

Reiss, M. J. (2007). Representing the world: Difference and science education. M. Reiss, R. J. DelPalma, & E. Atkinson (Eds.), *Marginality and difference in education and beyond* (pp. 61–72). Stoke-on-Trent, UK: Trenham.

Reiss, M. J. (2014). Sex education and science education in faith-based schools. J. D. Chapman, S. McNamara, M. J. Reiss, & Y. Wajsbid (Eds.), *International handbook of learning, teaching and leading in faith-based schools* (pp. 261–272). Dordrecht: Springer.

Reiss, M. J., & Mabud, S. A. (Eds.). (1998). *Sex education and religion*. Cambridge: The Islamic Academy.

Reiss, M. J., & White, J. (2013). *An aims-based curriculum: The significance of flourishing for schools*. London: IOE Press.

Ringrose, J. (2013). *Postfeminist education? Girls and the sexual politics of schools*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Roberts, C. (2002). "A matter of embodied fact": Sex hormones and the history of bodies. *Feminist Theory*, 3, 7–26.

Scholer, A.-M. (2002). Sexuality in the science classroom: One teacher's method for a college biology course. *Sex Education*, 2, 75–86.

Schütlenk, U., & Brooker, R. A. (1998). Biomedical research on sexual orientation: Researchers taking our chances in homophobic societies. *Journal of the Gay, Lesbian Medical Association*, 2(2), 79–84.

Sex Education Forum. (2011). *Parents and SRE: A sex education forum evidence briefing*. London: National Children's Bureau. Retrievable from http://www.ncb.org.uk/media/333401/parents___sre.pdf

Smerecnik, C., Schaalma, H., Geijo, K., Meijer, S., & Poelman, J. (2010). An exploratory study of Muslim adolescents' views on sexuality: Implications for sex education and prevention. *BMC Public Health*, 10, 533.

Solomon, J. (Ed.). (2003). *The passion to learn: An inquiry into autodidacticism*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Stephenson, J. M., Strange, V., Forrest, S., Oakley, A., Copus, A., Allen, J., et al. (2004). Pupil-led sex education in England (RIIPPE study): Cluster randomised intervention trial. *The Lancet*, 364(9431), 338–346.

Thomson, R. (Ed.). (1993). *Religion, ethnicity & sex education: Exploring the resource for teachers and others working with young people*. London: National Children's Bureau.

Critical Animal Pedagogies: Re-learning Our Relations with Animal Others

Karin Gunnarsson Dinker and Helena Pedersen

Learning How to Eat and Read Differently: A Theoretical Basis for Critical Animal Pedagogies

Our relations with animals permeate human social life, culture and education. These relations are asymmetrically imbued with power. Although not always explicitly acknowledged, animals are displayed, classified and represented, as well as confined, manipulated, consumed and killed; in a multitude of forms in education, and in other sectors of society. Asymmetric power relations, through which students are implicitly or explicitly taught to utilize, dominate or control other species, permeate not only the use of animals as dissection "specimens" in school laboratories or as food served in the school canteen, but also non-invasive human-animal pedagogical situations such as animal-assisted interventions (AAI), some versions of outdoor education, study visits to zoos and farms, and so on. These situations communicate messages of animals' instrumental position in human society and their endless accessibility for human purposes (Pedersen, 2010), often under the guise of

K. G. Dinker (✉)

Department of Geography, Swansea University, Swansea, UK
e-mail: karin_gunnarsson@hotmail.com

H. Pedersen

Department of Child and Youth Studies, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden
e-mail: Helena.Pedersen@hsv.se

harmonious interspecies coexistence. As will be made clear throughout the chapter, we view such messages as deeply problematic and counter-productive to *any* liberatory educational project. How, then, should we teach and learn about animals, and what is the appropriate place of animals in education? Is there an alternative education; a critical animal pedagogy that opens other knowledges of human–animal relations? Put differently, what does education become when humans are not regarded as the only subjects?

This chapter argues that the emerging scholarly discussion on animal education (e.g., Cole & Stewart, 2014; MacCormack, 2013; Miller, 2011; Pedersen, 2011; Rice, 2013; Rowe, 2011; Snaza, 2013; Wallin, 2014) needs to be interwoven with pedagogical practice. What we propose is a wide spectrum of pedagogical possibilities across ages and subject areas, including the *invasive and non-interventionist* critical animal pedagogies as a response to conventional anthropocentric education. Emphasised throughout our chapter is a critique of educational speciesism embedded in a wider pattern of marginalisation and oppression of any “other” (human or animal).

