

Open Inquiry Archive

ISSN 2167-8812

<http://openinquiryarchive.net>

September 2014

REVIEWS

Stephen F. Eisenman. *The Cry of Nature: Art and the Making of Animal Rights.* London: Reaktion Books, 2013, 256 pages.

Steve Baker. *Artist/Animal.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013, 304 pages.

Reviewed by Jessica Dallow (Associate Professor, University of Alabama at Birmingham)

Animal Voices, Artist Choices

Both Stephen F. Eisenman's *The Cry of Nature* and Steve Baker's *Artist/Animal* affirm how artists, throughout history and in the present, provide unique and valuable perspectives on animal life. Each, however, approaches the topic quite differently. Eisenman traces how art functions within a broad history of animal rights theory from the ancient world to the present. Baker's text examines, through a series of six case studies, eleven contemporary artists who work across different media. Though seemingly disparate, Baker's artists share an interest in making art in which they work with animals, rather than employing them for aesthetic or symbolic purposes. Although Eisenman examines in depth a selection of individual artists, his focus is on the visual representation of animals whereas Baker's is on artists' engagements with them.

Eisenman's and Baker's volumes admirably add to the growing corpus of recent scholarship on animals in art that includes Diana Donald's *Picturing Animals in Britain*,

1750-1850 (2008), Ron Broglio's *Surface Encounters: Thinking with Animals in Art* (2011), and Giovanni Aloï's *Art and Animals* (2012).¹ Baker's attention to living artists and their practices more closely approximates Broglio's and Aloï's focuses on the contemporary period. *Artist/Animal* engages notable posthumanist theorists like Donna Haraway, Jacques Derrida, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, Jonathan Burt, and Cary Wolfe since it is number 25 in the University of Minnesota Press's *Posthumanities* series of which Broglio's *Surface Encounters*, Haraway's *When Species Meet* (2007) and Wolfe's *What is Posthumanism?* (2009) are also part.² Baker, however, foregrounds the voices of his artist-subjects, using quotes drawn from interviews conducted over the last decade. In doing so, he exposes how artistic practice reveals the ways in which art employs unique tools for exploring "questions of animal life," ones that are distinct from other humanities and scientific disciplines but equally valid and perhaps even better.³ Moreover, in stressing how artists approach and think about their work, he asserts that "a rule-bound or unduly judgmental notion of ethics," often imposed by other disciplines, is not necessarily a useful line of inquiry. Eisenman's *The Cry of Nature* might be considered both a counter to *Artist/Animal* as well a companion Baker's book. It remains tangled in questions of ethics, since its central concern revolves around illuminating art's role in a history of advocacy for animal welfare, rights, and compassion. It also provides an expansive exploration of the various ways artists have approached and imaged animals:

In some cases . . . artists were in the avant-garde of animal rights and protections, and in others not. But in all instances, artists brought substantively different insights from writers to the definition and role of the animal—understandings based upon the unique, perceptual character of visual art.⁴

Because of its scope and aim, Eisenman's project is more deeply historical than Baker's. Like Donald's superb *Picturing Animals*, *The Cry of Nature* frequently relies on primary sources, including political and scientific tracts, novels, philosophical essays, and artists' writings to analyze images. It examines many of the same artists; however, while Eisenman's book often lacks the consistent, exhaustive art historical analysis of Donald, it remains image centered, focused on how artworks may either affect or be affected by contemporary understandings of animals. Baker's book, on the other hand, by divorcing itself from questions of ethics and privileging artistic choices, illuminates more so *how* artists engage with animals, but not necessarily what it *means* for them to do so. Therefore, I find Eisenman's book more useful in providing evidence of art's ability to shape thought about (and by implication treatment of) animals.

