo-liberal times*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Blanchette, A. (2015). Herding species: Biosecurity, posthuman labor, and the American industrial pig. *Cultural Anthropology, 30*(4), 640-669.

Briskin, L. (2013). In the public interest: Nurses on strike. In S. Ross & L. Savage (Eds.), *Public sector unions in the age of austerity* (pp. 91-102). Halifax & Winnipeg: Fernwood.

Bunderson, J. S., & Thompson, J.A. (2009). The call of the wild: Zookeepers, callings, and the double-edged sword of deeply meaningful work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *54*(1), 32-57.

Burgon, H. L. (2011). 'Queen of the world:' Experiences of 'at-risk' young people participating in equine-assisted learning/therapy. *Journal of Social Work Practice*, *25*(2), 165-183.

Caro, D., Davis, S. J., Bastianoni, S., & Caldeira, K. (2014). Global and regional trends in greenhouse gas emissions from livestock. *Climatic Change, 126*(1-2), 203-216.

Cobble, D. S. (2010). More intimate unions. In E. Boris & R. S. Parreñas (Eds.), *Intimate labors: Cultures, technologies, and the politics of care* (pp. 280-295). Stanford: Stanford Social Sciences.

Cochrane, A. (2016). Labour rights for animals. In R. Garner & S. O'Sullivan (Eds.), *The political turn in animal ethics (pp. 15-31). London: Rowman & Littlefield.*

Collard, R-C. (2014). Putting animals back together, taking commodities apart. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, *104*(1), 151-165.

Coulter, K. (2014). Herds and hierarchies: Class, nature, and the social construction of horses in equestrian culture. *Society & Animals*, *22*(2), 135-152.

Coulter, K. (2016). *Animals, work, and the promise of interspecies solidarity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Coulter, K. (forthcoming). Towards humane jobs: Gendered and multispecies intersections and possibilities. In M. G. Cohen (Ed.), *Gender and climate change in rich countries: Work, public policy and action.* London: Routledge.

Custance, D., & Mayer, J. (2012). Empathic-like responding by domestic dogs (*Canis familiaris*) to distress in humans: An exploratory study. *Animal Cognition*, *15*(5), 851-859.

Cutler, S. J., Fooks, A. R., & Van Der Poel, W. H. (2010). Public health threat of new, reemerging, and neglected zoonoses in the industrialized world. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, *16*(1), 1-5.

Davis, K. (1995). Thinking like a chicken: Farm animals and the feminine connection. In C. J. Adams & J. Donovan (Eds.), *Animals and women: Feminist theoretical explorations* (pp. 192-212). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

de la Bellacasa, M. P. (2012). 'Nothing comes without its world:' Thinking with care. *The Sociological Review*, *60*(2), 197-216.

de la Torre, M. P., Briefer, E. F., Reader, T., & McElligott, A. G. (2015). Acoustic analysis of cattle (*Bos Taurus*) mother-offspring contact calls from a source-filter theory perspective. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, *163*(1), 58-68.

Dickens, P. (1996). *Reconstructing nature: Alienation, emancipation and the division of labour*. London: Routledge.

Donaldson, S., & Kymlicka, W. (2011). *Zoopolis: A political theory of animal rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Donaldson, S., & Kymlicka, W. (2012, September). *Citizen canine: Agency for domesticated animals*. Paper presented at the colloquium Domesticity and Beyond: Living and Working with Animals, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada.

Donaldson, S., & Kymlicka, W. (2015). Farmed animal sanctuaries: The heart of the movement? *Politics and Animals*, *1*(1), 50-74.

Donovan, J. (2007). Caring to dialogue: Feminism and the treatment of animals. In J. Donovan & C. J. Adams (Eds.), *The feminist care tradition in animal ethics* (pp. 360-369). New York: Columbia University Press.

