

Members only? A posthuman view of otherthanhuman-animal immigrants across human-defined borders

SARAH OXLEY HEANEY

Exeter Anthrozoology as Symbiotic Ethics (EASE) Working Group
University of Exeter, Devon, United Kingdom
sh750@exeter.ac.uk

KRISTINE HILL

Exeter Anthrozoology as Symbiotic Ethics (EASE) Working Group
University of Exeter, Devon, United Kingdom
kh458@exeter.ac.uk

MICHELLE SZYDLOWSKI

Beacon College, Anthrozoology, Florida, USA
info@internationalelephants.org

JES HOOPER

Exeter Anthrozoology as Symbiotic Ethics (EASE) Working Group
University of Exeter, Devon, United Kingdom
jh1220@exeter.ac.uk

THOMAS AIELLO

Valdosta State University, Georgia, USA
aiello@valdosta.edu

ABSTRACT

The movement of otherthanhuman-animals (henceforth OTHA) across human-defined borders are often categorised depending upon human-assigned categories such as 'invasive', 'introduced', 'non-native' or 'migrating'. However, there is a paucity of literature categorising OTHAs, from a posthuman, anthrozoological view, as immigrants. This paper examines, through the dual lenses of posthumanism and anthrozoology, five scenarios for OTHA immigrants. First, how pigs became pawns

in America's New World, due to the continued unwillingness of humans to see the agency of OTHAs; secondly, what does the action of co-immigrating with our companion-animals say about our relationships with the accompanying OTHA? Next, whether the UK, a self-declared 'nation of animal lovers' is suffering from zoo-xenophobia, a form of xenophobia towards immigrant dogs? Then, an examination of elephant-human interactions in Nepal across Nepalese-Indian borders seems to indicate that tensions should decrease as the elephant immigrant population declines, but is not the case. Finally, how zoo-animal immigration, means an OTHA's belonging to a zoological collection is often transitory in nature and so not afforded citizenship. Each case discusses the fluidity of OTHA immigrant membership of a human-constructed category, which may waiver as the OTHA is able to fulfill human needs or become an unwitting transgressor of social and political desires, fears and conflicts.

KEYWORDS: otherthanhuman-animal (OTHA) immigrants; anthrozoology; wildlife; zoo-xenophobia; companion-animals

1 Introduction

Few words evoke such quick and primal responses in modern times as that of 'immigrant'. No longer welcoming the "huddled masses yearning to breathe free" (Lazarus 1883, np), the word immigrant has been thrust to the forefront of news reports around the globe and now serves as an acceptable political platform (Tatham 2020). However, 'immigrant' is often reserved solely for human-animals (hitherto human), moving from one territory to another while such words as 'invasive', 'introduced' and 'non-native' are cast contemptuously at otherthanhuman-animals (hitherto OTHAs). The use of these "power words" (Hill et al. 2021, 1; Szydlowski 2021, 47) to control both human and OTHA lives is reminiscent of Foucault's (1984) concept of language as a tool for societal control.

Immigration is defined here as permanent relocation from one nation to another. While adult humans may make choices about their immigration, such decisions may be made by other adults for children and adults without the capacity to consent. Similarly, OTHAs may be permanently moved from one country to another without consent or agency. However, OTHAs are often entangled in "topographies of exclusion" (Asdal, Druglitrø, and Hinchliffe 2017, 9) post human-enforced movement, subsequently anthropocentrically categorised as 'invasive', 'introduced', becoming 'feral' (Hill et al. 2021) and 'non-native' (Helmreich 2005; Lessa and Bergallo 2012; Crowl et al. 2008).

In these spaces the lives of animals play into the formation of public discourse surrounding political issues and imagined divides (e.g. Hooper, Aiello, and Hill 2021). Only a few scholars (e.g. Crowley 2014; Bough 2006; Nagy, Johnson, and Malamud 2013; Schuurman 2019) take a subjective gaze towards OTHAs in human-enforced boundary crossings. Scholars such as Wolfe (2010), Whatmore (2002), Bekoff (2001) are amongst those that challenge the early ideas of posthumanism, in order to move beyond anthropocentrism. Seeking to add to literature which considers boundary-crossing OTHAs as subjective 'immigrants' through just such a posthuman lens, five practising, anthrozoological authors, with shared interests in considering OTHAs as ethically significant beings, collaborated to offer this article which intends to provoke further thought, discussion and suggestions for novel areas of posthuman research which considers OTHAs as immigrants.

While each of the examined OTHA immigrant groups face different challenges, they are connected via similarities arising from the imposition of human viewpoints and human 'management' through the application of labels and other anthropocentric terminology. The following analysis demonstrates how the status of these OTHA immigrants' changes, based upon the strength of their resistance to human control and their ability to fulfill fluctuating human needs and desires. We show how OTHAs are left vulnerable, at the whim of being accepted 'members' of human-constructed spaces or excluded when fluid boundaries are transgressed.

Based upon the research interests of each of the five anthrozoologists, each investigation is analysed contemporarily. The first section looks at the historical, transitory categories of pigs purposely translocated but how they were never considered as immigrants. The next section discusses how companion animals immigrating with human families can become vulnerable to changing commitments. Subsequently, we look at how a term we coin as 'zoo-xenophobia', surrounds rescued, immigrant dogs rehomed in the UK. This movement, to prevent 'foreign' dog immigration, colours the UK companion animal landscape. The penultimate section then examines how human actions force elephants, involuntarily to become immigrants, thereby transgressing anthropocentric boundaries creating human-wildlife conflict. How captive wildlife is shuffled, without consent, across international borders to serve as both entertainment and reservoirs of genetic potential is the final offering. These challenges are examined through a posthuman, anthrozoological lens, which encourages investigation into how OTHAs are viewed as being worthy of ethical consideration and should be seen as active participants in the creation of meaning.

2 Pigs as Pawns

Migration comes in many forms, but for OTHAs, immigration that is welcomed by humans is almost always forced, and voluntary OTHA migration is almost always curtailed. Forced immigration may be conducted across human-designated national boundaries that are socially constructed, lines upon maps only acknowledged by humans as having a measure of reality for pragmatic reasons of statecraft. Voluntary OTHA immigration is generally motivated by food and resource availability, and its curtailment involves constructing actual borders in the form of fencing and walls. The immigrations of pigs in early American history can serve as an example of the phenomenon.

Pigs arrived in the New World as part of the broader Columbian Exchange. Christopher Columbus brought eight pigs to Cuba on his second trip west. The Spanish explorers who followed did much the same on other West Indian islands, all in aid of creating an easily accessible food source. The English colonists of what is now the USA followed suit in 1607, bringing three pigs to Jamestown (Mizelle 2011, 42). These pigs took care of themselves and thrived on the plentiful food sources found around human settlements. Not only did they breed quickly, but they were conveniently easy to kill (Mizelle 2011, 42–44).

The ability of these pigs to roam freely and rapidly reproduce led to the creation of a ‘feral’ hog population (Crosby 2012, 108), the forced immigration of pigs ultimately redounded to a voluntary migration outside the bounds of human constraint. The grazing of pigs in the ‘wild’¹ caused little problem, but when free-roaming pigs rooted human-cultivated farmland, butting up against human interests, humans reacted violently. Massachusetts in 1633 legalized killing pigs that encroached on a colonist’s farmland. Two years later, the colony built pounds to hold pigs not properly corralled. In 1636, the colony expanded its provision to allow anyone to claim unrestrained pigs. It was not a popular law and had to be repealed in 1638, largely because of class resentment. Just as in instances seen in unwelcome human immigration, class played a role in determining the legitimacy of OTHAs moving across various borders. As Bret Mizelle (2011, 43) noted, “pigs were favoured by poorer colonists while wealthier ones had both more cattle and more fields to be rooted up” (also see Cronon 1983). Colonists also ringed and yoked pigs at times to keep them from rooting up crops, a different kind of boundary-making akin to modern monitored ankle bracelets used to enforce

1 While we acknowledge that the term ‘wild’ is culturally specific and value laden, we employ it here as a foil to human-dominated or cultivated landscapes.

restrictions on human movement. “The emphasis was always upon protecting English property and sentiments,” never on the wellbeing of the pigs themselves (Mizelle 2011, 44; also see Cronon 1983).