Eisenman's volume takes its name from Scottish revolutionary and reformer John Oswald's *The Cry of Nature or an Appeal to Mercy and Justice on Behalf of the Persecuted Animals*, published in 1791. Though less well known than Michel de Montaigne's *Apology for Raymond Sebond* (1576) or Jeremy Bentham's *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (1879), Oswald's text presents, Eisenman contends, a "veritable manifesto of animal liberation long before Peter Singer's [1975] book of that title."⁵ The

“cry of nature” springs from Rousseau’s *Discourse on the Origins of Inequality* (1761)—an instinctual sound, the first and universal language of mankind, uttered in danger or distress. As a sound of both human and animal alike—“unmediated nature”⁶—it demands recognition and equality, and thus advocates for, on ecological and moral grounds, not only the humane treatment of animals, but a human vegetarian diet.⁷ Eisenman additionally stresses how Oswald grants agency to animals, as if through their bodies they demand their own emancipation. In so doing, the author positions eighteenth-century animal welfare reform not only within the wider context of justice movements, in which the oppressed appear as agents in their own struggle, but also within the period’s anti-slavery efforts. To explore animals as autonomous agents continues a current in animal studies scholarship that understands animals not just as metaphors, as “figures of and for the human,”⁸ but as ways to rethink the boundaries between species and hence what it means to be human.⁹ Yet to posit animal agency can prove equally vexing, since to do so often entails anthropomorphizing animals, projecting human qualities, manners, and behaviors onto them. Oswald’s cry, however, resists anthropomorphizing tendencies, grounding animals and humans on equal footing as and in Nature. For Eisenman, the middle of the eighteenth century is a pivot point, where the changes that began then “may now be reaching a kind of crescendo.”¹⁰ His book consequently proceeds to outline movement to and from that point.

Eisenman covers immense ground throughout *The Cry of Nature*. His first chapter considers how language, consciousness, and intelligence have informed the status of animals, while the next chapters proceed chronologically, moving from the ancient period to the present. The book concludes with a discussion of posthumanism and relational identity. Throughout, Eisenman interweaves philosophy, theology, and science with literature, painting, and illustration.¹¹ Two themes emerge from this dense field that continue to pose what he calls a “brutal contradiction”¹²: how animals have developed, in Western thought, into autonomous beings, endowed with intelligence and consciousness, yet remain subjugated as objects of scientific research and food. Indeed, the inability to resolve this is at the heart of animal welfare versus animal rights activism: the welfare faction that seeks to regulate the treatment of or mitigate the suffering of animals versus the rights faction that urges the emancipation of animals.

The dead animal body courses through *The Cry of Nature*. Chapter two examines the ascendancy of speciesism and its impact on the growing divide between human and animal, the belief in human dominion over animals, and thus, by extension, the right to eat them. The rise of the early modern game picture and meat still life evidence an era of “carnivorous Europe” that peaked around the turn of the seventeenth century.¹³ Pieter Aertsen’s *Meat Stall with the Holy Family Giving Alms* (1551) indicates the prevalence of meat and game in European markets and homes, as well as attitudes towards animals as “no more than meat on the hoof and on the wing.”¹⁴ Eisenman acknowledges the more typical readings of this painting as a condemnation of gluttony and greed or a Eucharistic message, but also emphasizes it as a symbol of the naturalization of a Christian right to cheap, plentiful meat.¹⁵ Rembrandt’s *Flayed Ox* (1655), in contrast, challenges such ideas by representing an animal body, though Christlike in pose,

reduced to a carcass that lacks a clear moralizing or redemptive meaning.¹⁶ Throughout chapter two, Eisenman finely interweaves analyses of flayed and butchered animals with syntheses of key thinkers of the period such as Montaigne, Jean de la Fontaine, and Julien Offray de La Mettrie, all of whom opposed Cartesian doctrine (that reduced animals to machines, bereft of reason or souls) and asserted in various ways the presence of animal consciousness. Extending the work of Sarah R. Cohen, he suggests that even J. B. S. Chardin's dead animals—with flesh and fur lushly rendered through paint—posit the existence of an animating soul now violently extinguished.¹⁷ While much early modern art history employs many of the same philosophical writings that Eisenman uses in his analysis of the game-meat still life, his contextualization of this genre within a history of animal rights theory and animal representation is original and informative.