In her beautiful and remarkable essay, *Gracious Pedagogy*, Patricia MacCormack (2013) outlines the contours of a non-anthropocentric pedagogical education. Drawing on Lyotard and Serres, she configures pedagogy and the will to learn as acts of war that animals can neither win nor participate in. Addressing an animal that has been endlessly silenced, classified, used, abused and parasitised on by education, MacCormack asks pedagogy to leave “the animal” alone. In any claims humans make about animals are bound to impose anthropocentric narratives and evaluations onto them. We use the animals continuously, but the parasitic relationship is not reciprocal: animals don’t need us, except as the result of our domestication of them or of our destruction of their habitat.

As the new focus of teaching and learning, MacCormack proposes that the unmaking of “man,” subjectivity, humanism, anthropocentrism and authoritarian desire to know that is embedded in all these notions of anthropocentric thought, MacCormack argues, can only come from *learning alone*: To create an alternative education that frees ourselves and animals from the destruction we wreak on their world, we need to take an epistemological and pedagogical step aside, stop intervening in animal life and exchange pedagogical desire to know the animal for a pedagogical practice of *unmaking the human*; unthinking our parasitic selves.

MacCormack’s “hands-off” approach to animal pedagogies echoes other recent writings in critical animal studies (Pedersen & Stanescu, 2013; Sorenson, 2014) as well as a long tradition of abolitionist animal theory and social movements, and serves as a philosophical and visionary underpinning of the present chapter. With our chapter, we distance ourselves from certain emerging tendencies in posthumanist and new materialist education which

ship that emphasise and promote “mutual entanglements” between children and animals as a new and celebrated approach to learning about the more-than-human world as well as a challenge to the human/animal divide in education. We argue that these approaches to interspecies education theory and practice gloss over asymmetric human–animal power relations. We read them as new euphemistic instantiations of human narcissism and desire for knowledge and meaning-making, rather than formations of genuinely ethical relations. Instead, we share MacCormack’s (2013) claim that critical animal pedagogies must be guided by abolitionist imperatives for the purpose of teaching and learning respectful non-intervention in animal life. From this, it would follow that the proper teaching and learning object in critical animal pedagogies is *the human*, and human behaviour towards animals, rather than the animal herself (who has, indeed, been studied enough; Pedersen & Stanescu, 2014).

We view, however, a pedagogy of “unthinking the human” as a multifaceted process that does not *a priori* rule out the possibility of ethical encounters with animals or intersubjectivity in human–animal relationships, although always accompanied by critical inquiry into knowledge production about animals, always attentive to the animal perspective, and with the cessation of invasive human interaction with animals as an ultimate vision. A process of unthinking the human is, as we shall see in for instance our outline of vegan education below, a process of breaking with pedagogical and societal convention, thinking outside the box and beyond the mainstream. While this means immersion in a different kind of *eating*, it may also, as Nathan Snaza (2013) suggests, be a process of immersion in a different kind of *reading*.

Rather than read texts to learn what it means to be human, we [teachers and students] can read in order to grapple with how the very idea of “the human” has led us to misrecognize ourselves and our relations to the world. (Snaza, 2013, p. 50)

Unthinking the human in critical animal pedagogies requires a re-formulation of the educational “texts” (Gordon, 1988) about humans and animals as well as concerted, collaborative critique and re-invention of a range of situated pedagogical practices; a few of which we begin to address in this chapter.

The Place of Animals and Affect in Education

Since the beginning of the Humane Education movement (Unri & DeRosa, 2003), animals have been used in educational settings to teach children care and compassion and, presumably, enhance children’s social, cognitive or emotional development. Paralleling these somewhat utopian ideas of the role

and potential of affect in human–animal pedagogies, there are more critical accounts of science education in particular as oriented towards emotional desensitisation in students. According to these studies, students are expected to acquire the abilities and the mindsets considered necessary for “proper” socialisation into a scientific profession by performing experiments on animal or human bodies (Arluke & Haffery, 1996; Boddice, 2012; Solor & Arluke, 1997). Arluke and Haffery (1996) describe how medical school students coped with the “dog lab,” where anaesthetised dogs are injected with drugs, surgically manipulated and subsequently killed, by denying their own responsibility for these acts. This guilt-denial is part of a socialisation process in science education that begins at a younger age: Solor and Arluke (1997) have shown how middle school children during an animal dissection class gradually learned to transform the exercise into a positive experience, despite initial feelings of ethical and emotional unease.

