UNIVERSITY of OTAGO
Te Whare Wānanga o Otāgo
NEW ZEALAND

Media, Film and Communication

MFCO Working Paper Series

SPECIAL ISSUE: ENVIRONMENTS, SPACES AND TRANSFORMATIONS

Knowledge spaces and the urban jungle: Animal agency in geographical understandings of public space

Linda Madden
University of Auckland

Abstract: Relations in spatial environments are continually being made, re-made and un-made. As such, transformation can be viewed as both process (transformation-as-happening) and outcome (transformed spaces). Furthermore, there is a relationship between such embodied transformation and shifting understandings in knowledge spaces. Here I focus on the emergent field of 'animal geographies' to explore how the management of urban space in Auckland is affected by ontological distinctions between humans and animals as a result of their philosophical construction. To do this I will unpack the ways that geographical methodologies have constructed constrictive boundaries that situate animals outside urban space (ultimately denying them urban citizenship), and the fundamental ontological premises this has been founded on (particularly ideas surrounding the place of animals as domestic/domesticated). I then consider the 'newer' animal geographies (those which challenge a human-animal binary) as an example of transformative scholarship and explore the implications that this has beyond the academic world, drawing from examples of animal-human encounter and animal agency in Auckland City.

Beginnings

This paper places emphasis on the possibilities for the discipline of geography to function as a transformative force, addressing the shifting relations between embodied animals and knowledge production in the context of Auckland's urban environment. Here I will draw on 'newer' cultural geographies that attempt to destabilize ontological dualisms and include non-human actants in accounts of space and place. Examples include work that addresses the agency of flora (see Jones & Cloke 2002, 2008) and inanimate objects (see Edensor 2011) as well as animal autonomy (see Holloway 2007) and beastly interaction with humans (see work on dog-parks by Laurier *et al* (2006) or Urbanik & Morgan (2013), or Anderson's (1995) work on agency in zoos as examples). Many such geographies draw from Bruno Latour, Michel Callon and John Law's work on actor-network theory and Judith Butler's concept of performativity, as well as the 'new materialism' pioneered by scholars such as Karen Barad, Rosi Braidotti and Annemarie Mol. Increasingly, post-structural continental philosophy has also been integrated into geographic scholarship as Deleuze and Guattari's vitalist posthumanism and Manuel DeLanda's 'assemblage theory' have subsequently been embraced by many geographic theorists (see Dewsbury 2011; Anderson & McFarlane 2011; Greenhough 2012), resulting in transgressions of convention and a transformation of knowledge landscapes. Here I unpack knowledge production in terms of my localised domain, drawing from specific examples in Auckland's urban human-animal milieux to re-view human engagement with animals in public space. In this way, I hope to highlight the potential for animal geography to reflect processes of embodied encounter and how can this result in transformations in the political orderings of multi-species Aucklanders. As Philo (1995, p. 51) suggested, we can think about animals 'using concepts more commonly employed by human geographers when studying minority or "outsider" human groups'; looking at how these groups 'create lives and places "from within" as well as getting caught up in "webs of power" structured from without'.

Knowledge spaces serve as fabricators of the 'proper' places for subjects, denying both the subjectivity and agency of animal subjects based on their non-humanness. Evidence of such 'placing' of animals can be seen within Auckland City's landscape in the everyday practices of both it's human and non-human participants. In this case, spaces are delineated as those appropriate for animal (or interspecies) use, and other spaces are

marked where they are not permitted. These sites of inclusion and exclusion are governed by the Auckland City Council (ACC) as the principal regulatory body of what is now called the Auckland 'Supercity', yet they are also informed by certain modes of knowledge production. As a geographer, I am interested in the way that my discipline has contributed to the way that animals are spatially managed through policy and urban planning and the ontological history of such management regimes. As such, in this paper I examine ways in which social science methodologies produce systemic and regulatory boundary-making processes. I consider how this results in animals becoming spatially separated from humans by drawing on geographic discourses of domestication as a focal point.

Governings

Governance of Auckland's animal spaces rests in the hands of human citizens, composed and disseminated in a written (and to a lesser degree, spoken) language. We construct regulations that exclude non-humans from some spaces and contexts, whilst encouraging their participation in others – for example, we support engagement with animals in the Auckland Zoo as objects of entertainment, while it would be deemed dangerous or unsanitary to have an otter or orangutan running 'wild' in the suburbs. Likewise, bylaws govern animals (and their management) by determining numbers of certain species allowed to be 'kept' per urban property (particularly dogs, poultry, goats and pigs), how they are to be confined (fences, kennels, coops and other structures), and minimum health requirements (water, food, shelter and so forth). In specific locations non-humans are allowed to move within are also defined in bylaws. For instance, off-leash dogs are confined to particular public parks and urban farm animals are limited to circumscribed spaces, while native skinks are not to be removed from the council-managed reserves in which they may be found. Regulation therefore determines animal place and provides structures in which humans must order (and control) our own behavior to ensure these spatial arrangements are maintained. As a result, the scope of spaces and manners of encounter that are possible between human and animal are restricted and constrained in Auckland's urban environment.