Other chapters continue investigations into the production and consumption of meat, exploring the impact of the slaughter industry on the presence and visibility of animals in modern, urban life. Chapter four examines La Villette, the so-called "City of Blood," that opened in 1867 on the outskirts of Paris.¹⁸ Described by Eisenman as a miniature Haussmannized city, it became an immense killing field and model of French rationalism and efficiency. Of course like all abattoirs, in reality it remained rife with carnage and cruelty, and was renowned across Europe for its filth. Indeed Upton Sinclair's *The Jungle* (1906) exposed the atrocities animals were subjected to in modern slaughter, the Chicago slaughterhouse workers indifferent to the blood and wails of agony.¹⁹ During their early years, slaughterhouses offered public tours, but as history progressed, they increasingly prohibited public access. Soon the world of slaughter—the stockyards, abattoirs, and packing plants—became isolated metropolises, resulting in the disappearance of meat production from the fabric of urban life and, with it, violent animal death.²⁰ Claude Monet's and Gustave Caillebotte's dead animal still lifes are consequently interpreted in light of the growing detachment between animals and humans, or at least between humans and those animals designated as meat, with *Calf's Head and Ox Tongue* (c. 1882) Caillebotte's vision of meat as a "product of a clean, safe and salubrious system of rationalized butchering, transport and refrigeration,"²¹ comparable to his sweeping, orderly Parisian boulevards. Sue Coe's drawings of factory farms and meat production, with their depictions of animals packed in tight battery cages and feedlots, or suffering on the kill floor, form a logical endpoint to *The Cry of Nature*, and provide an entrée into the contemporary moment, a time where new research reinforces animal intelligence and factory farming methods undergo increased scrutiny and regulation, yet inhumane practices and severe cruelty to animals endures.

Horses exist on the periphery of the slaughter narrative, not as a principal food source but because they are sent to the knackers after being used up as beasts of burden and in sport. The cruelty to and overwork of carriage and working horses, of course, galvanized activists into forming the various animal welfare societies that grew up during the nineteenth century in Europe and the United States. The hackney cab horse features in the second stage of William Hogarth's *Four Stages of Cruelty* (1751), a print series that Eisenman unsurprisingly argues marks the beginning of a serious visual

tradition of animal welfare and rights. In it, Hogarth depicts his protagonist, Tom Nero, viciously beating his collapsed and broken-legged horse into rising after a carriage accident. A tear even trickles down the horse's cheek. Such an inclusion signals the later equines of George Stubbs and Théodore Géricault, beasts endowed with sentience and expression. Stubbs's famous subject, the horse attacked by a lion, demonstrates the palpable emotion of fear, its head twisted to reach its attacker, eyes white, and teeth bared—a counter to Cartesian models of the animal as machine. Géricault's *Horse Frightened by Lightning* (c. 1813-14) advances Stubbs's realism: the horse shifts its weight to its haunches as it pulls back, neck arched, ears pointed, and eyes bulging, its body fully responding to the source of its fright. These representations of physical and potentially aural signs of response, provoked upon pain, fright, or exhaustion, Eisenman describes as cyphers or symptoms “of the modern”; of artworks that insist “on being seen” for what they are, not as allegories, symbols or metaphors.²² Implicit in this statement, though, is that the *animals* too insist on being seen. Erica Fudge acknowledges that written documents are a central problem inherent in a history of animals: “we are never looking at the animals, only ever at the representation of the animals by humans.”²³ The real animal disappears. One might say the same thing about artworks, a different, visual form of representation, since they are created by humans, and thus perhaps only evidence of the history of human attitudes towards animals. Yet while Eisenman enmeshes the visual history of animals within a broader history of (human) ideas, sometimes paralleling it, sometimes resisting it, he indicates the greater potential of visual art to manifest a “real” material animal (body) in ways distinct from the written document.