In this chapter we take the position that the connections between pedagogy, affect and animals above are not sufficient for the development of critical animal pedagogies. Instead, we argue for an alternative education where students at all levels across the curriculum are invited to explore *both* a critical analytical *and* a radically transformative approach to animals and affect in education. In a critical analytic approach, students explore the societal norms, discourses and institutions—the institution of education itself included—that organise our affective responses towards animals in ways that seek to increase and capitalise on our willingness to consume animal bodies rather than develop an ethical relationship with them, thus reducing human–animal relations to different modes of production and consumption. This approach involves critically engaging with the ways that meat, dairy and other animal industries work on consumers’ affective responses through creative marketing campaigns utilising emotionally charged animal imagery. These marketing efforts are not limited to imagery and representation, but also extend to situated *edutainment* experiences, such as the so-called “pasture releases” at Swedish dairy farms, especially targeted at families and schoolchildren, when the public is invited to witness the yearly release of the cows from confined conditions in the barn to a period of summer grazing (Linné & Pedersen, 2016). In critical animal pedagogies, students are invited to scrutinize the actual life situation of animals in the food production system, compare this to the messages communicated by the animal industries, analyse how emotions are employed to maximise the force of these messages and reflect on their own emotional responses.

Critical animal pedagogies use critical analysis as a springboard for creating conditions for an alternative affective human–animal education. The approach begins with opening the possibility of an intersubjective, I–Thou

relationship with animals (Sjögren, 2014), realising that they are beings at the same time similar to and different from us, with a life situation that matters to them and with their own interests, experiences, fears, joys and desires.

In practice, critical animal pedagogies involve both a critical-analytic and an affirmative-transformative approach to animals and affect, often in an intertwined fashion, but while always being clear about the purpose(s) of these activities—such as breaking the silences normally surrounding the situation of animals in human society. Depending on the age and education level of students, they may be engaged in activities such as:

- Investigating students’ own emotional encounter or relation with an animal (wild or domesticated) and the implications of this encounter (for this particular animal individual, for this animal species and for animals in general).
- Reflecting on and sharing ethnological insights about animals’ own feelings towards species kin, their environments, as well as towards humans they encounter (e.g., Balcombe, 2006; Bekoff, 2002). How does an animal experience being hunted, slaughtered, separated from her mother, forcibly inseminated, castrated, held in captivity, being a pet, forced to perform or participate in competitions, or being experimented upon? What does an animal need to enjoy life? Is an animal’s life enhanced or impeded by human interference?
- Critical discourse analysis of a range of animal-related education materials (science textbooks as well as animal industry marketing materials), investigating what kind of emotional responses they produce and for what purposes.
- Study visits to farms as well as animal shelters and sanctuaries, interviewing managers and employees/volunteers at these sites about their emotions for their animals and how they feel about their confinement and killing.
- Watching and discussing film documentaries from slaughterhouses and other sites of animal abuse, as well as documentaries from animal shelters and animal rescue operations, exploring the different emotional responses they invoke (in both humans and animals).
- Discussing why we mourn the death of some animals and not others (cf. Sjögren, 2014), how power relations work through these selective mourning rituals and how this affects the situation of animals themselves when still alive.
- Critically examining any anthropocentric bias of all the above.

The important point is for students to realise that humans are not the only beings with emotional experiences and emotional lives, discover that emotion

towards animals can be deepened and expanded and reflect on how students can act more honestly and congruently with their own emotions (as well as the emotions of animals) (cf. Andrzejewski, Pedersen, & Wicklund, 2009). This implies a significant pedagogical shift of perspective, guided by imperatives beyond mere instrumental curiosity, or will to know: a shift from learning *about* animals, to learning *with, from, and for* them.

Species-Inclusive Intersectionality Education

Species—much like race, gender, sexuality, ability and so forth—is a category of difference that is also a marker of privilege and power (Rowe, 2011). *Speciesism* is a notion with many definitions. Andrzejewski, Pedersen and Wicklund (2009) define speciesism as “the presumption of human superiority over other animals and their subjection to oppression based on this belief” (p. 140). Sanbonmatsu (2011) understands speciesism not as ignorance or the absence of a moral code towards animals, but as a mode of production and a material system imbricated with capitalism. As a key dimension of critical animal pedagogies, species-inclusive intersectionality education means to explore the multiple ways in which speciesism intersects with other social justice issues such as racism, sexism, heterosexism and ableism (e.g., Adams, 1990; Nilbert, 2002; Spiegel, 1996). However, despite its significant pedagogical potential, the idea of unpacking the shared logics and operations of various forms of oppression and ideologies, embedded in intersectionality education is also a deep irony: the critique of speciesism seems to require validation and support by appealing to other, anthropocentric social justice causes that target the liberation of *humans*. This brings us back to MacCormack’s (2013) call for *a pedagogy that unlinks the human* as outlined in the introduction of this chapter. Despite these paradoxes, we believe that the development of a critical intersectional literacy in education is a necessary place to begin. Andrzejewski (2003), Selby (1999, 2000), Kahn & Humes (2009), and Andrzejewski, Pedersen, and Wicklund (2009) have all sketched frameworks for species-inclusive intersectionality education. Importantly, any such approach must acknowledge the inherent political dimension of human–animal relations and the urgency of working against all forms of oppression and commodification (Kahn & Humes, 2009).