As mentioned in my introduction, many of these regulations are informed by academic research. Nevertheless, research is generally confined to animal behaviours,

physical requirements and to the determination of what constitutes 'suitable' spatial relations between humans and non-humans. As a result we can see a plethora of articles in both biological and social science literature that address animal-spacings in terms of human wellbeing (see Hart *et al's* [1987] study of dogs and the disabled, and both McNicholas & Collis (2000) and Wood *et al's* (2005) discussions of animal companionship and community building) and positive life changes, such as in Flynn's (2000) study of animals and battered women and Irvine's (2012) enquiry into pets as "lifesavers" of the homeless. Paradoxically, a proliferation of literature also exists framing them as public nuisances (noisy, smelly, or as in Jerolmack's 2008 study of pigeons, simply excessive in number) to dangerous (threat of attacks) and diseased (threat of zoonosis), demonstrating an ambiguous view in academic writing that is largely dependent on how animals are spatially depicted. It is evident then, that geography as a discipline often shares the tenets of urban planning and policy whereby animals are considered only in terms of bounded space, and the porosity of assemblages (of places, actors and policies) is largely discounted.

Instead, I am looking at animals in terms of 'agency'. While a contentious term – and one that is open to multiple understandings – I am referring here to 'agency' as indicative of an affective process (either by or to the agent). Animal agency, then, refers to animal relations with the world (being-in-the-world), and does not necessarily equate to power-holding. In this way, agency is relational – in the public world non-humans are unlikely to demonstrate what Carter & Charles (2013) call 'corporate' agency in spite of displaying personal (such as escaping a paddock) or private-space agency (such as letting oneself in a cat-door, or barking to request food or a walk). As a result, accounts of non-human agency frequently approach the animal body in terms of relative powerlessness compared to humans. Often, these ethical and politicized treatments of animals deal with the racialisation of animal-human spaces and relationships (see Anderson 2000), associations between gender and animals/nature (see Adams 2006; Birke 2007; Herzog 2007), and animal slaughter/death (see Weil 2006; Johnston & Probyn-Rapsey 2013).

Early work on animal geographies situated animals in the margins to draw attention to the ways in which the animal political body remained invisible within the discipline. Vialles (1994) for example, examines the physical location of abattoirs on the outskirts of town as a response to ideas about the (very material) act of killing animals, and Philo (1995)

discusses the way that public sensibilities surrounding live animals in urban market places has changed over time. Both accounts 'make real' animal bodies, granting animal agency even within the confines of anthropocentric systems. In this way, however, even recent work that has been of great benefit in terms of politicizing the animal body has the unfortunate side-effect of presenting animals as victimized minorities who suffer at the hands of oppressive human persecutors. While this cannot – nor should not - be denied in an outright manner, it is not the *only* conversation we might have about/with beasts. Indeed, such an exclusive focus on human-animal hierarchies serves only to deny *actual* animal agency in urban processes. Likewise, studies on zoo environments (see Anderson 1995; Bishop 2004; Braverman 2011; Gruffudd 2000) re-situate non-humans in urban accounts, rendering them visible and articulating the role they have played in the constructions of urban environments. Nevertheless they give little indication of the transgressive possibility of movement through and beyond institutionalized, regulated spaces and relations.

Languages

It therefore becomes clear that non-human animals are subject to dualist attitudes in which beasts and humans occupy separate worlds. In philosophical discussion surrounding what Wolch (2002) refers to as the 'human-animal divide', language is almost invariably credited as the determining factor that guarantees such a split. Philosopher Giorgio Agamben claims in *The Open* (2004) that the ontologically humanistic "anthropological machine" developed in part from early attempts to explain processes of human evolution. He cites the example of linguist Ernst Haeckel's 1899 theorization that the evolutionary passage from animal to man (sic) is tied to the belief that the human soul alone has the capacity for language. Without this capacity we would be but an "animal-man" - in Haeckel's case, the *missing link,* a bridge between man and beast. Agamben, on the other hand, views the reification of language as representative of a 'zone of exclusion' by which the pre-linguistic human is animalized and excluded from humanity to create the 'inhuman'. Instead Agamben argues for a destabilization of the machine, a return neither to animal nor human life, but to what he refers to as 'bare life'.