Drew, J. (2016). Rendering visible: Animals, empathy, and visuals truths in the Ghosts in Our Machine and beyond. *Animal Studies Journal, 5*(2), 202-216.
Ellis, C. (2013.) The symbiotic ideology: Stewardship, husbandry, and dominion in beef production. *Rural Sociology*, *78*(4), 429-449.
Ellis, C. (2014). Boundary labor and the production of emotionless commodities: The case of beef production. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *55*(1), 92-118.
Evans, N., & Gray, C. (2011). The practice and ethics of animal-assisted therapy with children and young people: Is it enough that we don't eat our co-workers? *British Journal of Social Work*, *42*(4), 1-18.
Fine, A. H. (Ed.). (2010). *Handbook on animal-assisted therapy: Theoretical foundations and guidelines for practice*. Amsterdam: Academic Press.
Fitzgerald, A. J. (2007). 'They gave me a reason to live:' The protective effects of companion animals on the suicidality of abused women. *Humanity & Society*, *31*(4), 355-378.
Fitzgerald, A. J. (2010). A social history of the slaughterhouse: From inception to contemporary implications. *Human Ecology Review*, 17(1), 58-69.
Fitzgerald, A. J., & Taylor, N. (2014). The cultural hegemony of meat and the animal industrial complex. In N. Taylor & R. Twine (Eds.), *The rise of critical animal studies: From the margins to the centre* (pp.165-182). London: Routledge.
Fraser, N. (1995). From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a 'post- socialist' age. *New Left Review*, *212*, 68-93.
Friedrich, B. (2012, September 8). National Pork Producers Council: Anti-science and anti-animal. *Common Dreams.* Retrieved from www.commondreams.org/views/2012/09/08/national-pork-producers-council-anti-science-anti-animal
Gaard, G. (2011). Ecofeminism revisited: Rejecting essentialism and re-placing species in a material feminist environmentalism. *Feminist Formations*, *23*(2), 26-53.
Gerber, P. J., Steinfeld, H., Henderson, B., Mottet, A., Opio, C., Dijkman, J., . . . Tempio, G. (2013). *Tackling climate change through livestock: A global assessment of emissions and mitigation opportunities*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).
Glenn, E. N. (2000). Creating a caring society. *Contemporary Sociology*, *29*(1), 84-94.
Glenn, E. N. (2010). *Forced to care: Coercion and caregiving in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Gruen, L. (1993). Dismantling oppression: An analysis of the connection between women and animals. In G. Gaard (Ed.), *Ecofeminism: Women, animals, nature* (pp. 61-90). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
Gruen, L. (2014). *Entangled empathy: An alternative ethic for our relationships with animals*. Brooklyn: Lantern Books.
Halley, J. O. (2012). *The parallel lives of women and cows: Meat markets*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Hamilton, L. A. (2013). The magic of mundane objects: Culture, identity and power in a country vet's practice. *The Sociological Review*, *61*(2), 265-284.
Hamilton, L. A. & Taylor, N. (2013). *Animals at work: Identity, politics and culture in work with animals.* Boston & Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers.
Herd, P., & Meyer, M. H. (2002). Care work: Invisible civic engagement. *Gender & Society*, *16*(5), 665-688.
Irvine, L. (2013a). Animals as lifechangers and lifesavers: Pets in the redemption narratives of homeless people. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *42*(1), 3-30.
Irvine, L. (2013b). *My dog always eats first: Homeless people and their animals*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
Irvine, L., & Vermilya, J. R. (2010). Gender work in a feminized profession: The case of veterinary medicine. *Gender & Society*, *24*(1), 56-82.
Kim, C. J. (2015). *Dangerous crossings: Race, species, and nature in a multicultural age.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
King, B. J. (2013). *How animals grieve*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Labrecque, J., & Walsh, C.A. (2011). Homeless women's voices on incorporating companion animals into shelter services. *Anthrozoos: A Multidisciplinary Journal of the Interactions of People & Animals*, *24*(1), 79-95.
Landers, T. F., Cohen, B., Wittum, T. E., & Larson, E. L. (2012). A review of antibiotic use in food animals: Perspective, policy, and potential. *Public Health Reports*, *127*(1), 4.
Lem, M., Coe, J. B., Haley, D. B., Stone, E., & O'Grady, W. (2013). Effects of companion animal ownership among Canadian street-involved youth: A qualitative analysis. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, *40*(4), 285-304.
Lerner, H., & Berg, C. (2015). The concept of health in one health and some practical implications for research and education: What is one health? *Infection Ecology & Epidemiology*, *5*, 1-7.
Lin, B. B., Chappell, M. J., Vandermeer, J., Smith, G., Quintero, E., Bezner-Kerr, R., . . . Perfecto, I. (2011). Effects of industrial agriculture on climate change and the mitigation potential of small-scale agro-ecological farms. *CAB Reviews*, *20*(6), 1-18.
Lister, R. (2009). A Nordic nirvana? Gender, citizenship, and social justice in the Nordic welfare states. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society*, *16*(2), 242-278.
Luxton, M., & Bezanson, K. (Eds.) (2006). *Social reproduction: Feminist political economy challenges neo-liberalism*. Montréal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
Mackenzie, J. S., Jeggo, M., Daszak, P. S., & Richt, J. A. (2013). *One health: The human-animal-environment interfaces in emerging infectious diseases*. Berlin: Springer.
Marino, L., & Colvin, C. M. (2015). Thinking pigs: A comparative review of cognition, emotion, and personality in *Sus domesticus*. *International Journal of Comparative Psychology*, *28*. Retrieved from http://escholarship.org/uc/item/8sx4s79c
Matsuoka, A., & Sorenson, J. (2013). Human consequences of animal exploitation: Needs for redefining social welfare. *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, *40*(4), 7-32.
Miller, J. (2008) 'We can't join a union, that would harm the horses:' Worker resistance in the UK horseracing industry. *Centre for Employment Studies Research Review*, April, 1-4.
Miller, J. (2013). Racing bodies. In C. Wolkowitz, R. L. Cohen, T. Sanders, & K. Hardy (Eds.), *Body/sex/work: Intimate, embodied, and sexualized labour* (pp.193-206). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
Nibert, D. A. (2014). Animals, immigrants, and profits: Slaughterhouses and the political economy of oppression. In J. Sorenson (Ed.), *Critical animal studies: Thinking the unthinkable* (pp. 3-17). Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
Noske, B. (1989). *Humans and other animals: Beyond the boundaries of anthropology*. London: Pluto Press.
Noske, B. (1997). *Beyond boundaries: Humans and animals*. Montréal: Black Rose Books.
Parreñas, R. (2012). Producing affect: Transnational volunteerism in a Malaysian orangutan rehabilitation center. *American Ethnologist*, *39*(4), 673-687.
Plumwood, V. (2002). *Environmental culture: The ecological crisis of reason*. London: Routledge.
Porcher, J. (2014). The work of animals: A challenge for social sciences." *Humanimalia: A Journal of Human-Animal Interface Studies, 6*(1), 1-9.
Robinson, M. (2010, October). *Veganism and Mi'kmaq legends: Feminist natives do eat tofu.* Paper presented at the American Academy of Religion conference, Atlanta, GA, USA.
Robinson, M. (2014). Animal personhood in Mi'kmaq perspective. *Societies*, *4*(4), 672-688.
Robinson, C. J., & Wallington, T. J. (2012). Boundary work: Engaging knowledge systems in co-management of feral animals on indigenous lands. *Ecology and Society*, *17*(2), 16-28.
Rock, M. J. & Degeling, C. (2015). Public health ethics and more-than-human solidarity. *Social Science & Medicine*, *129*, 61-67.
Ryan, T. (Ed.) (2014). *Animals in social work: Why and how they matter*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Sandberg, Ä. (Ed.). (2013). *Nordic lights: Work, management and welfare in Scandinavia.* Stockholm: SNS Förlag.
Sanders, C. R. (2010). Working out back: The veterinary technician and 'dirty work.' *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *39*(3), 243-272.