We propose that species-inclusive intersectionality education should be approached as a process unfolding through several steps and phases of critical exploration. Issues to be explored may include how ideas of a united “humanity” have failed to live up to their own criteria of value pluralism, justice, tolerance, and equity for all, how colonialism, (hetero)sexism and other forms of elitism have relied on assumptions of a particular ideal type of “human

creating arbitrary and exclusionary boundaries around whom is to be ascribed the status and privilege of subjecthood; and how oppressive practices towards certain categories of humans have historically paralleled oppressive practices towards animals.

As a knowledge base for species-inclusive intersectionality education, we propose the analysis of *the discourse of species and the institution of speciesism* as elaborated on by Wolfe (2003) and how these two phenomena—the symbolic system of language and meaning-making about animals, and the organised material practices of exploiting animal bodies and labour in a range of societal sectors—feed into each other as well as into constructions of “otherness” more generally. According to Wolfe, the animal possesses specificity as the object of both discursive and institutional practices, and this specificity gives the animal a particularly durable position in relation to other discourses of otherness. On the other hand, Wolfe argues, the discourse of speciesism is dynamic as it may rub off on *any* social other, resulting in an animalising/de-humanising of certain categories of people in, for instance, contexts of ethnic cleansing or genocide—a strategy that, of course, draws its force from the low status animals are generally ascribed in human society. The task of critical animal pedagogues must be to explore the root causes of these strategies, scrutinise their flawed assumptions and their disastrous effects on *both* animals and humans and combat them all *in their own right*. We suggest the following teaching and learning activities to approach intersectionality education:

- Studying different traditions (cultural, spiritual and religious), justifications and assumptions of animal and human exploitation. Identifying, reading and discussing texts that deal with “how the very idea of ‘the human’ has led us to misrecognize ourselves and our relations to the world” (Shauza, 2013, p. 50). Speculative fiction by Ursula LeGuin (1987) and Margaret Atwood (2003) could be used for exploring these issues.
- Investigating consequences of animal exploitation (farming, hunting, entertainment, experimentation, companionship) for both humans and animals. Tracing the impacts of individual animal-derived products by using an ethical consumer guide (e.g., <http://www.ethicalconsumer.org>).
- Comparing the histories of social justice movements for animal and human liberation (e.g., Adams, 1990; Nilbert, 2002; Spiegel, 1996). How have these movements converged? Sketching on a future scenario where both have been attained.

Studying the use of language perpetuating “easygoing speciesism” (Yates, 2004), that is, claims about the rightful place and legitimate use of animals, for example “the cow in the farm gives us meat” which glosses over both the fact that we have confined her on a farm and that we take her meat using

violence (for more examples, see <http://www.facebook.com/On-Human-Nonhuman-Relations-108169049262009/>). Discussing also the consequences for humans and animals of ascribing certain animal epithets such as “pig” or “chicken” to humans in a denigrating way, and the habit of referring to animals with “it.”

- For the younger ages, The Institute for Humane Education provides intersectionality-oriented materials such as media literacy online exercises (Mulkani, 2013; Rakestraw, 2013).

The Animal–Industrial Complex in Education

The animal–industrial complex is a term coined by Noske (1997), denoting a system sustained and maintained by the economically and politically powerful animal agribusiness and its networks, intersecting with the pharmaceutical, entertainment and prison-industrial complexes where animals are experimented upon, tamed, maimed or used therapeutically (Twine, 2012). The animal–industrial complex, built on the production and slaughter of animals, can be seen as the very materialisation of the institution of speciesism (Wolfe, 2003), where speciesism literally becomes “a mode of production” (Sanbonmatsu, 2011). Studying the *system*, rather than just its constituent parts, can help educators and students explore human–animal relations beyond individual consumers and farmers, grasp the wider phenomenon of speciesism and clarify the animal industry’s role in a globalised world. This requires that, in contrast to the superficiality of standardised learning, authentic critical and deep reflection is allowed and encouraged in the classroom. The animal industry is also an integrated part of the institutions of education. Many higher education institutions educate students for, and in collaboration with, agri- and pharmaceutical businesses, with courses such as animal meat, dairy and poultry sciences (Rowe, 2012). The industry also heavily targets compulsory schools directly through materials such as films, books, visits to farms with free food samples (Linné & Pedersen, 2016), products in the school canteen, advertising, vending machines, sponsorships and curriculum programmes (Rowe, 2013).