With the profusion of pigs in the New World colonies and after the Revolution, states began to monetize an available resource by trading pork throughout the hemisphere. As Mizelle has argued, “the more pigs there are in the world, the harder it has become to see them” (Mizelle 2011, 8). Such was true in the colonies and early states, and if pigs were no longer just a food source, but now an official commodity, new laws had to help create figurative and literal boundaries around the new business. Fencing laws appeared in most states to require pigs to be kept within enclosures. Again, the lower classes protested, leading to early-nineteenth century ‘hog wars’, where poor farmers defended the open range against fencing (Grettlar 1999; King 1982; Mizelle 2011). Again, the lower classes lost, fencing laws and private property rights becoming the standard of the day.

The southern relationship with OTHAs was always fraught. In 1785, South Carolina prohibited farmers from letting hogs run free in two low-country counties. White farmers responded by burning down the fences that were being erected (King 1982, 55). While such burnings ultimately benefited livestock in the short term, such moves were never about OTHAs themselves, who were always destined to be killed. Instead, hogs were the narrative tools by which freeholders fought against what they saw as unfair and overburdening government intervention. That unwillingness to see the personhood of OTHAs remained constant across time, as humans on both sides of the political divide used the movement of pigs across artificially designated places to make statements about legal control. It was biopower (Foucault 1990, 140) in service to political power, always redounding negatively to the OTHAs used as pawns in the game.

While pigs were forcefully moved as commodified objects, the second case considers the human-initiated movement of OTHAs, this time as subjective family members. However, while the motivation for movement is often considered as being in the interest of the OTHA immigrant, the often expensive and complicated immigration process can result in OTHAs being expelled from the family along the co-immigration journey.

3 Moving together: companion-animals, comigration, and personhood

Today, strict laws related to biosecurity and the control of zoonotic diseases regulate the international movement of OTHAs as immigrants, including companion-animals (for example see “Regulation (EU) No 576/2013” 2013; UK Government 2020; US DOS

2021; USDA APHIS 2020). One such set of laws, detailed in the EU PETS travel scheme, introduced in 2001, permits dogs, cats, and ferrets issued with a valid 'pet passport' to move freely within the European Union (Birke, Holmberg, and Thompson 2013; "Regulation (EU) No 576/2013" 2013). The immigration scheme requires the OTHA is microchipped, vaccinated against infectious diseases, including rabies, and carries valid vaccine, health-check documentation and, import-country dependent, a rabies titre certificate. Companies offering immigration services to travelers and immigrants seeking logistical support and transport services for their companion-animals (IPATA 2021) boomed when quarantine requirements for UK pet entry were removed in 2012 (BBC News 2011). Despite the companion-animal travel challenges created by the UK's exit from the European Union, the movement of companion-animals to and from the EU is unlikely to deter those humans with the motivation and means to co-immigrate with their companion-animals.

Given that companion-animals are commonly described as being part of the family (Charles 2014; Charles and Davies 2008; Finka et al. 2019; Owens and Grauerholz 2019), it is unsurprising that some families would go to great lengths to immigrate with them (Marchetti-Mercer 2020). However, the number of companion-animals relinquished to shelters each year due to 'moving', suggests the honorific of 'family member' might oftentimes be a superficial one (Coe et al. 2014; Sharkin and Ruff 2011). In an attempt to understand these contradictions, Shir-Vertesh (2012, 420) developed a theory of companion-animals as "flexible persons" to explain how they can be loved and incorporated into the family, yet at any moment may be demoted or rehomed. Essentially, Shir-Vertesh determines that, while companion-animals are considered family members by their humans, this is transient and can change when circumstances change. Nonetheless, the observation that companion-animals are often treated as such does not exclude the possibility of humans sometimes forming more permanent kinship bonds with OTHAs (Hill 2020), nor render all companion-animals in danger of relinquishment when life circumstances change. Indeed, examples exist of individuals making significant personal and financial sacrifices to keep their companion-animals safe and fed (Marchetti-Mercer 2020; Rauktis et al. 2017).

We proffer that the act of immigrating with companion-animals is antithetical to the notion of all companion-animals being flexible persons (Shir-Vertesh 2012), with those choosing to move with their companion-animals having formed *bona fide* kinship bonds. This is especially true when co-immigrating incurs considerable monetary burdens relative to financial means, time and effort, and sacrifices, in what is already, a stressful process for any family (Marchetti-Mercer 2020; Fox and Walsh 2011). A

complicating variable is that differences in socio-economic status means that co-immigrating with companion-animals is more feasible for privileged social groups from developed countries. Nevertheless, the logistics of co-immigrating with companion-animals renders it anything but trivial, even for the wealthiest of families. Furthermore, there are examples of human refugees going to great lengths to immigrate with their companion-animals (UNHCR 2018), suggesting they are anything but flexible persons. We are not disputing the theory of “flexible personhood” (Shir-Vertesh 2012, 420), which likely holds true for many OTHA ‘family’ members, however, flexible personhood appears not to be universal, and several studies support the conclusion that humans can, and sometimes do, form bona fide kinship bonds with other animals (see Ashall and Hobson-West 2017; Charles and Davies 2008; Hill 2020; Veldkamp 2009).

Fox & Walsh (2011) report that concerns regarding companion-animal wellbeing, namely the stress of traveling and acclimatizing to a new environment, were part of the decision-making process to relinquish a companion-animal rather than co-immigrate. However, reasons given for relinquishment rather than to co-immigration could simply be seeking to affirm decisions made and alleviate guilt (Oxley Heaney 2019). Shore et al., (2003, 42) reported ‘moving’ as the most cited reason given for relinquishment to a shelter in the US, and that this correlated with lower economic status and a need to move for employment. Thus, for persons who cannot find affordable pet-friendly accommodation, relinquishment might be the only way to avoid homelessness or and/or unemployment. For those who form strong bonds with OTHAs, their loss, including forced relinquishment can cause significant distress (McCutcheon and Fleming 2002; Redmalm 2015). Furthermore, the unselfish belief that relinquishment is in the companion-animals’ best interest, may underpin decisions to surrender a beloved companion to an animal shelter (Carter and Taylor 2020; Guenther 2020). Even if separation is truly in the OTHAs’ best interest, the emotional distress of the humans and OTHA cannot be overlooked. From the human perspective, a loss experienced from leaving behind a beloved companion-animal could exacerbate a general sense of mourning that is associated with Immigration (Ainslie 1998). Leaving behind a companion-animal is particularly distressing for immigrant children (Riggs, Due, and Taylor 2017). Companion-animals are intrinsic to the notion of home and creating a sense of belonging (Fox and Walsh 2011; Podberscek, Paul, and Serpell 2000; Power 2008), and Fox & Walsh (2011, 98) argue that they play an important role in re-establishing a sense of ‘home’ for immigrants. However, there is also a need to consider how the wellbeing of companion-animals and their own sense of home is affected by relocation. Just as relocation decisions are made for those finding themselves in passive positions,

for example, children, decisions are also made for companion-animals, however, unlike dependent humans, immigration renders companion-animals as property and removes all agency. Furthermore, unlike the passports issued to humans, “animal passports make no reference to status as citizens/subjects, nor requests for free passage” (Birke, Holmberg, and Thompson 2013, 4). Thus, the act of moving companion-animals across borders brings to the forefront the imbalance inherent in human - companion-animal relationships (Fox and Walsh 2011) and the burden of responsibility regarding their wellbeing falls on the human guardian. Recognition of the importance of interspecies kinship bonds is the first step toward providing “social support and initiatives aimed at keeping multispecies families together during times of hardship” (Hill 2020, 710).