It must be noted that a distinction is often drawn between language-as-communication (in which case non-verbal beastly communication is largely regarded as valid and meaningful), and language as a framework through which to construct abstract ideas. In this way language becomes associated with 'mindfulness', and equated with sentience. Inspired by Whitehead's philosophy of organisms, anthropologist - and early contributor to the cultural study of animals - Tim Ingold, argued that animals do in fact have language both in terms of communication and capacity for consciousness and creativity. While this may lie outside of human articulation: 'like us [the animal] is responsible for it's actions, having caused them to happen, even though it lacks our human ability to render an account of its performance, either beforehand as a plan or retrospectively as a report' (Ingold, 1988, p. 9). Ingold instead reconceptualised consciousness as a process (or *movement*), rather than in terms of abstract thinking, thus imbuing non-humans with agency no greater nor less than humans.

In spite of such views, within both physical and social science there is an enduring presupposition that it is the capacity for language (as representative of abstract thought) that makes us human. Blame for this usually falls upon Descartes, who remains notorious for both his conviction in a binary between humanity (as those who have souls) and non-humans (who don't), and his belief that animals are incapable of sentience. According to Cartesian philosophy animals are reduced to *automata*, by which their behaviour is mechanical instinct, devoid of reason:

> I know that animals do many things better than we do, but this does not surprise me. It can even be used to prove they act naturally and mechanically, like a clock which tells the time better than our judgement does. (Descartes, letter to the Marquess of Newcastle, 1646).

Such a claim clearly enables methodologies that treat animals as expendable objects of study (Descartes was, of course, a vivisectionist). Most significantly, it reflects the elevated value of reason, and a belief that lack of shared language amounts to incapacity to experience emotional or physical sensation. Descartes view permits us the use of animals, and to in turn push such utilitarian purposes behind a curtain. The physical situating of beasts within (and outside of) urban zones reflects this perspective, as non-human beings are accepted as belonging in particular types of spaces according to their use to humans. As

the 'new' animal geographers point out, non-domestic urban animal spaces are often marginal (Philo & Wilbert 2000), shared with human citizens of lower social status and economic class. It has been well documented how some socio-cultural groups (including women) are regarded as inferior due to their interaction with animals (see Adams 2006; Dixon 2008; Wolch & Zhang 2004) for discussions surrounding gender and animals, see Elder *et al*'s (1998), Anderson's (2000) and Griffith *et al*'*s* (2002) dissections of the many parallels between racialisation and animal interaction). Accordingly, groups with (bestial) jobs that deal with impure substances (such as nursing) or acts (such as abattoir workers or prostitutes) are at the lower end of social spectrum as a result of these relations (Shiva 1988; Wilkie 2013).

However, Auckland City Council's position on animal-human governance is not philosophical, of course, but practical. Regulation is directly related to *bodily* practice(s) that instantiate animal-ness as distinct from human-ness. By situating animals as the subject of enforcement, an abstracted ontological power imbalance is grounded in practice by which humans are the masters[1] of animal mobility and freedom of choice – we (try to) control both animal bodies and animal minds. Regulations govern this divide under the premise of ensuring that neither humans nor animals are subject to spread of disease, danger or - in the case of conservation discourse - exploitation. Here I will explore the idea of 'domestication' as a dominant trope in which animals are situated for two reasons; first it is an area that geography has demonstrated a constant fascination with, and secondly because Auckland's regulatory framework targets the control of domestic animals.

Domesticatings

Domestication is unavoidably relational – it necessarily unites animals and humans as sharers of space. The inherent conception is that as we bring animals under control we establish limits to a) non-human animal expression; b) how, when and where animals move; and c) the role of non-humans within society. By studying domestication in such a manner, geographers perpetuate the passive function of animals as (non)place-makers, ignoring the reciprocal relationship that they have in the process. The result is the relegation of animals to the backgrounds of landscapes, or their fetishisation into cultural artifacts or totems. Here lies a paradox that reflects intrinsic uncertainties with regard to how and where we

situate animals ideologically - by studying domestication as an interspace that incorporates humans and animals, non-human bodies become set in limbo, deprived of their 'naturalness', yet remaining outside of the cultural world.

Most apparent is the placement of animals into rural economic geographies as the traditional space of academic encounter. Ultimately this reinforces the idea that animals belong on farms, as passive features of a rural landscape. In this way knowledge spaces support traditional imaginings of New Zealand nationhood, with animals simultaneously representations of a rural idyll and valued commodities. Associated discourses articulate animals in terms of agrifood networks (see Drabenstott *et al* 1999; Le Heron *et al* 2001), processes of industrialization (see Symes and Marsden 1985; Willis 2004) or as part of the emotional and physical rural milieux that contribute to farming identity (see Hemsworth *et al* 1993; Holloway 2001; Riley 2011). As Yarwood and Evens (2000) pinpoint, livestock have always been "incidental" to some other goal of the rural or economic geographer – farm beasts are not credited with contributing actively to the formation of the farm-landscape.