Because of the industry’s strong presence in education and the deliberate hiding of its exploitative practices, we argue, along with Rowe, that it is the obligation of educational institutions to unveil these, “even if it is culturally taboo to do so” (Rowe, 2012, p. 160). Animal production of any kind is rooted in speciesism and reinforces the instrumental position of animals in human society and when silenced or euphemized, it reinforces the reduction

of animals to economic resources. Therefore we argue that critical animal pedagogies must equally question small-scale or organic production of animals and animal products. The image of the small-scale, organic farm is actually heavily used to greenwash the animal industry (Pedersen & Stanescu, 2014). The pastoral images of the traditional family farm used in the animal industries’ marketing strategies are also conveyed through children’s literature and film. Embedded in childhood, these images are very powerful (Yates, 2013) and gloss over the reality of confinement, deprivation, separations, mutilations and slaughter that also so-called “organic” animals endure.

Children’s literature, film and culture in general convey speciesist messages that reinforce and maintain the otherness of farmed animals, this even in relation to other categories of animals such as wild animals and pets. Stewart and Cole (2009) identify the most common of these messages: (1) Farmed animals are replaceable commodities (or just absent), objects to which we should not attribute individual characteristics; (2) In order to become a mature adult a child must lose empathy for [farmed] animals; (3) Animals are defined based on their relative utility to humans (and may, occasionally, be spared if they attain human-like qualities); and (4) Humans are at the top of the food chain, and eating animals “lower” than us is part of the circle of life.

Nowatzki (2013) points out another dimension of animal farming usually omitted or obscured in children’s media: the gigantic scale of animal production. The focus on individual animals effectively masks the fact that breeding and slaughtering operations in real life are on a massive scale. The following exercises may be used to introduce students to the animal–industrial complex:

- Showing children where food comes from is often emphasised in educational situations, and we propose this is done without the euphemistic aura often permeating such activities. For this purpose, stories and films from slaughterhouses may be used as a starting point.
- Using educational materials depicting “the happy family farm,” for instance the European Commission’s website Farnland (<http://www.farnland-thegame.eu/>), as an exercise in critical media literacy.
- Identifying messages that justify our use of animals communicated through more benign children’s films such as *Babe* and *Chicken Run*—films that may appear critical of animal exploitation, but have actually been used to promote meat-based “Happy Meals.” Stewart and Cole (2009) can be used to guide the discussion.
- For the youngest children, Ruby Roth’s book *That’s why we don’t eat animals* (2009) can be a suitable entrance point. Although the book has an animal rights perspective, Nowatzki (2013) suggests a critical reading and

shift of focus towards justice (to stop breeding animals) rather than love for animals (which entails continuing to keep them). Roth also problematizes the employed appeal to human sympathy through pointing out human animal similarities: What happens to other animals who do not display those similarities?

- For slightly older children animated films such as *Backwards Hamburg* (Free Range Studios, 2007) can be appealing yet critical entries into the animal–industrial complex. (For more suggestions on age-appropriate educational material about the food production system, see Rice, 2013).
- Visits to farms and slaughterhouses employing a critical lens. Animal sanctuaries may be visited as an alternative, or as a critical complement. Sanctuaries may provide valuable internships and project opportunities.
- Mapping your school's own place in the animal–industrial complex. Interview the Head of school regarding where the school's food comes from, and what other involvements (pedagogical or financial) the school has with the animal industry.
- Following an animal individual in the food production system from inception to slaughter, through all phases of breeding, mutilating, genetic altering, transportation and commodification through the method of Life Cycle Assessment (LCA). (LCA, normally used in environmental systems analysis, would here be used to make an individual animal visible for educational purposes.)
- Comparing the history of the animal industry with other industries and exploring how these complexes intersect today (Best, Kahn, Nocella & McLaren, 2011; Twine, 2012). Understanding how capitalism and the maximisation of profits lie behind the exploitation of both human and animal is a crucial component of this exercise (Andrzejewski, 2003).
- Comparing the industry's own story of their production system with that of animal rights organisations, and looking into the numbers of animals slaughtered daily, monthly and annually, both nationally and globally.

Liberating education from the grips of the animal–industrial complex is a huge task. As an alternative form of education, homeschooling may provide an opportunity to choose educational material and venues with an animal perspective and exclude animal oppressive practices (see blogs and websites such as veg.homeschool.com and www.dollifright.com). Homeschooling, as a potentially liberatory experience in itself, can allow people to think otherwise, for example open people's minds to new perspectives on their place in the "food chain" (Lewellyn, 2014), and facilitate taking the perspective of the animal (Lewellyn, 2014). However, along with Fielding and Moss (2011) we believe that common school

can, and should, hold emancipatory and radical potential: Revisioning and reimagining our relations with fellow humans, animals and the world should be a fundamental feature of any education that "rejects the docile and passive consumption of mainstream culture" (Rowe, 2011, p. 16).

Vegan Education

Veganism, as the previous section makes clear, is more than "just a diet" and is better seen and practised as a systemic and intersectional mode of critical analysis and a useful lived philosophy countering anthropocentrism, hierarchy and violence. Vegan education challenges meat normativity, which refers to the institutions, structures, relations and acts upholding the norm of production and consumption of animals, especially as everyday "meat" (Gillmark, 2005).