While humans immigrate with their companion-animal family members, animal rescuers seek homes for rescued animals in countries with good reputations for animal treatment, the UK being one. Furthermore, the increasing difficulties of adopting companion animals from organisations within the UK (Norman, Stavisky, and Westgarth 2020) result in people wanting to adopt rescued companion-animals from abroad. However, such immigrations are frowned upon by some sections of UK society, often by placing blame for societal ills upon the immigrant animals, echoing xenophobic rhetoric of the past and present.

4 Rehoming animals and xenophobic entanglements

Homeless² and often psychologically and physically injured, companion-animal species are sometimes relocated across international borders (Schuurman 2019), including to the UK, an oft declared “nation of animal lovers” (Wills 2018, 407; Baker 2001), seeking refuge as immigrants with new human families. However, such trans-national movements have attracted criticism. As human immigration has headlined global politics over the last half-decade (Tatham 2020), various narratives have been recently engaged to “promote restrictive immigration and integration policies” (Tatham 2020, 1558; also see Hooper, Aiello, and Hill 2021). Subramaniam (2005) remarks how the parallels of xenophobic rhetoric is being extended towards plants and OTHAs. Indeed, anti-immigrant narratives appear to have leaked into discourse surrounding which OTHAs are worthy of entering the UK, termed here as zoo-xenophobia, in this case affecting dog-immigrants.

2 We acknowledge not all homeless dogs are in need of human-allocated homes, however, here we recognise there are companion animals that people are trying to home.

Rzepnikowska (2019) discusses how tabloid media and various political narratives have aided xenophobic discourses with linguistic tools shaping a landscape of anxiety (Hartmann, Subramaniam, and Zerner 2005) surrounding the “foreignness of germs” (Markel and Stern 2002, 757). Human immigrants have often been stigmatised with causing social ills, engaged in order to drive anti-immigrant policy and rhetoric (Markel and Stern 2002). Anti-immigrant language is also found targeted at immigrant dogs that are translocated from European countries such as Greece, Romania and Cyprus into the UK (May 2019; Ruzicka 2020). One 2016 article warns of dogs imported from Europe as “an influx of immigrants that has gone largely unnoticed” (Carter 2016, np) reflecting UK media of that time warning of an “influx of migrants” (Farage 2015, np) the latter of which was described as a “blatant attempt to incite racial hatred” (Stewart and Mason 2016, np).

Despite a letter to the UK government highlighting how such terminology negatively affects vets from European origins working in the UK (Dunt 2016), anti-immigrant language nevertheless bleeds into veterinary-medical narratives concerning the importation of dogs with non-UK origins, specifically dogs from Eastern Europe. While the veterinary profession understandably shows concern towards disease vector threats, the wording used to describe such concerns carries a xenophobic bent and appears to scapegoat immigrant dogs as the only vector of pathogens. Markel & Stern (2002) remark on how medical discourses can be used to frame and drive xenophobic attitudes towards humans. Similarly, immigrant-dogs are labelled by British Veterinary Association article as “trojan” dogs which “warns” of “harm” to UK dogs (British Veterinary Association 2018, np). The article continues to accuse immigrant-dogs of bringing “dangerous exotic diseases into the country”. The term ‘Trojan’ is defined by Merriam-Webster (2021) as “someone or something intended to defeat or subvert from within usually by deceptive means”. This ‘devious dog’ message is then echoed across the media (Rockett 2019; Walden 2019) and society (Cherrydown Vets 2018; Wollaston 2019).

Immigrant dogs are labelled as bringing unwanted “exotic” (British Veterinary Association 2018, np) diseases into the UK (Wollaston 2019; Wood Green 2021), diseases allegedly not normally associated with British dogs (Norman, Stavisky, and Westgarth 2020). However, a considerable paperwork burden and disease-prevention process accompanies dog immigration into the UK, vastly lowering the risk of imported diseases. May (2019), however, argues that ‘British-tourist dogs’, British-born dogs that travel abroad then return to Britain, do not appear to receive such criticism or scrutiny. Another immigrant-dog guardian asks why she was aggressively persuaded to re-test

her Romanian dogs for exotic diseases, while the re-testing of returning British tourist dogs does not routinely occur (May 2019). Just as employing the term 'exotic' functions as a distancing technique, separating the "exotic other" from the "familiar other" (Papadopoulos 2002, 163), the language used towards dog-immigrants is breeding a xenophobic "biofear" (Hartmann, Subramaniam, and Zerner 2005, 1).

Moreover, diseases that 'trojan' immigrant dogs are accused of infecting British-born dogs with, have already been identified as having increased prevalence in the UK due to climate change (Baird 2009). Additionally, the analysis of 250 cases of leishmaniasis recorded in the UK between 2005 and 2007 showed 56% of these cases were in British "tourist dogs" (May 2019, np) spending time in countries with a climate suitable for the leishmaniasis sandfly vector and only 14% in rehomed immigrant dogs (Shaw, Langton, and Hillman 2009). This was several years *prior* to the removal of the quarantine requirement (BBC News 2011) and the "influx" of immigrant dogs from Eastern Europe (Carter 2016, np). Recent studies also show the rabies risk from Eastern European countries remains very low (Berriman et al. 2018). Such research contradicts claims that keeping out 'trojan' immigrant dogs will keep out exotic diseases. 'Germ panic' rhetoric in the early 20th century, created fear and panic towards human immigrants (Subramaniam 2005; Tomes 2000). Dog-immigrants are now being targeted by similar tactics and while UK-biosecurity may be the aim, the language-related techniques employed zoo-xenophobically stigmatises immigrant rescue dogs.

Another claim that besmirches immigrant dogs is that those arriving from rescue centres abroad have behavioural issues (Wollaston 2019; Wood Green 2021) creates further stigma and fear. However, behavioural centres for British-born dogs are commonplace (May 2019) with PDSA (People's Dispensary for Sick Animals) research revealing 75% of owners want their dogs to have better behaviour (People's Dispensary for Sick Animals 2020). Furthermore, a survey revealed that 97% of dog immigrants still resided with their guardians and only 1% were rehomed (Norman, Stavisky, and Westgarth 2020) suggesting if there were behavioural issues, they were not sufficient to warrant relinquishment. Such sentiments imitate the "lack of integration" rhetoric towards human immigrants (Rzepnikowska 2019, 66).

Just as human-immigrants have been blamed for Britain's economic and social ills (Rzepnikowska 2019; Shahvisi 2019; McGuire 2019; Sian, Law, and Sayyid 2012), immigrant dogs are blamed for possessing poor behaviour, causing euthanasiation of "excess", unhomed British dogs (Gordon 2017, np) and initiating health issues of British dogs. Xenophobia, fear of the stranger, from the Greek words, *xénos* "the stranger" and *phóbos* "fear" "is understood as hostility against 'foreigners'" (Rzepnikowska 2019, 63).

Sivanandan (2001, 2) termed “xeno-racism” as a form of intra-racial racism against immigrants, i.e. immigrants of the same racial group as the country they are immigrants within and goes on to say, xeno-racism is a racism against impoverished, dispossessed strangers. Rescue-dog immigrants are also often impoverished and dispossessed from poorer EU countries which arguably lack infrastructure or laws to provide adequate care for injured, abused or disabled animals (Tanner 2020) and are arguably indistinguishable in appearance from their British cousins. However, British animal charities are reportedly refusing immigrant dogs as they “take up space” for British-born dogs needing homes (Gordon 2017, np). Such language resembles political anti-immigrant comments stating foreign workers should not be “taking jobs from British workers” (Rzepnikowska 2019, 61). The UK, a self-declared animal-loving nation, appears to have developed an air of nationalism towards dogs, where immigrant dogs are targeted with a form of zoo-xenophobia. Just as certain dog types have been excluded from the ‘Britishness’ the bulldog has previously been favoured with and symbolised by (Baker 2001), dogs are still being excluded, by some, due to, not their symbolic representation, but their location of birth. “Why didn’t you adopt a British dog” May (2019, np) is asked on multiple occasions, arguably a case of, zoo-xenophobia echoing the xenophobia towards immigrants exposed by recent UK politics and resonating with rhetoric which justified immigrant discrimination and victimisation of the past (Fekete 2001) and present.