Likewise, despite the strong geographical interest in both urbanisation and globalization, there is virtually no mention of non-human place in either process, demonstrating a very powerful conceptual bias towards the placement of animals. The categorization of rural/urban spaces also problematically essentialises each as a finite zone. In reality, the constant transferal of animals, people, products, services, ideas, and of tangible (beastly) materialities (such as feed/seed, sewage, blood, bone, flesh, semen, breath) renders each region – if not indistinguishable – then certainly co-mingled. Within geography, however, the rural and urban largely retain independent statuses, as evident in the distinctions between each as separate sub-disciplines. While 'close' and 'afar' have been conflated in many texts (as evident in buzzwords such as 'glocal', for example), the urban-rural divide remains powerful within geographic practice, with journals and books generally devoted exclusively to either one or the other.

Within Auckland, domesticated animals usually fall into one of two categories: the aforementioned farm animals (domesticated commodities) or pets (where 'home' is domestic space). While these may consist of slightly different assemblages of actors, spaces and processes, it would be inaccurate to present them as discrete. There is an overlap

between pet/farm animals, and beasts often swing between the two. Retired working dogs or chickens who are rehomed after life in battery farms are but two examples where the animal identities shift. However, catagorical differences between species are entrenched in policy. In New Zealand, for example the home slaughter of household animals is unusual. ACC guidelines state this must be 'carried out on a premise licensed under the Meat Act 1964' (ACC bylaw no.3 2008), suggesting that blurring the lines between stock and pet is discouraged in a regulatory sense. In 2009, there was a well publicised case where an Auckland man barbequed and ate his pitbull terrier cross. In spite of being acceptable under the animal welfare act, public outcry was considerable and criminalisation of the act was advocated by many. The spokesperson for the SPCA stated: 'Although we appreciate the difference of cultures that exist in a place like New Zealand, the SPCA finds this sort of treatment of any animal to be totally unacceptable' (from TVNZ News, 2009). While stating "any animal", it is clear that this response was species-based, as the slaughter and consumption of other (farm) animals is rarely noted in the media (see also Elder, Wolch & Emel 1998 for a similar account of dog-eating).

This distinction between the moral implications of eating farm or pet beast reinforces what Deleuze and Guattari (1987 [1980]) would classify as the 'striation' of spaces. These stratified systems are closed, homogenized, hierarchized and segmented socially and physically. If an animal belongs in the home it is for companionship not consumption, while an animal belonging on a farm is destined for the abbatoir, hence emotional connection between human and animal species is discouraged. Animal bodies are thus remade, transformed and constructed to re-create human ideas of what animal environments *should* be like. In terms of the disciplinary constructions of animals by geography, this is most evident through the way that dominant geographic methodologies revolve around the categorisation of space and subsequent ways that this information is presented and (re)interpreted.

Mappings

Cartography - while out of vogue throughout the last decade - has still been the conventional, primary and most powerful mode of disseminating spatial information in the geographic tradition. In this way social geographic treatment of animals has mirrored

zoographic treatments, focusing on the spread of animal life over time and space. As biogeographic methodologies trace land formation based on ancient animal species distribution, animal geographies have been used as a way of proving scientific theories such as continental drift. Likewise, animal lives may be recorded on economic maps – as figures of livestock numbers within a certain region, for example, or numbers or types of fish recorded in a sea-space for the purpose of determining fishing quotas. Of course, in these cases animal 'lifes' are reduced to frameworks of feeding, breeding, evolution patterns and so forth. Geographic methods can thus be held accountable for perpetuating structural boundaries, as maps bound and categorise spaces (as those containing animals or not) giving the false impression that these borders are impenetrable, denying transgressive or transformative potentials for animals to 'become' (or behave) in ways that do not correlate with their spatial positioning[2].

Within Auckland's urban environment, maps and statistics also support the construction of specie-fic animal spaces. Cats and dogs remain by far the most typical domestic animals in Auckland's urban zoning although there are numbers of farm animals in some council-managed public spaces (mostly sheep and cattle), a small number of private urban farms, and the increasing popularity of keeping household chickens. Here I will look briefly at canine spaces in Auckland as an example of typological assemblages dominated by mapped and quantified regulatory processes. Dogs are situated first and foremost as part of the domesticated home rather than part of public space. My own dog SundayBoy, for example, is given free rein within our property - here, we are both entitled to decision-making, with SundayBoy participating in the same negotiations for space as the rest of the household. Yet when we perform our interspecies routines outside of the home, we become part of an assemblage that places humans as responsible for dog behaviour. Now, SundayBoy is put on a leash. I take the lead. I determine the paths, I map the routes. For him to roam 'free' – in order not to subvert regulation - we must (I must) research where to find an appropriate park as determined, recorded and mapped by the ACC. Striated spaces are again constructed as spatial territories. Parks, for example have sometimes been claimed by dog-walkers and subsequently reclassified as legitimate under ACC regulations. While on one hand this is an example of a response to animal agency, it is also illustrative of Deleuzian processes of territorialisation(s). Through appropriation, dogs/dog-walkers de-

territorialise spaces via bodily engagement with/in them. Yet once regulatory bodies name and classify a zone as a 'dog park', it effectively becomes re-territorialised through 'lines of articulation' (Dewsbury 2011). In becoming a dog-park it becomes striated, other parks become *non*-dog parks. In this way, canine spaces are assemblages, coming into being and out of being as bodies and expressions flow in, through and around them.