Through the socialisation process, the school plays an important role in establishing norms dictated by society at large. We see vegan education as creating conditions for learning a different kind of eating: a learning taking place within the larger framework of a different kind of *reading* (cf. Snaza, 2013), broadly conceived as a re-interpretation of how we view the world and our own place in it (see Salth, 2014, for an illuminating discussion on the shifts in perception, and the different ways of "knowing" involved in a transition to a vegan way of life).

What is consumed in the educational setting is an integrated part of education. Serving animal products in school makes critical inquiry into our exploitative relation to animals difficult, if not impossible (cf. Rice, 2013; Rowe, 2011, 2013). Veganism, in this sense, can be regarded as the baseline in critical animal pedagogues and a productive entrance point into MacCormack's (2013) pedagogical challenge of unthinking the human.

There is an emerging process of veganising education: The planned Solutionary School in New York will promote veganism as one of the solutions to our environmental and societal crisis (humaneeducation.org/solutionary-school/), and the Muse school (museschool.org) in California is turning its menu fully vegan, though primarily on environmental grounds. We suggest that the following areas be covered in vegan education:

1. Vegan culinary skills and nutrition.
2. Growing vegetables, fruits, grains and legumes. Vegan permaculture.
3. Exploring and discussing food choices. Sharing vegan meals and recipes in class can be a positive way of doing this (Andrzejewski, 2003), as food

choices are deeply embedded habits that contribute to our identity formation and our desire to be part of society at large.

- Theoretically and practically investigating vegan consumption in other areas than diet, for example, non-exploitative clothing materials and household products that have not been tested on animals. Visiting vegan fairs and events for more inspiration.
- Exploring the meaning and the consequences of veganism for human animals and the environment (see Andrzejewski, 2003). Developing knowledge of what veganism may imply in one's own area of interest and presenting future scenarios.
- Vegan culture events such as theatre, literature, films, happenings, music and festivals play an important role in breaking with convention and thinking outside the box and beyond the mainstream. For young children, try *Garden-Beet-Spinach-Mango-Carrot-Grapefruit Juice* (VanBalen, 2010), *Vegan is Love* (Roth, 2012) or *Vis for Vegan* (Roth, 2013).

Introducing a vegan knowledge base in school shows students that veganism is a viable option and a possible future. It can also help inspire critical action. In response to learning about the animal–industrial complex and the exploitation of animals, it is liberating to learn that it is possible to contribute to change. We suggest that pedagogical focus should be directed towards these liberating aspects. The role of vegan education is to bridge the gap between theory and practice in learning *with, from* and *for* animals by not only facilitating another kind of reading but indeed a different kind of eating.

Critical Animal Pedagogies and Social Change: A Conclusion

This chapter is, in a certain sense, a paradox. It is a chapter on animal education that argues for the *absence* (liberation) of animals in education. At the end, an absolute cessation of invasive human interaction with animals (MacCormack, 2013), as a result of unthinking the human. Unthinking and unmaking the human as a pedagogical, political and emancipatory project does not only aim towards developing particular didactic teaching methods, courses or elements of interspecies (non-)relations to be integrated in school and university curricula. It may, although not primarily, delineate a “alternative” education within the framework of the pedagogical present, what already “is.” Rather, it asks educators to explore *how education itself* is

change with the respectful leaving alone of animal life (MacCormack, 2013). In a society that has materially been built on the exploitation of animal bodies and labour, and where the institution of education is deeply conflated and integrated with the larger societal institution of speciesism, this is clearly a revolutionary project. However, it is in essence a *passive* revolution: it simply asks us to leave alone, to exercise non-intervention, to *not* consume, in short, to refuse our anthropocentric species privilege of using other animals for our own benefit. In a capitalist, consumer-oriented society, this request is indeed a radical one. From education, it asks a profound and urgent re-thinking, re-learning and re-invention of how (not) to live together with other species. It asks education to create a paradoxical, but urgent, safe space for animals, beyond the reach of human interference and beyond the reach of education itself.

We suggest that this task creates three main objectives for critical animal pedagogies, derived from the outlines of affect, intersectionality, the animal–industrial complex and vegan education above:

- To deconstruct received knowledge, norms and ideas of human–animal relations (a critical-analytic approach);
- To show, and encourage, alternative ways of relating to animals (including non-intervention whenever appropriate)—i.e.: to explore how to *eat* and how to *read* differently (a radically transformative approach);
- To keep a respectful distance (MacCormack, 2013) with regard to the integrity of animal life and not by default take human self-interest as a point of departure (a merged critical-analytic and radically transformative approach).