Like immigrant companion-animal dogs above, free-living OTHAs who cross human-defined boundaries are portrayed as in the media as problematic immigrants. However, what happens when this phenomenon extends to species that are unable to be human-controlled by virtue of their sheer size or strength, a threat to the carefully cultivated places where nature is held carefully under human control (Jerolmack 2008)?

5 The Decreasing Elephants - Increasing Conflicts Paradox

Migratory herds of Asian elephants wander across invisible, socially-constructed national boundaries, crossing from the small country of Nepal into neighbouring India with no heed to political correctness (Government of Nepal 2009). These elephants, members of an endangered species whose numbers continue to decrease (Williams et al. 2020) represent vitally important genetic material for preserving diversity in their species (Koirala et al. 2016), yet they are often framed as antagonists when conflicts with humans occur (Kopnina 2017). The travel patterns of these immigrants across political borders make it difficult to get an accurate count of their numbers (AsERSM

2017). Estimates for these Nepalese elephants range from 109 to 170 individuals, too low to be considered a viable number for repopulating the area (Santiapillai and Jackson 1990). With population numbers dropping, why then are these immigrant animals creating such a stir? The expectation that elephant-human conflict would be decreasing due to falling numbers of individuals is a logical one, but that is not the case. Instead, fragmentation of habitats due to burgeoning human populations are partially to blame for an increase in conflicts (AESRM, 2017; Menon & Tewari, 2019). Human villages are forcing elephants into narrower and narrower corridors, or completely cutting off habitats from one another (AsERSM 2017; Menon and Tiwari 2019; Sukumar 2006). This fragmentation forces elephant immigrants not just across national borders, but into human-dominated landscapes.

In 2007, Resources Himalaya tracked several herds, each of which passed through approximately twenty-two separate villages (Government of Nepal 2009). These villages had arisen within previously 'wild' landscapes, and herd members continued their migration patterns despite finding human immigrants on elephant land. Naturally, herd members were not universally welcomed into these now 'settled' areas, as they tended to help themselves to cultivated crops and occasionally killed a villager who was trying to prevent such incursions (Government of Nepal 2009). Humans responded to these elephant immigrants by shooting or poisoning them, chasing them with fire, and escalating conflicts much as they do to other human immigrants trespassing on land perceived as theirs (Government of Nepal 2009).

Rising human populations are largely to blame for this increase in elephant-human conflict (AsERSM 2017; Menon and Tiwari 2019; Sukumar 2006), but academics seem hesitant to address the issue. Criticising social issues such as rapid human population growth in developing countries is often avoided by authors from the global north, perhaps out of the fear of being labelled a neo-colonialist or even a racist (Kopnina 2017, 226). However, these issues are the reasons that elephant-human conflict is on the rise and changes in species protection is unlikely to occur unless the spread of human populations into critical elephant habitat is addressed (Choudhury 2004; Kharel 1997; Kopnina 2017). Conflict issues need to be reframed through the dual lenses of anthrozoology and environmental justice, where both species who face anti-immigration sentiment are recognized as marginalized populations equally deserving of consideration (Kopnina 2017; Satoo and Changchui 2002). Otherwise, neither species will have the space necessary to thrive.

Whereas in the 'wild', large, migratory OTHAs can come into conflict with humans through encroachment into human-claimed spaces, as part of zoo collections,

OTHAs are primarily welcomed into human landscapes. It is in this final example that we offer an exploration into the status of zoo OTHAs, those who either themselves are first generation (wild-caught) immigrants, or the resulting (captive-bred) progeny from immigrant lineages.

6 Forced immigration and the formation of the modern zoo

It was the translocation of exotic animals from their countries of origin to various European nations in the 15th and 16th century that began the formation of zoos as we are familiar with them today (Baratay and Hardouin-Fugier 2004). Indeed, it was upon the same vessels which carried coffee, sugar, and slaves, that exotic wildlife was also involuntarily transported. 'Wild'-caught OTHAs were gifted to the wealthy European elite to carry political favor and to build alliances in the formation of the wealthiest nations (Rothfels 2002, 19). The influx of wild OTHAs and the need to house them soon gave rise to the expanse of exotic OTHA collections throughout Europe, and while such collections were initially symbols of wealth, power, and influence, it was human intrigue into the natural world that inspired the transition of menageries from private collections to publicly accessible institutions.

Inspired in part by the publication of Darwin's (1859) *The Origin of Species*, the menagerie shifted in purpose from ornate display to scientific resource for research and public education (Clay 2018), though it must also be emphasized that at its core the zoo has relied upon its value as a place of recreation. Although the first public menagerie, the Jardin des Plantes in Paris, France, opened in 1793, the opening of London Zoo in Regents Park in 1828 followed closely by Bristol Zoo in 1835 (Hosey, Melfi, and Pankhurst 2009) set in motion the rise of entertainment within the zoo environment within the nineteenth century. Typically set within urban environments, for much of the public the zoo offered (and continues to offer today) the first opportunity to view OTHAs from across the world, making zoos popular tourist attractions within city landscapes (Robinson 1996). By the early 1900s the zoo itself became a cultural status symbol, one which human citizens held in comparable regard to museums and art galleries in major cities across Europe (Robinson 1996, 136). Thus, the introduction of 'exotic' wildlife that may have otherwise been considered as 'invasive', were instead culturally celebrated as it was recognized that their being there provided benefits to humans. In the present day, modern zoos pride themselves for their societal role for ex-situ conservation and public education (Roe, McConney, and Mansfield 2015). Yet to be able to meet these revised institutional objectives, modern zoos continue to rely on human-

instigated wildlife immigration.

The management of OTHA species for conservation purposes is an activity which intrinsically relies upon the commodification of OTHAs and their trade across human defined boundaries. For conservation in the wild, where population numbers are low, wildlife is harvested and placed into captive breeding programs. Examples include the black footed ferret (Jachowski et al. 2011), the golden lion tamarin (Kierulff et al. 2012) and the Panama golden tree frog (Gagliardo et al. 2008), all of which are regularly cited as conservation success stories due to the safeguarding of endangered species via supplementation of wild populations with captive-bred individuals. Similarly, where habitats are fragmented, gene pools can be strengthened by the translocation of individuals to alternative regions (Bellis et al. 2020), and where ecological processes require restoration, keystone species are inserted to assist with rewilding. The re-introduction of grey wolves to Yellowstone National Park (Boyce 2018) and Eurasian beaver to Scotland (Coz and Young 2020), both serve as examples of the ways in which conflict can arise through human-induced species dispersal. Thus, with the introduction of wildlife, even those which are historically native, comes risk that the species can transgress human-defined once again to the status of unwelcomed immigrant for venturing too far into what are now human-claimed spaces.

While zoo OTHAs may serve little direct value to the habitat they are separated from, their conservation value is assigned most rigorously to their potential as ambassadors for their wild counterpart. Be it through entertaining and educating zoo visitors or in reproductive output, zoo OTHAs work within the context of the zoological institution, a labour which assures them comparatively greater levels of individual protections. According to Sue Donaldson and Will Kymlicka (2011) citizenship theory can be applied to OTHAs in order to recognize the variety of ways humans and animals interact within multi-species spaces. Donaldson and Kymlicka explain that where domestic animals rely on humans, and so can be classed as citizens of human societies, wild OTHAs in comparison are citizens of their own political environments. Thus, for wildlife, Donaldson and Kymlicka assign the concept of 'sovereignty', a framework in which wild OTHAs are seen as self-governing members of sovereign communities. Under such conditions, when OTHAs and human sovereignty intersect, the sovereignty of the OTHAs territory must be respected.