Apart from those animals designated as food, or used in sport, what about those animals that we do not eat, those lap dogs and exotic pet monkeys that pervade images of the same periods? The rise of petkeeping has been thoroughly treated, notably in texts like Kathleen Kete's *Beast in the Boudoir: Petkeeping in Nineteenth-Century Paris* (1994).²⁴ Pets figure only marginally in Eisenman's book, for example in two paintings of dogs by Sir Edwin Landseer (*Dignity and Impudence*, 1839; *Alexander and Diogenes*, 1848). Here, the author suggests that the artist actually undermined his own animal welfarist views by oversentimentalizing his canines, making them verge on the unbelievable or ridiculous. Such an interpretation implores further analysis and comparisons with other animals of the period. What tips an expressive or sentient animal into the realm of the overly sentimentalized, and thereby ineffectual? And why then were Landseer's images appropriated by nineteenth-century animal anti-vivisection organizations? Indeed sentimentalized, anthropomorphic animals pervade animal welfarist publications as Donald and J. Keri Cronin have shown, and often do so quite effectively.²⁵ Cronin's work especially offers an alternative to Eisenman's fine arts emphasis through her examination of nineteenth-century welfare and antivivisection ephemera.

Eisenman also contends that the other preeminent nineteenth-century animalier Rosa Bonheur, like Landseer, denies the autonomy of her animals: her *Horse Fair* (1853) bereft of any cruelty or tragedy, her later pictures conventionally sentimental.²⁶ His gloss of Bonheur points to the conspicuous omission of women throughout *The Cry of Nature*,

beyond Coe's contemporary images or William Blake's illustrations for Mary Wollestonecraft's *Original Stories for Children* (1791). Of course, women's roles in anti-vivisection and welfarist movements have been well documented, and even my quick perusal of an online timeline of animal rights literature reveals several relevant writings by women, including Saint Bridget of Sweden, Helen Maria Williams, and Anne Field Elsdale.²⁷ The absence of women is surprising not only because of his work on Coe here, as well as in a recent exhibition catalog, but also in considering the established links between the representation (and objectification) of the animal and female body, or the female body and meat.²⁸ Eisenman's sole suggestion of the gendering of meat comes in his discussion of French modernism, in which artists' depictions of meat reflect, like their female nudes, inventive challenges to past artistic tropes, as in Caillebotte's *Calf in a Butcher Shop* (1882), where the carcass adorned with flowers and pink corsage resembles a young *cocotte*, the likes of which frequent the poems of Charles Baudelaire or novels of Émile Zola.²⁹

Eisenman's text provides a useful history of animals in art, centered on the struggle for animal liberation. Within this history exist meta-narratives about the rise of the slaughterhouse into the factory farm, the meat and game still life, animal 'voices,' and the foundations and contestations of speciesism. *The Cry of Nature* is also richly illustrated; however, because its black and white reproductions often make details hard to decipher, it would have benefited from key illustrations in color. Nevertheless, I would certainly use it in an art history course on animal rights and art, or the representation of animals. In the end, however, when Eisenman posits that we are at a critical juncture where changes begun in the eighteenth century are reaching a kind of crescendo, I remain skeptical. What comes through in his text is not only how a wealth of Western thought developed that has consistently contested the barriers between human and animal and condemned cruelty to animals, but also how the powerful combination of Christian dogma, Cartesian doctrine, and capitalism coalesced as a potent force that effectively shut out, and continues to diminish, the cry of nature, to achieve its own aims.