It is interesting to note that transformation is possible in mapping practice too. Maps are often accepted as having a singular essence from which we can derive understanding. However, other theorists reject such an ontological position (see Kitchin & Dodge 2007; Kitchin, Perkins & Dodge 2009), and instead regard mapping as revealing intrinsic multiplicity through interpretation. Thus, while a map remains a material representation of a 'reality', it is also a process as its employment is dependent on the needs, prior understandings and situationism of map-readers as well as those who constructed them. For example, 'a feminist GIS might empower very different gazes, new themes can be mapped, in new ways…[whereby]…a more hybrid vision becomes possible in which power may be subverted' (Perkins 2009, p. 394). There has recently been renewed interest in alternative mapping strategies, often drawing from publicly open sources such as OpenStreetMapping (see Perkins 2014; Dodge & Kitchin 2014). Likewise, Caquard's (2011) 'narrative mapping', and Gerlach's (2013) 'vernacular mapping' both present transformative cartographies as mutable, interactive and localised. Such practices de-center the idea of maps as irrefutable knowledges produced by an elite, and recognize them as performances of the everyday and as records of personal experience or interest. Acceptance of animal agency opens up the geographic possibility of animal mapping, using cartographies of bodily movements rather than relying on language to reveal non-human narratives. Mapping then, can be a way in which transformative methodologies can be applied.

Animals' geographings

In the ACC's 2012 Auckland Plan, there is no mention of animals as 'citizens'. Although touted as a plan for 'all Aucklanders', it clearly refers only to humans, as non-humans are referenced only in the 'Environment' section of the plan where they feature as 'wildlife' or in terms of 'biodiversity' (ACC 2012). Thus, we need to look outside these frameworks for our examples of animal agency. Activism and animal advocacy groups, commercial animal

spaces, the home, and use of public spaces all provide assemblages in which animals can centralize themselves. Rather than structuring animal geographies in terms of what they can offer to humans, Hodgetts & Lorimer (2014) suggest a reframing towards 'animals' geographies', entailing the re-writing of non-humans as agents who enter and traverse the urban environment as geographic agents, then exit having left their marks upon it.

As Bear (2010) advocates, it is possible to focus on individual animals rather than collectives such as herds, schools, or species. Looking at an octopus-subject named 'Anjelica' in *The Deep*, an aquarium in Hull, Bear's interest was not only in 'how Angelica was presented to visitors', but 'also how she lived her own life' (2010, p. 299). By positioning himself in a series of encounters with Anjelica, Bear sensitively reveals her subjectivity through his own interpretative lens. As a result, he constructs a geography of enclosure that still centralizes Anjelica's agency and individuality. To return to SundayBoy and our interspecies walks, we can apply this methodology to Auckland's animal spaces. Crucially, it must be noted that in spite of attempts at regulation, opportunities for transgression by both human and canine agents abound. Dog-paths are not linear, they circle, backtrack, investigate the hidden spaces, the undergrowth, the thickets, the inhuman places. As I walk with Sunday he gravitates to the bushy margins of open space, a tree, a lamppost, a pile of leaves is a marker. Our conceptions of boundaries clearly differ and bureaucratic spatial enforcements are somewhat deflected as a result.

Figure 1. SundayBoy 'dog-mapping'

SundayBoy also engages in activities that transgress human social norms on these walks. Urine, feces and sexual acts are never uncommon among dog-friends, just as sudden and seemingly inexplicable violence is not uncommon among dog-enemies. It is these moments of wildness, of unpredictable and bestial behaviour that destabilise our human-centred perceptions of public behavior. The assemblage that is the dog-human-walk is therefore constituted by engagements with objects, creatures, smells and sounds that would not have been evident had the walker been without a canine companion. The retention of sites of dominance such as off-leash parks may indeed deny genuine opportunities for becoming (as Deleuze and Guattari might contend), as binaries of domination and systems of classification exclude rather than include the animal. However, participating with and sharing space with dogs can in many ways be seen as incorporating animals as partners in webs of power relations (Braidotti 1997, p. 70). Spaces become intersubjective, realms in which partners communicate and negotiate the terms of their relationship (Smuts, 2001:304) through rituals of a shared, embodied vocabulary of complementary movements. The very presence of the animal, then, can de-territorialise a regulatory space.

Finally, we will look at 'Merli', a cat who has made herself present in the urban lives of humans by choosing to make her home in a public space. Helpfully for us, Merli's 'owners' have taped a note to a bus shelter in the Auckland suburb of Northcote, explaining that she has decided to reside here in spite of having a conventional home down the road. This note demonstrates how Merli has made a conscious decision to claim place, subsequently de-stabilising orders that privilege humans as public space-makers. She has both actively upended the idea that an elderly cat 'belongs' in the home and drawn in new actors who might otherwise not have been central to the assemblage (such as the bus driver I met who regularly stops here expressly to greet and interact with her).