Yet despite their reliance upon humans in the modern zoo context, citizenship cannot be fully realized for wildlife under zoo management. Most notably, where citizens possess the basic right to life, not all zoo OTHAs hold such privilege. The transgression of zoo OTHAs from a life with value to a commodity 'surplus' to requirements,

can lead to the killing of otherwise healthy surplus 'stock' (Benbow 2004), a phenomenon of such frequency that it has been dubbed "zoothanasia" amongst zoo critics (Bekoff 2018, np). Furthermore, despite the portrayals of zoo OTHAs in popular media as residents, and therefore citizens, of the zoo (Hooper, Aiello, and Hill 2021), *ex situ* conservation management strategies ultimately revoke an OTHA's right to full citizenship within human societies. OTHA transfers are commonplace in order to increase genetic diversity and ensure gene flow within species breeding programs. Transfers occur within the confines of captivity where dispersal of individuals is under the strict control of humans who determine who, when, and where a zoo OTHA is to be transferred. Interestingly, it is in such management decisions that OTHA liminality between the status of zoo citizen and immigrant is exposed and, in its exposure, comes further conflict between conservation objectives and popular narrative.

Several landmark cases highlight the conflicting views held by zoo stakeholders surrounding institutional OTHA transfer. Where zoo management strategies must prioritize genetic flow of the captive population (Braverman 2014), the paying zoo visitor in comparison prioritizes the familiarity of specific zoo-animal encounter. Indeed, the attribution of personhood through the naming of charismatic zoo individuals, while serving the sentiment of inclusive belonging (Borkfelt 2011), also highlights the lack of OTHA agency which leads to the public questioning the dichotomy between the interests of the individual versus the species. Such conflicting interests can be observed throughout the history of the global zoo industry. Where the sale of Jumbo, an African elephant by London Zoo in the 1880s was claimed by the media as an act which caused "national insult" (Nance 2015, 10), the 1991 transfer of Timmy, a western lowland gorilla, from the Cleveland Metroparks Zoo to the Bronx Zoo for breeding purposes, resulted in a court battle between animal advocacy groups and the holding institution. Where Cleveland Metroparks Zoo was accused of compromising Timmy's welfare due to a forced separation from his then current enclosure partner Kate (newspapers published a letter apparently written by Timmy where he proclaimed his love for Kate along with a desire to stay with her in the zoo he had called home for 15 years), the needs of the species were upheld by the Judge, and Timmy was transferred on the same morning the court case closed (Braverman 2012). In both cases, Jumbo and Timmy were first generation immigrants whose citizenship was advocated for on the basis that they were valued members of human society.

7 Conclusion

In this article we have attempted to consider OTHAs through the application of post-humanist and anthrozoological lenses. Such analysis into the status of OTHAs as immigrants has been demonstrated as an opportunity to further academic understanding of the interplay between human and OTHA experience. As viewpoints on human movement and diaspora in new landscapes fluctuate according to the political backdrop of the time, so too can attitudes towards OTHA immigration. This article served to provoke thought and engage in considering OTHAs being categorised as immigrants, members of society, rather than anthropocentric categories such as 'invasive', 'non-native', or 'introduced', albeit still potentially being fluid members of human-socially constructed groups.

As long as OTHAs serve a purpose, such as co-immigrating companion-animals, members of zoo collections, or food-commodities, the OTHA immigrants may be given a warm welcome. However, should OTHAs move without anthropocentric benefit into human-dominated landscapes their movement may be considered unwelcomed 'incursions'. Additionally, human-initiated OTHA rehoming efforts, motivated by either the wish to find a better life for 'homeless' OTHAs or stringent, national, adoption rules preventing within-nation adoption, the ideology of rehoming 'foreign' OTHAs may clash with socio-political moods of the time. While these OTHAs become entangled with xenophobic messages which echo similar sentiments surrounding human immigrants, they become targets for justifying their removal, extermination, or confinement. 'Exotic' OTHA immigrants may be welcomed, for a time, if they are a useful human-needed resource, or do not transgress human-constructed ideological or physical boundaries.

In this article we have offered viewing the OTHAs in question through a non-anthropocentric lens. Each section has been linked through the research-related work of a collaborative team of anthrozoologists. While each anthrozoologist has a different research area they are linked by a desire to see OTHAs treated as ethically significant beings. As such, each anthrozoologist has experienced questions surrounding OTHAs as immigrants through the subjective, posthuman lens, rather than the oft normalised anthropocentric view.

As posthuman and anthrozoological examinations of OTHAs continue to expand, we hope more questions will be asked of human-constructed categories which are used influence control over their lives, deaths and lived experiences.

References

- Ainslie, R.C. 1998. "Cultural Mourning, Immigration, and Engagement: Vignettes from the Mexican Experience." In *Crossings: Mexican Immigration in Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, edited by M Suarez-Orozco, 285–300. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Asdal, Kristin, Tone Druglitrø, and Steve Hinchliffe. 2017. "Introduction: The 'More-than-Human' Condition: Sentient Creatures and Versions of Biopolitics." In *Humans, Animals and Biopolitics. The More-than-Human Condition*, edited by Kristin Asdal, Tone Druglitrø, and Steve Hinchliffe, 1–29. London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- AsERSM. 2017. *Asian Elephant Range States Meeting Final Report*. Jakarta, Indonesia. https://www.fws.gov/international/pdf/AsERSM_2017_Final_Report.pdf.
- Ashall, Vanessa, and Pru Hobson-West. 2017. "'Doing Good by Proxy': Human-Animal Kinship and the 'Donation' of Canine Blood." *Sociology of Health and Illness* 36 (9): 908–922. doi:10.1111/1467-9566.12534.
- Baird, Graham. 2009. "Animal Health Implications of Climate Change in Britain." *Vet Times*. <https://www.vettimes.co.uk/app/uploads/wp-post-to-pdf-enhanced-cache/1/animal-health-implications-of-climate-change-in-britain.pdf>.
- Baker, Steve. 2001. *Picturing the Beast: Animals, Identity, and Representation*. Urbana; Chicago: University of Illinois Press. [https://books.google.pt/books?redir_esc=y&id=xjG3ex19Lw4C&q=bulldog#v=onepage&q=animal lover&f=false](https://books.google.pt/books?redir_esc=y&id=xjG3ex19Lw4C&q=bulldog#v=onepage&q=animal%20lover&f=false).
- Baratay, Eric, and Elisabeth Hardouin-Fugier. 2004. *Zoo: A History of Zoological Gardens in the West*. Reaktion Book. doi:10.2752/089279302786992450.
- BBC News. 2011. "Quarantine Laws to Be Relaxed in UK." *BBC*. <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-16347725>.
- Bekoff, Marc. 2018. "Zoothanasia: The Cruel Practice of Killing Healthy Zoo Animals | Salon.Com." https://www.salon.com/2018/02/03/zoothanasia-the-cruel-practice-of-killing-healthy-zoo-animals_partner/.
- Bekoff, Marc. 2001. "The Evolution of Animal Play, Emotions, and Social Morality: On Science, Theology, Spirituality, Personhood, and Love." *Zygon: Journal of Religion & Science* 36 (4): 615. doi:10.1111/0591-2385.00388.
- Bellis, Joe, David Bourke, Joyce Maschinski, Katie Heineman, and Sarah Dalrymple. 2020. "Climate Suitability as a Predictor of Conservation Translocation Failure." *Conservation Biology* 34 (6). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd: 1473–1481. doi:10.1111/COBI.13518
- Benbow, S. Mary P. 2004. "Death and Dying at the Zoo." *The Journal of Popular Culture* 37 (3). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd: 379–398. doi:10.1111/J.0022-3840.2004.00074.X.