Whereas the entirety of *The Cry of Nature* revolves around art and animal rights, *Artist/Animal* only examines it specifically in one chapter on Sue Coe, Britta Jaschinski, and Angela Singer. Each author's respective analysis of Coe signifies their divergent approaches. Eisenman positions Coe's work within the rise of the factory farm, centralizing her portrayal of the miserable plight of meat animals, including their cramped conditions on the factory farm, inhumane transport, and agonizing deaths. Baker instead begins by asking what the artist can offer the cause of animal rights beyond that which is already being delivered by activist film and videos of rampant abuse.³⁰ In other words, how might art operate differently from documentary, and by extension, more effectively? Baker invokes Jonathan Burt's and James Elkins's writings on slaughterhouse documentaries and photographs of executions to raise questions about the power and affect of images of extreme violence, yet his response mainly turns on visual description and artists' quotes. As a result, he doesn't offer a definitive answer, other than the fact that Coe continuously grapples with how to show such incendiary

and disturbing subject matter—“The subject matter I address is very difficult to look at in any other form . . . almost impossible to look at”—even though her audience comprises primarily activists, already sympathetic to her subject matter. Baker’s afterword is more satisfying in its discussion of Coe, when he contends with Cary Wolfe’s positioning of her art in the humanist, rather than posthumanist, camp because of her focus on the animal face and her graphic, realistic (traditional) medium. In contrast to Wolfe, Baker emphasizes the interactions between Coe’s animal and human *bodies*, her hybrid medium that often blurs high and low (e.g., *Sheep of Fools* disseminated as a comic), and her often uncertain practices as evidence of posthumanist concerns, and thus the not so neat categorization of her work.³¹

Jaschinski’s photographs approach activism differently than Coe’s representations of piteous farm and laboratory animals by challenging stereotypical documentary strategies, specifically that of wildlife film and photography, to address the threat of extinction.³² In her 2006 black and white series *Dark*, blurry close ups of wild animals transform into specters of themselves, distinct from the conventional lush color images of majestic animals in their natural habitat. This subversion of traditional documentary style—the use of blank backgrounds and depictions of ghostly animal forms—makes visible normalized documentary codes and suggests the fates of the animals. So, then, what does Jaschinski add to the cause of animal rights? The answer for Baker is that there is no explicit answer, that art doesn’t bring certainties in any straightforward sense: “Art brings questioning, and an avoidance of the *easy*.”³³ By including several quotes by the artist, Baker foregrounds Jaschinski’s aesthetic choices: for example, that she is interested in subtlety, or how one picture may look awkward or weird, but that she is “trying to see it from the angle of the animal rather than the viewer . . . and that’s so hard.”³⁴ The aesthetic component of the work—the artist’s formal rigor and understanding of medium—is as important as subject matter. As Coe states: “Before art can be a tool for change, it has to be art.”³⁵

Attention to the works as art, and to artistic process as a working through of formal decisions as much as the expression of ideas, or iteration of intention, suffuses *Artist/Animal*. Baker opens his introduction with accounts of two artists whose artworks ignited debate about the ethical dimensions of animal art: Kim Jones, who, in his performance *Rat Piece* (1976), burned live rats, and Marco Evaristti, who, in his installation *Helena* (2000), set up a series of ten blenders filled with one live goldfish each that visitors could turn on at their will. Both were charged with animal cruelty. Most discussions of Jones and Evaristti have naturally turned on the ethics of using animals and whether such use is justifiable, especially considering that both artworks were really not about animals at all but employed them as vehicles to explore human choices and actions. Baker intimates that these types of artworks that use animals irresponsibly cloud the wider picture of contemporary art that engages explicitly and sympathetically with animal life.³⁶ As an alternative to Jones’s killing of rats, he offers up British artist Lucy Kimbell’s *One Night with Rats in the Service of Art* (2005), a performance lecture in which the artist intended to “share the results of her aesthetic experiments with rats” in discussion with film and animals studies scholar Jonathan Burt.³⁷ Her research consisted

of interviews with scientists, participation in a rally protesting animal experiments, and conversations with rat owners and enthusiasts, as well as a *Rat Fair*, which included an artist competition for rats. Throughout his discussion of Kimbell, Baker stresses that her “practice-based” research, which neither began with a definitive objective nor ended with a clear outcome, was, perhaps, more about being there with the animal in various moments and contexts: “I wonder,” Kimbell stated in her performance lecture, “what knowledge, if any, was produced here?”³⁸