By creating a thousand tiny spaces for animal perspectives in school, education will, in the long term, not only contribute to the liberation of animals from harmful human interference in their lives, but also liberate *itself* from destructive practices and regimes based on speciesism as a category of difference and a mode of production.

In our introduction, we posed the question “What does education become when humans are not regarded as the only subjects?” Although this question will remain open, our key point is, as delineated throughout this chapter, that education can—and we argue that it also *should*—become something *else* than a mere reflection of, reproducer of, and reduction to, speciesist (sexist, racist, classist, ableist) society at large. Education can become a space for unthinking the human, ourselves and our relations to the world.

References

- Adams, C. J. (1990). *The sexual politics of meat: A feminist-vegetarian critical theory*. New York: Continuum.
- Andrzejewski, J. (2003). Teaching animal rights at the university: Philosophy and practice. *Animal Liberation Philosophy and Policy Journal*, 1(1), 16–34.
- Andrzejewski, J., Pedersen, H., & Wicklund, F. (2009). Interspecies education for humans, animals, and the earth. In J. Andrzejewski, M. P. Balthodano, & L. Symons (Eds.), *Social justice, peace, and environmental education: Transformative standards* (pp. 136–154). New York: Routledge.
- Arluke, A., & Haffery, F. (1996). From apprehension to fascination with “Dog Lab”: The use of absolutions by medical students. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 25, 201–225.
- Arwood, M. (2003). *Oryx and Crane*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
- Balcombe, J. (2006). *Pleasurable kingdom: Animals and the nature of feeling good*. New York: Macmillan.
- Bekoff, M. (2002). *Minding animals: Awareness, emotions, and heart*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Best, S., Kahn, R., Nocella, A. J., II, & McLaren, P. (Eds.). (2011). *The global industrial complex: Systems of domination*. Plymouth, UK: Lexington Books.
- Boddie, R. (2012). Species of compassion: Aesthetics, anaesthetics, and pain in the physiological laboratory. 19. *Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century* (15), 1–22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.16995/nm.628>
- Cole, M., & Stewart, K. (2014). *Our children and other animals: The cultural construction of human-animal relations in childhood*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Fielding, M., & Moss, P. (2011). *Radical education and the common school: A democratic alternative*. London: Routledge.
- Free Range Studios. (2007). *Backwards Hamburger* [Motion Picture]. Beverly Hills, CA: Participant Media.
- Gälmarm, L. (2005). *Skönheter och odjur: En feministisk kritik av djur-människa relationen*. Gothenburg, Sweden: Makadam.
- Gordon, D. (1988). Education as text: The varieties of educational hidden curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 18, 425–449.
- Kahn, R., & Humes, B. (2009). Marching out from Ultima Thule: Critical pedagogies of emancipatory educators working at the intersection of human rights, animal rights, and planetary sustainability. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 14, 179–195.
- Lees, H. (2014). *Education without schools: Discovering alternatives*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- LeGuin, U. K. (1987). *Buffalo gals and other animal presences*. Marple: Penguin.
- Linné, T., & Pedersen, H. (2016). With care for cows and a love for milk: Affect and performance in dairy industry communication strategies. In A. Potts (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on meat culture*. Leiden: Brill.
- Llewellyn, G. (1998). *The teenage liberation handbook: How to quit school and get a real education*. Eugene, OR: Oryx Publication House.
- MacCormack, P. (2013). Gracious pedagogy. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 10(1), 13–17.
- Miller, A. (2015). Losing animals: Ethics and care in a pedagogy of recovery. In N. Saza & J. A. Weaver (Eds.), *Posthumanism and educational research* (pp. 104–118). New York: Routledge.
- Mulkani, L. (2013). *Picturing oppression*. Retrieved from <http://humaneeducation.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/PictOpp2013.pdf>
- Nibert, D. (2002). *Animal rights/human rights: Entanglements of oppression and liberation*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Noske, B. (1997). *Beyond boundaries: Humans and animals*. Montreal: Blackrose Books.
- Nowatzki, A. (2013). Vegan parenting: Navigating and negating speciesist media. In K. Socha & S. Blum (Eds.), *Confronting animal exploitation: Grassroots essays on liberation and veganism* (pp. 89–111). Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Pedersen, H. (2010). *Animals in schools: Processes and strategies in human-animal education*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.
- Pedersen, H. (2011). Animals and education research: Enclosures and openings. In P. Segerdahl (Ed.), *Undisciplined animals: Invitations to animal studies* (pp. 11–26). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Pedersen, H., & Stanescu, V. (2014). Conclusion: Future directions for critical animal studies. In N. Taylor & R. Twine (Eds.), *The rise of critical animal studies: From the margins to the centre* (pp. 262–276). London: Routledge.
- Palkestraw, M. (2013). *Don't tread on me: Exploring oppression*. Retrieved from <http://humaneeducation.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/DontTreadonMe2013.pdf>
- Pike, S. (2013). Three educational problems: The case of eating animals. *Journal of Thought*, 48(2), 112–126.
- Roith, R. (2009). *That's why we don't eat animals*. Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books.
- Roith, R. (2012). *Vegan is love*. Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books.
- Roith, R. (2013). *Vis for vegan*. Berkeley, CA: North Atlantic Books.
- Howe, B. D. (2011). Understanding animals-becoming-meat: Embracing a disturbing education. *Critical Education*, 2(7). Retrieved from <http://ices.library.ubc.ca/index.php/critical/article/view/182311>
- Howe, B. D. (2012). *Consuming animals as an educational act*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ohio University EDU Policy and Leadership, Columbus, OH.
- Howe, B. D. (2013). It IS about chicken: Chick-fil-A, posthumanist intersectionality, and gastro-aesthetic pedagogy. *Journal of Thought*, 48(2), 89–111.
- Salhi, S. (2014). Vegans on the verge of a nervous breakdown. In N. Taylor & R. Twine (Eds.), *The rise of critical animal studies: From the margins to the centre* (pp. 52–68). London: Routledge.

