

Contemporary Social Science

Journal of the Academy of Social Sciences



ISSN: 2158-2041 (Print) 2158-205X (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rsoc21>

Incongruous killing: cats, nonhuman resistance, and precarious life beyond biopolitical techniques of making-live

Jacquelyn JohnstonWholsFeral

To cite this article: Jacquelyn JohnstonWholsFeral (2019): Incongruous killing: cats, nonhuman resistance, and precarious life beyond biopolitical techniques of making-live, Contemporary Social Science, DOI: [10.1080/21582041.2019.1667523](https://doi.org/10.1080/21582041.2019.1667523)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21582041.2019.1667523>




View supplementary material 



Published online: 22 Sep 2019.



Submit your article to this journal 



Article views: 19



View related articles 



View Crossmark data 



Incongruous killing: cats, nonhuman resistance, and precarious life beyond biopolitical techniques of making-live

Jacquelyn Johnston 

Department of Global and Sociocultural Studies, Florida International University, Miami, FL, USA

ABSTRACT

Under traditional programmes, unclaimed cats entering animal shelters were euthanized by barbiturate injection; since the implementation of Trap-Neuter-Return (TNR), cats are sterilised and returned to the streets. TNR cats are not only made to *live* – they are made to *work* for politics through a technique of tracking live releases from the shelter system to gain public support. However, biopolitical techniques are more than counting – life persists beyond the statistic. This paper traces the underexplored consequences of ‘nuisance wildlife’ removal laws in the ‘no kill’ era of TNR-only programmes in Miami. Trapped cats can be processed as ‘nuisance wildlife’, and killed by gassing, rather than by the only lawful method for killing cats in a shelter: lethal injection. How does TNR, created to make cats *live*, result in new vulnerabilities and incongruous cat *deaths*? This case study makes visible both known and unforeseen nonhuman vulnerabilities when biopolitical techniques are implemented without consideration for the complex systems of power at play within the apparatuses of nonhuman animal management. The precarious lives of cats suspended between wild and domestic, wanted and unwanted, and across political and legal purviews, requires greater engagement with the frameworks of killability for domestic and wild species.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 31 January 2019
Accepted 7 September 2019

KEYWORDS


Urban; wild or domestic; law; nonhuman resistance; biopolitics; multispecies

Introduction

In 2015, Miami-Dade Animal Services (MDAS) boasted a record-breaking number 10,000+ cats released alive from their shelter through Trap-Neuter-Return (TNR) programme. Miami’s TNR-only programme replaced the previous policy to kill all cats presented to the shelter in a trap or deemed feral; now, all healthy cats over 1.8 lbs are sterilised, marked by removing the tip of their left ear, and returned to their original urban spaces. Only extremely injured or ill cats and neonate kittens are accepted into the shelter under this policy.

That same year, a home owners’ association (HOA) sent out a notice to all residents that a wildlife trapper company had been hired to remove free-roaming cats, including TNR cats. A resident requested a cruelty investigation be initiated, and the County’s service request notes describe the resident’s concerns alleging inhumane trapping methods

CONTACT Jacquelyn Johnston  jjohn237@fiu.edu;  @WholsFeral

 Supplemental data for this article can be accessed <https://doi.org/10.1080/21582041.2019.1667523>.

© 2019 Academy of Social Sciences

and that the trappers removed her personal cats. An investigation by MDAS uncovered that the trapper was contracted by the HOA legally but was killing the trapped animals, cats included, by gassing.

Florida law prohibits the gassing of dogs and cats in shelters, as does county ordinance; however, it remains unclear if these laws pertain to cats in the custody of wildlife trappers. Under previous trap-and-kill cat management techniques trapped cats were automatically euthanized by lethal injection. TNR cats become vulnerable to a type of death widely considered by animal advocates and the public to be inhumane – gassing. The investigation was submitted to the State Attorney's Office. This case study addresses the incongruous legal frameworks pertaining to the killing of unwanted urban mammals, focusing on the consideration of free-roaming cats depending upon custody.