Such a prevalent emphasis on open-endedness, however, often feels incomplete, as though I am coming into the middle of a conversation and leaving before it has finished. Each case study would benefit from a clearer account of each project and better overview of its place within the artist’s broader practice. The extensive use of artists’ quotes too makes me wonder whether the book would have been equally as effective as a collection of interviews, framed by an introduction and conclusion. Of course, though, it seems this is Baker’s very intention: his book is constructed much like artistic practice, which is often messy, unresolved, and nonlinear. And indeed his approach calls into question methods of writing art histories of living artists, when artists can readily explain their own work. James Elkins, Baker notes, raises a related point in his essay, “Why Art Historians Should Learn to Paint,” since most art history is not conventionally written by practicing artists and would certainly be quite different if it was.³⁹ Elkins’s entreaty consequently informs Baker’s own art project, its photographs of roadkill paired with other views of the area, for example, a dead bird alongside a fallen, overgrown sign (*Untitled*, from *Norfolk Roadkill, Mainly*, 2009). Baker admits that his artworks have many shortcomings but importantly suggests that in creating them, he not only learned “to pay attention to what other artists do, a way to take them seriously,” but also how formal concerns intersected with, and often eclipsed, ethical ones.⁴⁰ Such a discovery not only influences the weight he gives to the artist’s voice throughout *Artist/Animal*, but also, the art-ness of the art, what Coe reminds us that her work has to be, before it can be anything.

Artist/Animal expands on the myriad of ways that artists interact with different animals—Olly and Suzi and penguins and seals, Katherine Chalmers and cockroaches, Eduardo Kac and rabbits, Mircea Cantor and peacocks, Mary Britton Clouse and chickens, Catherine Bell and squid, Sanna Kanisto and insects, and Baker’s own photographs of roadkill⁴¹—its central chapters broken up by interludes addressing issues pertinent to artmaking in general but that surface afresh when animals come into play: intentionality, ethics, visuality, and regulation. These “critical reflections,” as Baker calls them, serve as suggestive segues between the highly diverse artistic projects with animals. His often unexpected juxtapositions of artists, for example Cantor with Britton Clouse, or Chalmers with Kac—also prove highly provocative. From his comparison of Chalmers and Kac emerges problems of pace—how the paces of the animals themselves determine the pace of artistic work—that become invisible in a photograph’s frozen moment, or even through the editing of a film or video.

Towards the end of *Artist/Animal*, Baker synthesizes the material in his earlier chapters through “speculations” on place, form, and medium. Like the entirety of his