Figure 2. 'Merli'

At the same time, however, a paradox arises whereby Merli's agency is made evident through her *encounters with humans*. It is because her situation is outlined to the public (in a language Merli cannot use), that license is given for her to take her bus-stop place. Without this, she is at risk of being removed to a refuge or perhaps 'rehomed' by a well-meaning passerby. However, it is this very interaction between human and non-human that has shown us how Merli transforms the way that the – albeit small – space of this particular bus stop and adjoining park are assembled. By disturbing order, a 'smooth' space (Deleuze & Guattari 1987 [1980]) emerges, in which non-humans become part of entangled interrelations with space and other lives.

As the presence of the animal can deterritorialise a regulatory space, so too can the telling of their stories deterritorialise knowledge spaces. By treating animals as individuals as Bear does, or through our quick glimpse into SundayBoy's or Merli's Auckland-assemblages, we find ourselves re-viewing (and dismantling) the binaries of nature/culture that attempt to place animals as appropriate to certain spaces. We draw attention to what Haraway calls 'techno-biopolitics', whereby identity is partial, contradictory and linked to multiple non-human kinships (1991). Our participation as actors in a network of public social relations relies on bodily and hybridized spaces of entanglement. Such types of academic spaces are where new, enmeshed relationships can be forged between society and the environment.

Here we can acknowledge that knowledge and observation – and by extension, academic research – is fleshy, located, and partial. As Neumann (2009) remarks, academic recognition of these qualities allows science to better understand the limits of knowledge claims. Like its subjects, research into animal geography is embodied and incomplete, and it pays to reflect on the way this too resides on the edge of my discipline, much as animals sit on the edge of culture.

Endings

Upon reviewing the types of geographic knowledge spaces in which animals are situated, it seems that perhaps as academics we remain subject to what Laland & Hoppitt (2003) refer to as a 'brainist bias' – a bias that maintains a view of an evolutionary hierarchy that culminates in human reason and language. These values are credited with a capacity for moral value that excludes animals from our scholarly considerations of culture, resulting in a segregation between the ways we address human and non-humans within knowledge spaces. Moreover, methodological preferences in geography retain a reluctance to treat animals as active subjects – a position that reflects deep-seated ideas about who and what is worth studying, a bias towards empirical research and an underlying lack of critical openness regarding alternative research methods. A general belief in a nature-culture divide is therefore retained whereby human researchers study the 'natural' world objectively and animals simply constitute parts of such faceless, nameless processes rather than becoming active agents that co-create space alongside us. However, the world consists of real, embodied interactions between species that take place in material urban spaces as well as within 'nature'.

In Auckland, the animal-human landscape consists of institutions and institutionalized knowledges of urban (and rural) regulations, discourses of domestication, conservation, of health, safety and rights, as well as the actual houses, streets, shops that make up the landscape. These elements sit alongside representations of animals in art and advertising that shape and reflect our understandings of what constitutes them, and the material objects and structures that confine beasts, that divide us from them, and represent our authority over all that is not human (fences, cages, leashes, aquariums and so on). Academic construction of animals has contributed to such confinements of animals within

(human) constructed parameters thus reflecting/reinforcing perceptions of non-human creatures as separate from 'us'. By situating animals aside of humanity, bestial place is justified as lying beyond both physical and ideological boundaries, and as such the academic construction of animals ultimately results in their constriction. It is therefore important to acknowledge how the methodologies we employ as social scientists reflect meta-concepts that tacitly position animals as less-than-human. Yet non-human doings are the result of complex, messy and unstable arrangements between animal agencies and external power politics, and should be researched as such. Academic articulations of non-humans, then, can benefit from taking Philo's (1998) advice to heart; by researching animal lives in the manner we do human lives, we can deny the animal-human binary. As we document individual animal moments of encounter and detail the mundane existences of the 'everyday' urban animal population we start to better understand how animal spaces are created and supported as shared, interspecies processes.

Endnotes

1. I use the masculine term deliberately here, as many parallels are evident between the politics of being-woman and the politics of being-animal (see Davis 1995; Adams 2006; Birke 2007; McHugh 2012). While my emphasis here is not in reviewing feminist geographies, it would be a disservice to both women and animals to fail to acknowledge such a linkage.

2. This is not to say that animals do not independently transgress spatial boundaries, merely that this is rarely (if ever) articulated on maps, as they deal with animal collectives not individual agencies.

References

Auckland City Council 2008, Bylaw No.3 'Animals'.