Scholz, S. J. (2008). *Political solidarity*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Serpell, J. A., Coppinger, R., & Fine, A. H. (2006). Welfare considerations in therapy and assistance animals. In A. H. Fine (Ed.), *Handbook on animal-assisted therapy: Theoretical foundations and guidelines for practice* (pp. 481-502). London: Academic Press.

Steinfeld, H., Gerber, P., Wassenaar, T., Castel, V., Rosales, M., & de Haan, C. (2006). *Livestock's long shadow: Environmental issues and options*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

Stuart, D., Schewe, R., & Gunderson, R. (2013). Extending social theory to farm animals: Addressing alienation in the dairy sector. *Sociologia Ruralis*, *53*(2), 201-222.

Stull, D. D., & Broadway, M. J. (2013). *Slaughterhouse blues: The meat and poultry industry in North America* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Taylor, N. (2010). Animal shelter emotion management: A case of *in situ* hegemonic resistance? *Sociology*, *44*(1), 85-101.

Tronto, J. C. (1993). *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care*. London: Psychology Press.

Tronto, J. C. (2013). *Caring democracy: Markets, equality, and justice*. New York: New York University Press.

Van Dooren, T. (2014). *Flight ways: Life and loss at the edge of extinction*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Weisberg, Z. (2014). Animal assisted intervention and animal citizenship. Unpublished paper accessed from the author.

Wilkie, R. M. (2010). *Livestock/deadstock: Working with farm animals from birth to slaughter*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Winter, D. (2016). *Processes of caring among animal liberation activists in the United States and Denmark*. Unpublished paper accessed from the author.

Woldehanna, S., & Zimicki, S. (2015). An expanded one health model: Integrating social science and one health to inform study of the human-animal interface. *Social Science & Medicine, 129*, 87-95.

World Health Organization. (2010). The FAO-OIE-WHO collaboration: Sharing responsibilities and coordinating global activities to address health risks at the animal-human-ecosystems interfaces. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/influenza/resources/documents/tripartite_concept_note_hanoi_042011_en.pdf

Yong, M. H., & Ruffman, T. (2014). Emotional contagion: Dogs and humans show a similar physiological response to human infant crying. *Behavioural Processes*, *108*, 155-165.

Zamir, T. (2006). The moral basis of animal-assisted therapy. *Society and Animals*, *14*(2), 179-199.