Specifically, this case study unpacks the legal and political structures employed to manage unwanted urban nonhuman animals. How does the TNR cat management technique, created to make cats *live*, result in new vulnerabilities and incongruous cat *deaths*? And how does Miami's case of TNR cats gassed by wildlife trappers make visible a systematic incongruence between public pressure to end gassing shelter animals and a concomitant inattention to the continued practice of death-by-gassing for other urban nonhumans?

These techniques must be situated within the larger set of institutions, political narratives, laws, programmes, policies, spoken and unspoken beliefs, and discourses that comprise the overall 'apparatus', or 'system of relations' from which these techniques emerge (Foucault, 1980, p. 194). As Grove (2013) argues, management techniques intended to control populations may seem apolitical or even mundane, and yet Foucauldian biopolitical analysis reveals the highly political and contingent systems of power inherent within the creation and implementation of such techniques.

Inspired and frustrated by Foucault's *The Birth of the Clinic* (1973), Haraway (2008) extends the idea of working through human-nonhuman relationships and techniques of control by unpacking complex systems of power – or apparatuses. A recurring theme in *When Species Meet* are the various types of human-nonhuman apparatuses within which such techniques unfold; for example, the potential for exploring animal rights within 'international human rights apparatuses,' human-animal response-ability in laboratory apparatuses, 'biosocial apparatus of modern breeds,' and the apparatus of production/reproduction of dogs or cloning endangered species (Haraway, 2008). Thierman (2010) builds on Haraway's discussion of Foucault's concept of the apparatus as a useful method for critically thinking about techniques implemented upon human and nonhuman bodies in contemporary slaughterhouses. Whereas urban dwelling cats play a minor role in Thierman's (2010) introduction, Holmberg (2015) offers a more detailed discussion of how a human-based apparatus can be extended to the analysis of urban free-roaming cats. Specifically, discussion of the 'apparatus of homelessness' of human populations is useful for analysing the systems of power that result in techniques for managing 'homeless' animals by rendering pets a 'social problem'. Once the cats are discursively constructed as a problem in need of management, techniques to manage and control manifest cats-as-killable (Holmberg, 2015).

Building on this legacy of dissecting techniques within an apparatus, this paper engages with theoretical debates about killability, vulnerability, and nonhuman resistance. Managing cats through TNR is one example of a technique where nonhuman animals are

made to live, only to become vulnerable to a myriad of other lethal forces after being counted.

The first section explores nonhuman animal resistance to biopolitical management techniques. Killability and resisting through escape are two common themes in literature describing ways animals resist biopolitical techniques to make die. Life persists beyond management techniques created to make animals live, as well. As Despret (2016) reminds us, violence may erupt as nonhumans negotiate vulnerabilities of life after life-making techniques. This paper proposes cats resist techniques to make live by living in precarious urban spaces.

The TNR-only technique used by MDAS is explored further in the second section and is situated within contemporary trends in the animal sheltering industry. Management techniques for culling unwanted free-roaming cats were standard in many animal shelters prior to an early 2000s shift toward reducing shelter euthanasia. This paper uses the term ‘Live Release Animal Shelter Apparatus’ (LRASA) to indicate that Miami’s TNR-only programme is a biopolitical technique used in government-run shelters interested in increasing the shelter’s live release rate. This case analysis supports the theoretical usefulness of thinking through nonhuman animal management techniques within a specific apparatus,¹ and strives to make visible the political narratives, social pressures, and legal frameworks currently involved in the contemporary iteration of animal sheltering practices focused on reporting *live releases*.

To explore the incongruous laws governing cat killing contingent upon custody, the third section traces the legislative revisions to the various laws that govern death-making techniques for cats as a pet species.² This investigation reveals legal loopholes pertaining to cats killed by privately-owned trapping businesses; this paper examines the history of public pressure to reduce shelter killing that changed laws pertaining to pets in shelter custody. Concomitantly, this analysis uncovers unequal public and legislative attention to the methods of killing, record keeping, reporting, and general consideration of the methods of killing wild and domestic urban animals ambiguously classified as free-roaming.