Auckland City Council 2012, *Auckland Plan*, viewed 20 September, 2014, http://theplan.theaucklandplan.govt.nz

Adams, C J 2006, 'An animal manifesto: Gender, identity, and vegan-feminism in the twenty-first century', *Parallax,* vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 120-128.

Agamben, G 2004, *The open: Man and animal* (Vol. 1), Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Anderson, K 1995, 'Culture and nature at the Adelaide zoo: At the frontiers of 'human' geography', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 275-294.

Anderson, K 2000, '"The beast within": Race, humanity, and animality', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 301-320.

Anderson, B & McFarlane, C 2011, 'Assemblage and geography', *Area*, vol. 43 no.2, pp 124-127.

Bear, C 2011, 'Being angelica? exploring individual animal geographies', *Area,* vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 297-304.

Birke, L 2007, 'Relating animals: Feminism and our connections with nonhumans', *Humanity & Society,* vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 305-318.

Bishop, R 2004, 'Journeys to the urban exotic: Embodiment and the zoo-going gaze', *Humanities Research,* vol. 11. no. 1, pp. 106-124.

Braidotti, R 1997, 'Meta(L)Morphoses', *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 14, no.2, pp.67-80.

Braverman, I 2011, 'States of exemption: The legal and animal geographies of American zoos', *Environment and Planning A*, vol. 43, pp. 1693-1706.

Caquard, S 2011, 'Cartography I: Mapping narrative cartography', *Progress in Human Geography,* vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 135-144

Carter, B & Charles, N 2013, Animals, agency and resistance, *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, vol. 43, no. 3, pp 322-340.

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*, Duke University Press.

Deleuze, G & Guattari, F 1987 [1980], *A thousand plateaus* (B. Massumi, trans.) Minneapolis, MN, University of Minnesota Press.

Descartes, R 1970, Letter to the Marquis of Newcastle, November 23, 1646. *Descartes: Philosophical Letters*.

Dewsbury, J D 2011, 'The Deleuze-Guattarian assemblage: Plastic habits', *Area*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 148-153.

Dixon, B A 2008, 'The feminist connection between women and animals', *Environmental Ethics*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 181-194.

Dodge, M & Kitchin, R 2014, 'Crowdsourced cartography: mapping experience and knowledge', *Environment and Planning A,* vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 19-36.

Drabenstott, M, Henry, M & Mitchell, K 1999, 'Where have all the packing plants gone? The new meat geography in rural America', Bureau of Business Research Publications. Paper 13, http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/bbrpub/13

Edensor, T. 2011, 'Entangled agencies, material networks and repair in a building assemblage: The mutable stone of St Ann's Church, Manchester1', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 238-252.

Elder, G, Wolch, J & Emel, J 1998, 'Race, place, and the bounds of humanity', *Society and Animals*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 183-202.

Flynn, C P 2000, 'Battered women and their animal companions: Symbolic interaction between human and nonhuman animals', *Society and Animals*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 99-127.

Gerlach, J 2013, 'Lines, contours and legends coordinates for vernacular mapping', *Progress in Human Geography,* vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 22-39.

Greenhough, B. 2012, 'On the agencement of the academic geographer', *Dialogues in Human Geography,* vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 202-206.

Griffith, M, Wolch, J & Lassiter, U 2002, 'Animal practices and the racialization of Filipinas in Los Angeles', *Society and Animals,* vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 221-248.

Gruffudd, P 2000, 'Biological cultivation: Lubetkin's modernism at London zoo in the 1930s', in C Philo & C Wilbert (eds), *Animal spaces, beastly places: new geographies of human-animal relations,* Routledge, London, pp. 222-242.

Haraway, D 1991, *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature*. Routledge, London & New York.

Hart, L A, Hart, B L, & Bergin, B 1987, 'Socializing effects of service dogs for people with disabilities', *Anthrozoos: A Multidisciplinary Journal of the Interactions of People & Animals*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 41-44.

Hemsworth, P H, Barnett, J L, & Coleman, G J 1993, 'The human-animal relationship in agriculture and its consequences for the animal', *Animal Welfare,* vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 33-51.

Herzog, H A 2007, 'Gender differences in humananimal interactions: A review', *Anthrozoos: A Multidisciplinary Journal of The Interactions of People & Animals,* vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 7-21.

Hodgetts, T & Lorimer, J March 2014, 'Methodologies for animals' geographies: cultures, communication and genomics', *Cultural Geographies,* pp. 1-11.

Holloway, L 2001, 'Pets and protein: placing domestic livestock on hobby-farms in England and Wales', *Journal of Rural Studies,* vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 293-307.

Ingold, T 1988. 'The animal in the study of humanity' in T Maran, D Martinelli & A Turovski (eds), *Readings in zoosemiotics*, Walter de Gruyter GmBH & Co, Berlin & Boston, pp. 357-376.

Irvine, L 2012, 'Animals as lifechangers and lifesavers: Pets in the redemption narratives of homeless people', *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 1-28.