book, chapter seven presumes an audience deeply engaged in both the disciplines of contemporary art and animal studies. Here Baker considers the important question of how the animal operates within the language of art. His exploration of the “animal-object-in-art”, for example, acknowledges that the animal is an already loaded thing, that it has clout, it is different than other kinds of objects no matter the context in which it is placed. Earlier, in his discussion of Cantor’s caged peacock, he noted that, “[Animals] are *objects*, things in and of themselves: not (just) the persuasive illustration of an idea.”⁴² In doing so, he invokes, albeit indirectly, the longer history of found objects in modern and contemporary art, and how disparate elements, even when juxtaposed with others in an assemblage or collage—their layering or combination creating a new meaning—escape the confines of the composition to speak for themselves. Related to the question of the animal as object, he also speculates on the animal as medium, drawing on Rosalind Krauss’s writing on the post-medium condition of contemporary art.⁴³ Although this section is especially difficult to make sense of, it suggests an interesting way to think about how the animal may function as medium: in terms of Greenbergian reductivism where the technical properties of a medium determine an artwork’s essence; in conceptual practices (often based in photography and film or mixed media) in which medium—what Krauss calls a kind of “theoretical object”—is deployed in connection to subject matter, often as a tool of critique or deconstruction⁴⁴; or, in a self-reflexive reinventing of itself.⁴⁵ Baker proffers as an example Snæbjörnsdóttir/Wilson’s *the naming of things* (2009) that charts the taxidermy of a seal, but distances itself from conventional documentary by focusing on selected, slowed sequences. These sequences, the artists note, highlight the meeting of human hand and animal skin in such a way to “challenge . . . the consequences of the abbreviated forms [of animal and human] with which we populate our intellect and our experience” and to show how the process of “a sanitized dead body” is “moulded into a representation of itself.”⁴⁶ Snæbjörnsdóttir/Wilson’s artwork is, I believe, some of the most compelling of the present because of its combination of social engagement, research, site-specificity, and historical awareness; therefore its brief treatment here⁴⁷ returns me to one of Baker’s premises, established at the outset: that “contemporary art’s distinctive contribution to understandings of human-animal relations will be recognized only if artists’ practices—flawed and provisional as they may be—are taken seriously.”⁴⁸ But what do we need to take them seriously? Indeed *Artist/Animal* very successfully highlights the vitality of contemporary animal art that is sympathetic to animal life; it further immerses us in artists’ choices and processes. But Baker’s tendency to cast aside matters of significance, to write around ethics and other assessments of the work in question—to show how the art works, and, for the most part, to let his artists describe and reflect on their projects, often leaves me feeling unsure of why some of this art matters, how is it responsible practice, and what potential it has for the lives of animals.

Jessica Dallow is Associate Professor of Art History at the University of Alabama at Birmingham. Her research and teaching areas are American and contemporary art and

critical theory with emphases on race and gender, as well as the representation of animals in art. She received her Ph.D. from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Her current project looks at how aspects of identity are defined and contested through equine portraiture and images of equine sports in American art. Contact her here: jdallow@uab.edu

NOTES

¹ Diana Donald, *Picturing Animals in Britain, 1750-1850* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008); Ron Broglio, *Surface Encounters: Thinking with Animals in Art* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011); Giovanni Aloï, *Art and Animals* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2012).

² Donna Haraway, *When Species Meet* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007); Cary Wolfe, *What is Posthumanism?* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009).

³ Steve Baker, *Artist/Animal* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press), 18.

⁴ Stephen F. Eisenman, *The Cry of Nature* (London: Reaktion Books, 2013), 18.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 10.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 146.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 10.

⁸ Susan McHugh, "Animal Farm's Lessons for Literary (and) Animal Studies," *Humanimalia* 1, no. 1 (2009): 24.

⁹ Erica Fudge, "A Left-Handed Blow: Writing the History of Animals," in *Representing Animals*, ed. Nigel Rothfels (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002), 15-16.

¹⁰ Eisenman, *Cry of Nature*, 18.

¹¹ He examines treatises and essays by Aristotle, St. Thomas of Aquinas, René Descartes, Michel de Montaigne, Jean Jacques Rousseau, Charles Darwin, Sigmund Freud, and Jean Paul Sartre, alongside artwork and novels by Rembrandt, William Hogarth, George Stubbs, Theodore Gericault, William Blake, Thomas Bewick, J. B. S. Chardin, Charles Dickens, Gustave Caillebotte, and Sue Coe.

¹² *Ibid.*, 260.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 67.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 71.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 72.

¹⁶ Ibid., 74-78.

¹⁷ Ibid., 88-91.

¹⁸ Ibid., 164.

¹⁹ Ibid., 188-189.

²⁰ Ibid., 187-188.

²¹ Ibid., 171.

²² Ibid., 113.

²³ Fudge, "A Left-Handed Blow," 6.