- Berriman, A. D.C., A. R. Fooks, L. A. Kelly, and E. L. Snary. 2018. "Assessing the Risk of Rabies Re-Introduction into the United Kingdom from Eastern European Countries." *Microbial Risk Analysis* 8 (April). Elsevier B.V.: 50–52. doi:10.1016/j.mran.2017.11.001.
- Birke, L, T Holmberg, and K Thompson. 2013. "Stories of Animal Passports: Tracing Disease, Movements, and Identities." *Humanimalia* 5 (1): 1–27. doi:10018/1014550.
- Borkfelt, Sune. 2011. "What's in a Name?—Consequences of Naming Non-Human Animals." *Animals 2011, Vol. 1, Pages 116-125* 1 (1). Molecular Diversity Preservation International: 116–125. doi:10.3390/ANI1010116.
- Bough, Jill. 2006. "From Value to Vermin: A History of the Donkey in Australia." *Australian Zoologist* 33 (3). Royal Zoological Society of NSW: 388–396. doi:10.7882/AZ.2006.013.
- Boyce, Mark S. 2018. "Wolves for Yellowstone: Dynamics in Time and Space." *Journal of Mammalogy* 99 (5). Oxford Academic: 1021–1031. doi:10.1093/jmammal/Gyy115.
- Braverman, Irus. 2012. "Zooveillance: Foucault Goes to the Zoo." *Surveillance and Society* 10 (2): 119–133. doi:https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v10i2.4106.
- Braverman, Irus. 2014. "Captive for Life. Conserving Extinct in the Wild Species through Ex Situ Breeding." In *The Ethics of Captivity*, edited by Lori Gruen. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- British Veterinary Association. 2018. "Trojan Dogs – Do You Know the Risks of Rehoming a Stray Dog from Abroad?" *BVA News and Blog*. https://www.bva.co.uk/news-and-blog/blog-article/trojan-dogs-do-you-know-the-risks-of-rehoming-a-stray-dog-from-abroad/?fbclid=IwAR0JxoUuiH_xuuJB-SYmb9CKVBj0tD8mJilnAv1NkHtlCdv2EYjFYczCfi4.
- Carter, Anne. 2016. "Britain Faces a Migration Issue: European Rescue Dogs." *The Conversation*. <https://theconversation.com/britain-faces-a-migration-issue-european-rescue-dogs-57394>.
- Carter, Jennifer, and Clark Scott Taylor. 2020. "Socio-Economic Factors in Companion Animal Relinquishment on the Sunshine Coast, Australia." *Society and Animals* 28 (5–6): 531–549. doi:10.1163/15685306-12341473.
- Charles, Nickie. 2014. "'Animals Just Love You as You Are': Experiencing Kinship across the Species Barrier." *Sociology* 48 (4): 715–730. doi:10.1177/0038038513515353.
- Charles, Nickie, and Charlotte Aull Davies. 2008. "My Family and Other Animals: Pets as Kin." *Sociological Research Online* 13 (5). University of Surrey: 13–26. doi:10.5153/sro.1798.
- Cherrydown Vets. 2018. "Be Aware of 'Trojan' Dogs." <https://www.cherrydownvets.co.uk/news/be-aware-of-trojan-dogs/>.

- Choudhury, Anwaruddin. 2004. "Human–Elephant Conflicts in Northeast India." *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 9 (4): 261–270. doi:10.1080/10871200490505693.
- Clay, Anne. 2018. "Applying Compassionate Conservation Principles to Improve Animal Welfare Best Practices." In *The Ark and Beyond: The Evolution of Zoo and Aquarium Conservation*, edited by Ben A. Minteer, Jane Maienschein, and James P. Collins, 582. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Coe, Jason B, Ian Young, Kim Lambert, Laura Dysart, Lea Nogueira Borden, and Andrijana Rajić. 2014. "A Scoping Review of Published Research on the Relinquishment of Companion Animals." *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science* 17 (3): 253–273. doi:10.1080/10888705.2014.899910.
- Coz, Deborah M., and Juliette C. Young. 2020. "Conflicts over Wildlife Conservation: Learning from the Reintroduction of Beavers in Scotland." *People and Nature* 2 (2). Blackwell Publishing Ltd: 406–419. doi:10.1002/PAN3.10076/Suppinfo.
- Cronon, W. 1983. *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England*. *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Crosby, Alfred W. 2012. "Ecological Imperialism: The Overseas Migration of Western Europeans as a Biological Phenomenon." In *The Ends of the Earth: Perspectives On Modern Environmental History*, edited by DJ Worster, 103–117. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/cbo9781139173599.006.
- Crowl, Todd A., Thomas O. Crist, Robert R. Parmenter, Gary Belovsky, and Ariel E. Lugo. 2008. "The Spread of Invasive Species and Infectious Disease as Drivers of Ecosystem Change." *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 6 (5): 238–246. doi:10.1890/070151.
- Crowley, Sarah L. 2014. "Camels Out of Place and Time: The Dromedary (*Camelus Dromedarius*) in Australia." *Anthrozoos: A Multidisciplinary Journal of The Interactions of People & Animals* 27 (2): 191–203. doi:10.2752/175303714X13903827487449.
- Darwin, Charles. 1859. *On the Origin of the Species*. Darwin. Vol. 5. doi:10.1016/S0262-4079(09)60380-8.
- Donaldson, Sue, and Will Kymlicka. 2011. *Zoopolis: A Political Theory of Animal Rights*. : 9780199673018: Amazon.Com: Books. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dunt, Ian. 2016. "Brexit Damage: Vets Warn Anti-Foreigner Rhetoric Putting People and Animals at Risk." *Politics.Co.Uk*. <https://www.politics.co.uk/blogs/2016/10/19/brexit-damage-vets-warn-anti-foreigner-rhetoric-putting-people-and-animals-at-risk/>.
- Farage, Nigel. 2015. "UK Could Face Huge Influx of Migrants after Med Crisis Thanks to Cameron." *Express Online*. <https://www.express.co.uk/news/politics/572757/Nigel-Farage-David-Cameron-immigration-Mediterranean-boat-crisis>.

- Fekete, Liz. 2001. "The Emergence of Xeno-Racism." *Race and Class* 43 (2): 23–40. doi:10.1177/0306396801432003.
- Finka, Lauren R., Joanna Ward, Mark J. Farnworth, and Daniel S. Mills. 2019. "Owner Personality and the Wellbeing of Their Cats Share Parallels with the Parent-Child Relationship." *PLoS ONE* 14 (2). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0211862.
- Foucault, Michel. 1984. *The Foucault Reader*. Edited by Paul Rabinow. New York. Vol. 1. New York: Pantheon Books. <https://philpapers.org/rec/FOUFR>.
- Foucault, Michel. 1990. *The History of Sexuality. Volume 1: An Introduction*. Translated by Rober Hurley. New York: Vintage.
- Fox, Rebekkah, and Katie Walsh. 2011. "Furry Belongings: Pets, Migration and Home." In *Animal Movements • Moving Animals Essays on Direction, Velocity and Agency in Humanimal Encounter*, edited by J Bull, 97–117. Uppsala University: Uppsala University.
- Gagliardo, R., P. Crump, E. Griffith, J. Mendelson, H. Ross, and K. Zippel. 2008. "The Principles of Rapid Response for Amphibian Conservation, Using the Programmes in Panama as an Example." *International Zoo Yearbook* 42 (1). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd: 125–135. doi:10.1111/J.1748-1090.2008.00043.X.
- Gordon, Andrea. 2017. "Should We Be Adopting Imported Rescue Dogs?" *Holidays4Dogs*. <https://www.holidays4dogs.co.uk/article/adopting-imported-rescue-dogs/>.
- Government of Nepal. 2009. *Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation & Department of Soil and Forest Conservation. Elephant Conservation Action Plan for Nepal*. Kathmandu. http://dnpwc.gov.np/media/publication/Elephant_Action_Plan_for_Nepal_2009-2018.pdf.
- Grettler, David J. 1999. "Environmental Change and Conflict over Hogs in Early Nineteenth-Century Delaware." *Journal of the Early Republic* 19 (2): 197–220. doi:10.2307/3124952.
- Guenther, Katja M. 2020. *The Lives and Deaths of Shelter Animals. The Lives and Deaths of Shelter Animals*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hartmann, Betsy, Banu Subramaniam, and Charles Zerner, eds. 2005. *Making Threats : Biofears and Environmental Anxieties*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Inc.
- Helmreich, Stefan. 2005. "How Scientists Think; About 'Natives', for Example. A Problem of Taxonomy among Biologists of Alien Species in Hawaii." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 11 (1): 107–128. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9655.2005.00228.x.
- Hill, Kristine. 2020. "Tattoo Narratives: Insights Into Multispecies Kinship and Griefwork." *Anthrozoos* 33 (6): 706–726. doi:10.1080/08927936.2020.1824652.