Jerolmack, C 2008, 'How pigeons became rats: The cultural-spatial logic of problem animals', *Social Problems*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp. 72-94.

Johnston, J & Probyn-Rapsey, F 2013, *Animal death,* Sydney University Press, Sydney.

Jones, O., & Cloke, P 2002, *Tree cultures: the place of trees and trees in their place*. Berg Publisher, Oxford.

—— 2008, 'Non-human agencies: Trees in place and time' in L Malafouris & C Knappett (eds), *Material agency*, Springer, US, pp. 79-96.

Kitchin, R & Dodge, M 2007, 'Rethinking maps', *Progress in Human Geography,* vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 331-344.

Kitchin, R, Perkins, C & Dodge, M 2011, 'Thinking about maps', in M Dodge, R Kitchin, & C Perkins (eds), *Rethinking maps: New frontiers in cartographic theory*, Routledge, London.

Laland, K.N & Hoppitt, W 2003, 'Do animals have culture?', *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews,* vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 150-159.

Laurier, E, Maze, R & Lundin, J 2006, 'Putting the dog back in the park: Animal and human mind-in-action', *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, vol. 13, no.1, pp. 2-24.

Le Heron, R, Penny, G, Paine, M, Sheath, G, Pedersen, J & Botha, N 2001, 'Global supply chains and networking: A critical perspective on learning challenges in the New Zealand dairy and sheepmeat commodity chains', *Journal of Economic Geography,* vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 439-456.

Mchugh, S 2012, 'Bitch, bitch, bitch: Personal criticism, feminist theory, and dog-writing', *Hypatia,* vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 616-635.

McNicholas, J, & Collis, G 2000, 'Dogs as catalysts for social interactions: Robustness of the effect', *British Journal of Psychology*, vol. 91, no. 1, pp. 161-170.

Neumann, R.P 2009, 'Political ecology' in R Kitchin & N Thrift (eds), *International encyclopedia of human geography*, Elsevier, Oxford, pp. 228-233.

Perkins, C 2009, 'Mapping, philosophy' in R Kitchin, & N Thrift (eds), *International encyclopedia of human geography,* Elsevier, Oxford, pp. 385-397.

—— 2014, 'Plotting practices and politics: (Im)mutable narratives in OpenStreetMap', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* vol. 39, no. 2, pp. 304-317.

Philo, C 1995 'Animals, geography, and the city: Notes on inclusions and exclusions', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* vol. 13, pp. 655-681.

Philo, C & Wilbert, C 2000, 'Animal spaces, beastly places: an introduction' in C Philo & C Wilbert (eds.), *Animal spaces, beastly place: New geographies of human-animal relations,* Routledge, London, pp. 1-37.

Riley, M 2011, '"Letting them go"–Agricultural retirement and human–livestock relations', *Geoforum,* vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 16-27.

Shiva, V 1989, *Staying alive*, Zed Books, London.

Smuts, B 2001, 'Encounters with animal minds', *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, vol. 8, no. 5-7, pp. 293-309

Symes, D & Marsden, T 1985, Industrialisation of agriculture: Intensive livestock farming in Humberside, *The industrialisation of the countryside,* Geobooks, Norwich.

TVNZ News 2009 'No charges for man who barbecued dog', *ONE News/NZPA,* 16 August, 2009, viewed 26 September, 2011, http://tvnz.co.nz/national-news/no-charges-man-barbecued-dog-2919419

Urbanik, J & Morgan, M 2013, 'A tale of tails: The place of dog parks in the urban imaginary', *Geoforum*, vol. 44, pp. 292-302.

Vialles, N 1994, *Animal to edible*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, New York & Melbourne.

Weil, K 2006, 'Killing them softly: Animal death, linguistic disability, and the struggle for ethics', *Configurations,* vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 87-96.

Wilkie, R 2013, 'Academic "Dirty Work": Mapping scholarly labor in a tainted mixed-species Field', *Society and Animals*, DOI: 10.1163/15685306-12341312, pp. 1-19.

Willis, R P 2004, 'Enlargement, concentration and centralisation in the New Zealand dairy industry', *Geography*, vol. 8*9*, pp. 83-88.

Wolch, J 2002, 'Anima urbis', *Progress in Human Geography,* vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 721-742.

Wolch, J & Zhang, J 2004, 'Siren songs: gendered discourses of concern for sea creatures', in L Nelson & J Seager (eds), *A companion to feminist geography,* Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Malden, MA, pp. 458–485.

Wood, L, Giles-Corti, B & Bulsara, M 2005, 'The pet connection: Pets as a conduit for social capital?', *Social Science & Medicine,* vol. 61, pp. 1159-1173.

Yarwood, R & Evans, N 2000, 'Taking stock of farm animals and rurality', in C. Philo & C. Wilbert (eds.), *Animal spaces, beastly places: New geographies of human-animal relations,* Routledge, London, pp. 98-114.