²⁴ Kathleen Kete, *Beast in the Boudoir: Petkeeping in Nineteenth-Century Paris* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994).

²⁵ Donald, *Picturing Animals in Britain*; J. Keri Cronin, "'Can't You Talk?' Voice and Visual Culture in Early Animal Welfare Campaigns," *Early Popular Visual Culture* 9, no. 3 (2011): 203-223; Cronin, "'A Mute Yet Eloquent Protest': Visual Culture and Anti-Vivisection Activism in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," in *Critical Animal Studies: Thinking the Unthinkable*, ed. John Sorenson (Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press, 2014), 284-297.

²⁶ Eisenman, *Cry of Nature*, 180-181.

²⁷ Coral Lansbury, *The Old Brown Dog: Women, Workers and Vivisection in Edwardian England* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985); <http://www.animalrightshistory.org> (accessed June 25, 2014).

²⁸ Stephen J. Eisenman, *The Ghosts of Our Meat: Sue Coe*, ed. Phillip Earenfight (Carlisle, Pennsylvania: The Trout Gallery, Dickinson College, 2013); Carol J. Adams, *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory* (New York: Continuum, 1990); Lynda Birke, "The Meanings of Meat," *Society and Animals* 1 (1993): 191-207; Carol J. Adams and Josephine Donovan, ed., *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995).

²⁹ Eisenman, *Cry of Nature*, 169-171.

³⁰ Baker, *Artist/Animal*, 175.

³¹ Ibid., 230-239.

³² Ibid., 163.

³³ Ibid., 176.

³⁴ Ibid., 160.

³⁵ Ibid., 151. For Coe's original quote, see Susan Vaughn, "Staying True to a Unique Vision of Art," *Los Angeles Times*, April 1, 2001, <http://graphicwitness.org/coe>.

³⁶ Ibid., 4.

³⁷ Ibid., 41-42.

³⁸ Ibid., 62.

³⁹ James Elkins, "Why Artists Should Learn to Paint: The Case for Studio Experience," <http://www.jameselkins.com> (accessed June 23, 2014); Baker, *Artist/Animal*, 188.

⁴⁰ Baker, *Artist/Animal*, 193-195.

⁴¹ Several of the artists examined in *Artist/Animal* Baker has written about elsewhere, including Olly and Suzi, Britta Jaschinski, and Angela Singer. See *The Postmodern Animal* (London: Reaktion Books, 2000); "What Does Becoming-Animal Look Like?" in Rothfels, *Representing Animals*, 67-98; and "You Kill Things To Look At Them: Animal Death in Contemporary Art," in *Killing Animals*, Animal Studies Group (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006), 69-98.

⁴² Baker, *Artist/Animal*, 101.

⁴³ Ibid., 212-226; Rosalind Krauss, *A Voyage on the North Sea: Art in the Age of the Post-Medium Condition* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1999).

⁴⁴ Rosalind Krauss, "Reinventing the Medium," *Critical Inquiry* 25, no. 2 (Winter 1999): 294. Also see Toni Ross, "Art in the 'Post-Medium' Era: Aesthetics and Conceptualism in the Art of Jeff Wall," *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 101, no. 3 (Summer 2002): 556.

⁴⁵ Andrew McNamara, "Apprehension? Performativity and Medium-Specificity in Modern Art," *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 101, no. 3 (Summer 2002): 483-484, 492-493.

⁴⁶ Baker, *Artist/Animal*, 217, 226.

⁴⁷ For another discussion between Baker and these artists, see "Bryndís Snæbjörnsdóttir and Mark Wilson in Conversation with Steve Baker and Ross Birell," *Art and Research: A Journal of Ideas, Contexts and Methods* 1, no. 2 (Summer 2007), <http://www.artandresearch.org.uk> (accessed June 23, 2014).

⁴⁸ Baker, *Artist/Animal*, 3.