- Hill, Kristine, Michelle Szydlowski, Sarah Oxley Heaney, and Debbie Busby. 2021. "Uncivilized Behaviors: How Humans Wield 'Feral' to Assert Power (and Control) over Other Species." *Society & Animals* in press.
- Hooper, Jes, Thomas Aiello, and Kristine Hill. 2021. "Portrayals of Animals in Covid-19 News Media." *Anthrozoos*. Taylor and Francis Ltd. doi:10.1080/08927936.2021.1974703.
- Hosey, Geoff, Vicky Melfi, and Sheila Pankhurst. 2009. *Zoo Animals*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- IPATA. 2021. "International Pet And Animal Transportation Association." Accessed January 24. <https://www.ipata.org/>.
- Jachowski, David S., Robert A. Gitzen, Martin B. Grenier, Brian Holmes, and Joshua J. Millspaugh. 2011. "The Importance of Thinking Big: Large-Scale Prey Conservation Drives Black-Footed Ferret Reintroduction Success." *Biological Conservation* 144 (5). Elsevier: 1560–1566. doi:10.1016/J.BIOCON.2011.01.025.
- Jerolmack, Colin. 2008. "How Pigeons Became Rats: The Cultural-Spatial Logic of Problem Animals." *Social Problems* 55 (1): 72–94. doi:10.1525/sp.2008.55.1.72.
- Kharel, Fanindra R. 1997. "Agricultural Crop and Livestock Depredation by Wildlife in Langtang National Park, Nepal." *Mountain Research and Development* 17 (2): 127–134. doi:10.2307/3673827.
- Kierulff, M. C.M., C. R. Ruiz-Miranda, P. Procópio de Oliveira, B. B. Beck, A. Martins, J. M. Dietz, D. M. Rambaldi, and A. J. Baker. 2012. "The Golden Lion Tamarin *Leontopithecus Rosalia*: A Conservation Success Story." *International Zoo Yearbook* 46 (1). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd: 36–45. doi:10.1111/J.1748-1090.2012.00170.X.
- King, J. Crawford. 1982. "The Closing of the Southern Range: An Exploratory Study." *The Journal of Southern History* 48 (1): 147–166. doi:10.2307/2207296.
- Koirala, Raj Kumar, David Raubenheimer, Achyut Aryal, Mitra Lal Pathak, and Weihong Ji. 2016. "Feeding Preferences of the Asian Elephant (*Elephas Maximus*) in Nepal." *BMC Ecology* 16 (54): 1–9. doi:10.1186/s12898-016-0105-9.
- Kopnina, Helen. 2017. "Beyond Multispecies Ethnography: Engaging with Violence and Animal Rights in Anthropology." *Critique of Anthropology* 37 (3): 333–357. doi:10.1177/0308275X17723973.
- Lazarus, Emma. 1883. "The New Colossus." *The Statue of Liberty*. New York. <https://www.poetryfoundation.org/poems/46550/the-new-colossus>.
- Lessa, ICM, and HG. Bergallo. 2012. "Modelling the Population Control of the Domestic Cat: An Example from an Island in Brazil." *Brazilian Journal of Biology* 72 (3): 445–452. doi:10.1590/S1519-69842012000300005.
- Marchetti-Mercer, Maria C. 2020. "The Role of Companion Animals in the Process of Emigration: A Family Perspective." *Society and Animals* 28 (1): 81–100.

doi:10.1163/15685306-12341608.

- Markel, Howard, and Alexandra Minna Stern. 2002. "The Foreignness of Germs: The Persistent Association of Immigrants and Disease in American Society." *Milbank Quarterly* 80 (4). Milbank Memorial Fund: 757–788. doi:10.1111/1468-0009.00030.
- May, Nina. 2019. "My Response to the Guardian's Article 'They Look Cute, but Should We Rescue Romania's Street Dogs?' | Wunderdog Magazine." *Wunderdogmagazine*. <https://wunderdogmagazine.com/news/my-response-to-the-guardians-article-they-look-cute-but-should-we-rescue-romanias-street-dogs/>.
- McCutcheon, Kelly A., and Stephen J. Fleming. 2002. "Grief Resulting from Euthanasia and Natural Death of Companion Animals." *OMEGA - Journal of Death and Dying* 44 (2): 169–188. doi:10.2190/5qg0-hvh8-jed0-ml16.
- McGuire, Kim. 2019. "Engaging with the Media in a Pre and Post Brexit World: Racism, Xenophobia and Regulation: A United Kingdom Perspective." *Journal of Hate Studies* 15 (1). Foley Center Library, Gonzaga University: 255–273. doi:10.33972/JHS.170.
- Menon, Vivek, and Sandeep K.R. Tiwari. 2019. "Population Status of Asian Elephants *Elephas Maximus* and Key Threats." *International Zoo Yearbook* 53 (1): 17–30. doi:10.1111/izy.12247.
- Merriam-Webster. 2021. "Trojan Horse." *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*. Accessed August 9. [https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/Trojan horse](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/Trojan%20horse).
- Mizelle, Brett. 2011. *Pig*. London: Reaktion Books. <http://www.reaktionbooks.co.uk/display.asp?K=9781861898050>.
- Nagy, Kelsi, Phillip David Johnson, and Randy Malamud. 2013. *Trash Animals: How We Live with Nature's Filthy, Feral, Invasive, and Unwanted Species*. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press. doi:10.5860/choice.51-2088.
- Nance, Susan. 2015. "Animal Modernity: Jumbo the Elephant and the Human Dilemma." *Animal Modernity: Jumbo the Elephant and the Human Dilemma*, January. Palgrave Macmillan, 1–87. doi:10.1007/978-1-137-56207-4.
- Norman, Charlotte, Jenny Stavisky, and Carri Westgarth. 2020. "Importing Rescue Dogs into the UK: Reasons, Methods and Welfare Considerations." *Veterinary Record* 186 (8). British Veterinary Association: 248. doi:10.1136/vr.105380.
- Owens, Nicole, and Liz Grauerholz. 2019. "Interspecies Parenting: How Pet Parents Construct Their Roles." *Humanity & Society* 43 (2): 96–119. doi:10.1177/0160597617748166.
- Oxley Heaney, Sarah. 2019. "Exploring the Cat (*Felis Silvestris Catus*) Abandonment Phenomenon in Saudi Arabia." The University of Exeter (Unpublished).

- Papadopoulos, Renos K. 2002. "The Other Other: When the Exotic Other Subjugates the Familiar Other." *Journal of Analytical Psychology* 47 (2). Blackwell Publishing Ltd: 163–188. doi:10.1111/1465-5922.00303.
- People's Dispensary for Sick Animals. 2020. "PAW Report - PDSA." <https://www.pdsa.org.uk/get-involved/our-campaigns/pdsa-animal-wellbeing-report>.
- Podberscek, Anthony Louis, Elizabeth Shaun Paul, and James A. eds. Serpell. 2000. *Companion Animals and Us : Exploring the Relationships between People and Pets*. Cambridge University Press.
- Power, Emma. 2008. "Furry Families: Making a Human-Dog Family through Home." *Social and Cultural Geography* 9 (5): 535–555. doi:10.1080/14649360802217790.
- Rauktis, Mary Elizabeth, Lynda Rose, Qi Chen, Rachel Martone, and Amy Martello. 2017. "'Their Pets Are Loved Members of Their Family': Animal Ownership, Food Insecurity, and the Value of Having Pet Food Available in Food Banks." *Anthrozoos* 30 (4): 581–593. doi:10.1080/08927936.2017.1370225.
- Redmalm, David. 2015. "Pet Grief: When Is Non-Human Life Grievable?" *Sociological Review* 63 (1): 19–35. doi:10.1111/1467-954X.12226.
- "Regulation (EU) No 576/2013." 2013. *Official Journal of the European Union*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32013R0576>.
- Riggs, Damien W., Clemence Due, and Nik Taylor. 2017. "'I Want to Bring Him from the Aeroplane to Here': The Meaning of Animals to Children of Refugee or Migrant Backgrounds Resettled in Australia." *Children and Society* 31 (3): 219–230. doi:10.1111/chso.12196.
- Robinson, Michael H. 1996. "Foreward." In *New Worlds, New Animals : From Menagerie to Zoological Park in the Nineteenth Century*, edited by R. J. Hoage and William A. Deiss, 198. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Rockett, Karen. 2019. "Vets Warn of 'Trojan' Dogs Bringing Deadly Diseases to the UK." *Mirror Online*. <https://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/vets-warn-trojan-dogs-bringing-20895203>.
- Roe, Katie, Andrew McConney, and Caroline F. Mansfield. 2015. "The Role of Zoos in Modern Society—A Comparison of Zoos' Reported Priorities and What Visitors Believe They Should Be." *Anthrozoös* 27 (4). Routledge: 529–541. doi:10.2752/089279314X14072268687808.
- Rothfels, Nigel. 2002. *Savages and Beasts: The Birth of the Modern Zoo*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. doi:10.2752/089279303786992053.
- Ruzicka, Angelique. 2020. "Getting a Dog from Abroad: Is It a Good Idea? | This Is Money." *Thisismoney*. <https://www.thisismoney.co.uk/money/bills/article-8798607/Getting-dog-abroad-good-idea.html>.

