**Reimagining Organization through Critical Animal Studies.**

Convenors: Caroline Clarke, Matthew Cole, Erika Cudworth, David Knights, Iain Munro

Past criticisms of CMS have focused on a lack of self-reflection concerning *what* is studied and by *whom*, including the claim that its output ‘tends to universalize the experiences, perspectives, and interests of mostly white, heterosexual, professional Western men and women’ (Ashcraft, 2009, p. 318). Despite this, CMS is founded on principles that include interrogating inequalities through the study of the dominated and the dominating, and topics such as ageism, ethnicity, sexuality, ableism, class and gender have been the subject of much scrutiny and debate over the years.

Yet the claims to raise awareness of exploitative and marginalising practices have a fly in the ointment when it comes to the subject of *speciesism.* Speciesism; the practice of treating members of one species as being morally more important than members of other species, relies on asymmetrical anthropocentric relations, where nonhuman animals are understood as resources *at, and for, the disposal* of the human animal (Clarke and Knights, 2018). We are interested in how these assumptions (de Fontenay, 2012, p.12) facilitate an organisation of work that exposes nonhuman animals to levels of ‘unprecedented and undeniable subjugation’ (Sayers, 2016, p.373).

In this call we advocate a meeting of two critical fields of study: *Critical Management Studies* and *Critical Animal Studies* (CAS). CAS ([www.criticalanimalstudies](http://www.criticalanimalstudies).org) as a field of study dedicated to the abolition of animal and ecological exploitation, oppression and domination’, which has considerable synergies with claims made by CMS. We believe that Critical Animal Studies has the potential to act as ‘a catalyst’ for organization studies in ‘creating new opportunities to … profoundly reshape and reorganize our economies, politics and societies’ (CfP, Precarious Presents, Open Futures).

This potential alliance is timely, because despite our criticisms the field of organization studies is starting to acknowledge the problematic relations of nonhuman animals at work (Hamilton, 2013, Hamilton and Taylor, 2012, Cunha et al. 2018), and special issues on non-human animals have been published in *Organization* (Labatut et al., 2016; Hamilton and McCabe, 2016; Sayers, 2016); and *Gender, Work and Organization* (Clarke and Knights, 2018; Davies, and Riach, 2018; McLoughlin, 2018). However, these remain the exception, while work continues to be organised and predicated on anthropocentric hierarchical relations that objectify nonhuman animals for ‘productive’ purposes, with seemingly few, if any consequences e.g. VW and diesel fume testing on monkeys.

Power relations may be explicitly exploitative, including but not limited to: the industrialised meat industry (Hamilton and McCabe, 2016); animal experimentation; transport; security; and the sale of nonhuman animal body parts for clothing. More implicitly they may involve: entertainment (zoos, circuses, dog shows, racing, and film); or leisure and companionship (‘pets’, horse riding, and hospital visits). Whether animals are the objectified victims of human taste preferences, relatively valorised and protected as companions, or representations serving a range of symbolic functions in human culture, their entanglements with humans deserve greater attention across the social sciences.

Moreover, the complexity of these relations demands a multi-disciplinary effort to facilitate their understanding, and a critical perspective to destabilise the anthropocentrism that dominates those relations. In recent years, a combination of interdisciplinarity, critique and activism has been fostered by CAS, which explicitly opposes and seeks to end the human subjugation of members of other species. CAS is inflected by intersectional concerns with relationships between the oppression of NHAs and oppressions of ‘othered’ humans. Examples include the relationship between colonialist dispossession of indigenous peoples with the global acceleration of ‘meat’ production (Nibert, 2016); the connection between ‘meat’-eating and patriarchal masculinities in Western food cultures (Adams, 2000, 2002); or critiques of the marginalization of women and people of colour in the animal rights movement (Wrenn, 2016). Erika Cudworth has recently refocused attention on feminist interpretations (which have long-standing roots in eco-feminism) and human-nonhuman animal relations. Her theory of anthroparchy (Cudworth, 2011) encapsulates the human domination of ‘nature’, which includes NHAs, as well as human ‘others’ who become legitimized targets.

CMS has a valuable role in this unfolding interdisciplinary project. Nonhuman animals play myriad roles in human organizations, in their: productive capacity; labour power; entertainment value; and status as collateral victims in the ongoing ecocide associated with the expansion of industrial agriculture).

We welcome submissions that seek to:

* Apply a CMS perspective to the domination of NHAs in or by organizations
* Challenge CMS over its marginal attention towards NHAs to date towards a more open future
* Examine or envisage liberatory organizational practices towards NHAs
* Critique the intersection between organizational domination of NHAs and human ‘others’, for instance in relation to gender, ‘race’, class, embodiment, age or sexuality
* Develop a critical theory of organization with concepts from Animal Studies, Critical Animal Studies, and post-humanism, including the work of Haraway, Serres, Deleuze and Guattari amongst others.
* Explore how legal frameworks constitute nonhuman animals differently across cultures
* Illuminate ethical issues surrounding productive non-human animals at work

Please submit a 500- word abstract (excluding references and titles, 12 Font, Word Document) together with your contact information and the style of your proposal (presentation, performance, discussion, other) to [caroline.clarke@open.ac.uk](mailto:caroline.clarke@open.ac.uk) by **January 31st 2019.** We will notify you of our decision by the **end of February 2019**.
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