Moreover, this case exemplifies the need to consider the vast entanglements within which humans and animals coexist in urban spaces – particularly when a seemingly apolitical technique is implemented to manage a targeted population. TNR cats’ stories begin, not end, once counted by the shelter. Life after counting opens up novel vulnerabilities – the life of a TNR cat in Miami may end in death that is illegal for shelter cats. As the cats in this case reveal, even *live releases* from the shelter may *die* despite being counted as alive, killed in a tank filled with a lethal inhalant as invisible as they are in public records.

Situating biopolitical techniques, vulnerability, and nonhuman resistance

Killability, and biopolitical techniques of making live

Government programmes of conservation or wildlife protection consist of animal management techniques to make certain animals live, but simultaneously create new vulnerabilities³ for animal life that does not fit within the mission. As Lynch (2019) reports, the US Fish and Wildlife Service has justified the killing of over 40 million animals in two decades. Making nonhumans live is often a justification for making other nonhumans

die. The various techniques that comprise apparatuses of conservation, human-nonhuman conflict management, and stray pet populations emerge from sociopolitical situations where human interests in economics, public health, or control over space result in programmes that render some animal life killable. Manifesting killability in nonhumans takes many forms, and the potential for shared suffering or justified suffering of the other raises questions regarding human power to make those decisions for other species (Haraway, 2008). Human interventions to control space through eradication of specific nonhumans consists of global networks of power; decades of literature in geography and political ecology have unpacked the complexities of these techniques. In early colonial efforts in Africa, animals were classified as either domestic or wild as a strategic management technique to control space, humans, and render desired species more easily hunted (Neumann, 1998). As urban industrial spaces became more populated, techniques to manage human-nonhuman urban encounters also emerged. Inclusion and exclusion from the city is negotiated in terms of domestication or classification as pets (Philo, 1998). Spatial segregation of industrial slaughterhouses from public spaces increased killing capacity while sanitising the death from public gaze (Fitzgerald, 2010). Species and space specific contexts classify populations of animals as *pests*, leading to a wide range of extermination practices and normative discourses of killing 'trash animals' (Nagy & Johnson, 2013). Literature focused on untangling the uneven consideration of certain animals according to space or custody is particularly critical to this case discussion, such as Dayan's (2015) discussion of groups of dogs who are deemed irreparably damaged by association and killed without legal due process for their owners, and the discrepancies that emerge when situating nonhuman death-making laws within human legal frameworks (Janda & Lahun, 2016).

As with many culling techniques, making life *live* is wrapped up in making some other population *die*. Conservation techniques are rife with examples. Death is counted, motivated, justified, and implemented as if it were an apolitical necessity for life. When analysed through the lens of biopolitical techniques situated within an apparatus, the political, historical, social, and spatial systems of power are made visible.

Foucauldian biopolitical technique analysis offers a way to critically engage with how power, populations, politics, and the environment work and rework the technologies and techniques created to regulate life; one such technique is to count and control (Grove, 2013). Once a complex system is abstracted through the use of population statistics, political narratives use simplified reports of making live to further specific agendas.

Nonhuman resistance, and biopolitical techniques of making die

Current academic debates about nonhuman resistance⁴ to techniques of making die, such as when an animal raised for consumption escapes from the slaughter apparatus, offers other ways to analyse techniques to control nonhumans. Braverman (2016) argues for the need to look at ethical and political legacies of human legal frameworks and how systems of governance imposed upon more-than-human life often disrupt the narratives from which these systems emerge. Large-scale agricultural production of animal bodies for slaughter is a nonhuman animal management technique that has been normalised within modern industrial apparatuses of Western meat consumption. The removal of slaughterhouses from visible urban spaces (Wolch, 1998) is complicated when an individual cow

manages to escape, becoming visible to the public through media and in the flesh. Biopolitical techniques that make animal bodies work for humans are challenged when the animal fails to die according to the intended technique, such as when cows resist slaughter through escape (Colling, 2018), which Allen and von Essen (2018) expand on by focusing on the human response to the escape. Specifically, they raise issues of legal frameworks of animals-as-property, ownership, ethical considerations of responsibility to escaped animals, and sustained political pressure of public opinion. In these examples, animal bodies are made useful when they are killed, escape thwarts the practice of making their bodies work after death. Do we also find animal resistance in techniques implemented with the mission of making animals live?