- Rzepnikowska, Alina. 2019. "Racism and Xenophobia Experienced by Polish Migrants in the UK before and after Brexit Vote." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 45 (1). Routledge: 61–77. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2018.1451308.
- Santiapillai, Charles, and Peter Jackson. 1990. *The Asian Elephant - An Action Plan for Its Conservation*. IUCN/SSC Asian Elephant Specialist Group. Gland: IUCN. Switzerland. <https://portals.iucn.org/library/node/6042>.
- Satoo, Taisitiroo, and He Changchui. 2002. "Foreward From: Giants on Our Hands." In *The International Workshop on the Domesticated Asian Elephant*, edited by Iljas Baker and Masakazu Kashio. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. <http://www.fao.org/3/ad031e/ad031e01.htm#bm01>.
- Schuurman, Nora. 2019. "Encounters with a Canine Other: Performing Domestication in Transnational Animal Rescue and Rehoming." *Social and Cultural Geography* 22 (5): 686-703,. doi:10.1080/14649365.2019.1619820.
- Shahvisi, Arianne. 2019. "Austerity or Xenophobia? The Causes and Costs of the 'Hostile Environment' in the NHS." *Health Care Analysis* 27 (3). Springer: 202–219. doi:10.1007/S10728-019-00374-W.
- Sharkin, Bruce S., and Lisa A. Ruff. 2011. "Broken Bonds: Understanding the Experience of Pet Relinquishment." In *The Psychology of the Human-Animal Bond*, 275–287. New York, NY: Springer New York. http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-1-4419-9761-6_16.
- Shaw, Susan E., Debra A. Langton, and Timothy J. Hillman. 2009. "Canine Leishmaniosis in the United Kingdom: A Zoonotic Disease Waiting for a Vector?" *Veterinary Parasitology* 163 (4). Vet Parasitol: 281–285. doi:10.1016/j.vetpar.2009.03.025.
- Shir-Vertesh, Dafna. 2012. "'Flexible Personhood': Loving Animals as Family Members in Israel." *American Anthropologist* 114 (3): 420–432. doi:10.1111/j.1548-1433.2012.01443.x.
- Shore, Elsie R., Connie L. Petersen, and Deanna K. Douglas. 2003. "Moving As a Reason for Pet Relinquishment: A Closer Look." *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science* 6 (1). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. : 39–52. doi:10.1207/S15327604JAWS0601_04.
- Sian, Katy, Ian Law, and S Sayyid. 2012. *The Media and Muslims in the UK*. " Centre for Ethnicity and Racism Studies, University of Leeds. http://www.bbc.co.uk/iplayer/episode/b00xw21x/Face_the_Facts_Islamophobia/.
- Sivanandan, Ambalavaner. 2001. "Poverty Is the New Black." *Race & Class* 43 (2): 1–5. doi:10.2307/j.ctt183q61c.17.
- Stewart, Heather, and Rowena Mason. 2016. "Nigel Farage's Anti-Migrant Poster Reported to Police." *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/>

- jun/16/nigel-farage-defends-ukip-breaking-point-poster-queue-of-migrants.
- Subramaniam, Banu. 2005. "The Aliens Have Landed! Reflections on the Rhetoric of Biological Invasions." In *Making Threats: Biofears and Environmental Anxieties*, edited by Betsy Hartmann, Banu Subramaniam, and Zerner Charles, 294. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Inc.
- Sukumar, Raman. 2006. "A Brief Review of the Status, Distribution and Biology of Wild Asian Elephants *Elephas Maximus*." *International Zoo Yearbook* 40: 1–8. doi:10.1111/j.1748-1090.2006.00001.x.
- Szydlowski, Michelle. 2021. "Framing Conservation, Colonialism and Care: Captive Endangered Asian Elephants (*Elephas Maximus*) in Nepal. Thesis for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. University of Exeter." <http://hdl.handle.net/10871/127765>.
- Tanner, Claudia. 2020. "New Eurotunnel Animal Restriction Will 'cost the Lives of Hundreds of Thousands of Rescue Dogs' Warns Charity." *Inews*. <https://inews.co.uk/news/real-life/eurotunnel-animal-restriction-limit-five-rescue-dogs-cats-charity-766766>.
- Tatham, Michaël. 2020. "Regions and Immigration in Advanced Democracies." *Regional Studies* 54 (11): 1558–1563. doi:10.1080/00343404.2020.1840541.
- Tomes, Nancy. 2000. "The Making of a Germ Panic, Then and Now." *American Journal of Public Health* 90 (2): 191–198. doi:10.2105/AJPH.90.2.191.
- UK Government. 2020. "Pet Travel: To and from Great Britain." <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/pet-travel-to-and-from-great-britain>.
- UNHCR. 2018. "Pets Bring Refugees Comfort and Purpose." <https://www.unrefugees.org/news/pets-bring-refugees-comfort-and-purpose/>.
- US DOS. 2021. "Pets and International Travel." Accessed January 24. <https://www.state.gov/pets-and-international-travel/>.
- USDA APHIS. 2020. "International Animal Movement." *USDA Animal Plant and Health Service*. <https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/animalhealth/nvap/NVAP-Reference-Guide/Animal-Movement/international-animal-movement>.
- Veldkamp, Elmer. 2009. "The Emergence of 'Pets as Family' and the Socio-Historical Development of Pet Funerals in Japan." *Anthrozoos* 22 (4): 333–346. doi:10.2752/089279309X12538695316103.
- Walden, Lisa. 2019. "British Vets Issue Warning Over 'Trojan Dogs.'" *Country Living*. <https://www.countryliving.com/uk/wildlife/dog-breeds/a29694224/trojan-dogs-warning/>.
- Whatmore, Sarah. 2002. *Hybrid Geographies: Natures Cultures Spaces Bewildering Spaces*. SAGE Publications Ltd. London: Sage Publications.

- Williams, Christy, Sandeep K. Tiwari, Varun R. Goswami, Sherman de Silva, Anil Kumar, Nagarajan Baskaran, K. Yoganand, and Vivek Menon. 2020. *Elephas Maximus*. *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2020*.
- Wills, Joe. 2018. "A Nation of Animal Lovers? The Case for a General Animal Killing Offence in UK Law." <https://doi.org/10.1080/09615768.2018.1555026> 29 (3). Routledge: 407–436. doi:10.1080/09615768.2018.1555026.
- Wolfe, Cary. 2010. *What Is Posthumanism?* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Wollaston, Sam. 2019. "They Look Cute, but Should We Rescue Romania's Street Dogs?" *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/global/2019/jan/08/they-look-cute-but-should-we-rescue-romania-street-dogs>.
- Wood Green. 2021. "Rehoming Dogs from Abroad." *Wood Green - The Animals Charity*. Accessed January 15. <https://woodgreen.org.uk/pet-advice/article/rehoming-dogs-from-abroad>.