- Sanbonmatsu, J. (Ed.). (2011). *Critical theory and animal liberation*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Selby, D. (1995). *Earthkind: A teachers' handbook on humane education*. Stoke-on-Trent, UK: Trentham Books.
- Selby, D. (2000). Humane education: Widening the circle of compassion and justice. In T. Goldstein & D. Selby (Eds.), *Weaving connections: Educating for peace, social and environmental justice* (pp. 268–296). Toronto, ON: Sumach Press.
- Sjögren, H. (2014). Den politisk-etiska potentialen hos djur-människokorrelationer i läroplanens samtal om hållbar utveckling. *Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige*, 19(2–3), 90–109.
- Snaza, N. (2013). Bewildering education. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*, 10(1), 38–54.
- Solot, D., & Arluke, A. (1997). Learning the scientist's role: Animal dissection in middle school. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 26(1), 28–54.
- Sorenson, J. (Ed.). (2014). *Critical animal studies: Thinking the unthinkable*. Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Spiegel, M. (1996). *The dredded comparison: Human and animal slavery*. New York: Mirror Books.
- Stewart, K., & Cole, M. (2009). The conceptual separation of food and animal in childhood. *Food, Culture and Society: An International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 12, 457–476.
- Twine, R. (2012). Revealing the “animal-industrial complex”—A concept & method for critical animal studies? *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, 10(1), 15–32.
- Uri, B., & DeRosa, B. (2003). Humane education. Past, present, and future. In D. J. Salem & A. N. Rowan (Eds.), *State of the animals II* (pp. 27–50). Washington, DC: Humane Society Press.
- VanBalen, N. (2010). *Garlic-Onion-Beet-Spinach-Mango-Carrot-Grapefruit Juice*. Nashville, TN: Thora Thinks Press.
- Wallin, J. (2014). Dark pedagogy. In P. MacCormack (Ed.), *The animal studies towards abuman theory* (pp. 145–162). London: Bloomsbury.
- Wolfe, C. (2003). *Animal rites: American culture, the discourse of species, and posthumanist theory*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Yates, R. (2004). *The social construction of human beings and other animals in human-nonhuman relations*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wales, Bangor, UK.
- Yates, R. (2013). *Growing up as animal harming animal lovers: Sociology and animal studies* [Video presentation]. Retrieved from <http://veganinformationproject.org/growing-up-as-animal-harming-animal-lovers-sociology-and-animal-use/>

28

Solitude and Spirituality in Schooling: The Alternative at the Heart of the School

Julian Stern

Introduction

Educational alternatives are often based on fact that most learning takes place before, after and beyond schooling. This chapter recognises that, but focuses on exploring the world before, after and beyond schools from *within* schools. Three overlapping sets of alternatives are presented here: schools themselves, school-based spirituality, and solitude. Here is an illustration:

A group of 13–14 year-olds are rehearsing for a debate in the form of a legal trial. One group asks to practice outside the classroom, and the teacher notices a girl—to be the prosecution lawyer—choosing to work on her own. She was silent, but was gesturing. On returning, the teacher asks why she worked in this way: “There was talk back from the witnesses when I did it on my own,” and “it’s easier to hear what’s right and wrong,” she said. Anyway, “I like hearing the arguments in my head” and “it’s actually exciting.” She concluded, “I will go back to my team knowing more.” (Personal communication between P. Ward and the author in 2015)

In solitude, in silence, this young person finds a space for lively many-voiced dialogue, for learning, for knowledge, for engagement. She has found a rich alternative to the typically busy and intensely social life of the school.

Julian Stern (ed.)

Faculty of Education and Theology, York St John University, York, UK
e-mail: j.stern@yorksj.ac.uk