Vulnerability as resistance after being counted as a statistic

To explore animal resistance within biopolitical techniques of making animals live, this case study explores the impact of animal advocate pressure to end the culling policies of free-roaming cats in Miami, and the unintended vulnerabilities created as a result of this shift. Van Patter and Hovorka (2018) document the conflicting discursive constructions ‘feral’ cats must negotiate when living after being sterilised and returned to spaces shared with humans. The authors describe the overwhelming vulnerability of cats who, according to many of the participants, ‘are rarely considered to be legitimate community members’ (2018, p. 16). As described in the following section, the legacy of cats-as-pets informs these known vulnerabilities when cats are returned to a life outside domestic spaces – cats living outside traditional classification of pet balance precariously, independent of the bonds of domestication, but nevertheless dependent upon human tolerance to coexist. What happens when TNR cats are returned to spaces where they are unwanted? Specifically, what happens when we explore the emergent possibilities of life after being counted? Does cat life after Miami’s TNR programme make visible the apparatus from which this technique is implemented – an apparatus focused on statistical shelter *outcomes* and increasing *live release* rates, rather than on making cats live?

Novel vulnerabilities, and life after being counted

Pets in contested spaces

By following the cats in this case, we see the same cats walk across lingering boundaries of domestic-pet, free-roaming, and wild life in the city. Miami’s TNR cats easily wander across a varied field of literature that Cavanagh (2018) describes as new frontiers of biopolitical analysis where conservation, geography, and political ecology reflect the inescapable politics of more-than-human management strategies. Cats defy the separation of wild and domestic. Urban life subverts boundaries by dismantling any illusions of pristine nature devoid of human construction. In urban spaces domestic and wild function as ‘two semi-oticmaterial domains constantly stretching into each other without any stable or clear boundary line’ (Brighenti & Pavoni, 2018, p. 281). Once seen not as a binary, but as a scale across which vulnerabilities are shared, the legacies of being cast as wild urban pests subject to extermination makes visible the novel vulnerabilities emerging in the realm of the free-roaming domestic cat.

Cats-as-pets also have their own historical legacies within urban spaces. As Anderson (1997) and Howell (2015) argue, the idea of a domestic pet must be situated within historical, cultural, colonial, and political contexts that explore how these relationships are made and are not given. In a comparative study between government programmes and laws pertaining to stray dog populations in the UK and India, Srinivasan (2013) develops a biopolitical analysis of divergent responses: culling in the UK and TNR-style programmes in India. While the colonial legacies of animal welfare politics is beyond the scope of this paper, this case study demonstrates that classification techniques of pet animal species must be situated within the contingent iterations of pet animal welfare management apparatuses. It is precisely these legacies of cats-as-pets that persist in the public imaginary resulting in new vulnerabilities for the politicians trying to capitalise on the political value of making TNR cats live in spaces where inhumane death awaits.

Visible death: legal requirement for animal shelter reporting

TNR demonstrates a shifting biopolitical imperative – killing millions of shelter cats every year is increasingly contested in the public and political debates. Under previous trap-and-cull cat management techniques, up to 90% of free-roaming or feral cats entering animal shelters were euthanized by barbiturate injection. TNR programmes have become the standard cat management choice of animal advocates (Berkeley, 2004), and an increasing number of animal shelters have adopted TNR as a way to reduce cats killed in the shelter (Spehar & Wolf, 2018).

The widespread adoption of TNR directly correlates with increasing *live release*. Miami's animal shelter Director credits the TNR programme for achieving its goal of over 90% live release of shelter animals. Over the past fifteen years, a significant body of literature in the field of shelter veterinary medicine has been produced from emerging programmes specifically focused on training students to provide medical care and high-quality, high-volume sterilisation surgery to pets in public and private shelters.⁵ A key focus of this research is the impact these programmes have on the *live release* rate of animal shelters using TNR as a cat management technique (Levy, Isaza, & Scott, 2014).

Despite the frequent citation of veterinary science in political debates, cat management by culling or by TNR are not sterile, apolitical techniques. These are biopolitical practices that are part of a wider set of systems, linked to national trends in sheltering, increased funding of where reduced killing is a goal, and widespread public demands for increased political response to the needs of millions of pets entering shelters. Analysing Miami's TNR-only cat management technique within LRASA⁶ makes visible the political and social systems of power at play.

Making cats live through TNR is an oversimplified, arbitrary mathematical technique utilised to report cats leaving the shelter alive to service political goals and gain public support. Negotiations between public opinion and shelter management often result in legislative revisions (Crețan, 2015). In Miami, laws, legal definitions, and targeted legislative revisions reveal the selective reaction of politicians to such public pressure. One significant change occurred in 2013; Florida Statute § 823.15 was revised to require all government-run shelters report income and outcome statistics to the public – including the number and species of all animals killed. The law made shelter death-making techniques visible. High death rates (sometimes over 90% for Miami's cats), resulted in acute public pressure

to reduce shelter killing. Abstract statistics makes sterilised cat bodies work for a political outcome. The fate of TNR cats is neither reported nor tracked by the shelter. Cats count as live release – nothing more.

Novel vulnerabilities

While TNR exemplifies political expediency of making cats live, Miami's TNR cats complicate this narrative. Cats in contested urban spaces raise new questions about contingent and space-specific politics that govern human-nonhuman encounters in this iteration of Miami's LRASA. Whereas the culling technique was politically valuable and justified through narratives of nuisance and public health, the demand to reduce killing created the need for TNR, where *live* cats are more politically valuable. Public pressure and political haste created the potential for legal loopholes that afford disparate levels of legislative protections to cats-as-pets and cats-as-wildlife.

TNR cats are made to work by using the biopolitical technique of counting cat bodies leaving the shelter alive. Resistance is internal to the programme itself; precarious cat lives resist tidy statistical reporting by becoming vulnerable after being counted, crouching and darting through urban spaces where all nonhumans risk extermination.

Currently, under Miami's TNR-only technique, the only option available to property owners who wish to remove unwanted cats is to hire a wildlife trapping company. Trapped cats are processed as 'nuisance wildlife' and killed by gassing, instead of the only lawful method for killing cats in shelters: lethal injection.

Incongruous laws pertaining to death-making techniques

Notwithstanding public demand to end killings of free-roaming cats, techniques to make cats live must be situated within human-nonhuman coexistence. Not all urban nonhumans are welcome. Cats share spaces with wild species: most commonly, raccoons, foxes, and opossums.

When MDAS implemented a mandatory TNR policy for all unowned cats presented to the shelter, novel potentials emerged. Live release statistics are an abstracted record of a singular moment – cats persist after this moment. As Povinelli (2006) argues, life after management techniques can be an unruly fleshly reminder that despite biopolitical efforts to control life, life is not reducible to these systems. Cats living and dying after TNR may subvert the narrative of making live – the cats in this case are vulnerable to a death considered less humane than their shelter counterparts. Laws governing the treatment of dogs and cats in shelters do not extend beyond pets in custody of owners or shelters – in the wild urban spaces, techniques of killing unwanted wildlife reigns.

Animal sheltering laws: dying in public custody

Pet animal policies are contingent upon space and politics; biopolitical analysis of policies and laws situates management techniques imposed upon precarious populations of unclaimed pets (Srinivasan, 2013). Florida has several statutes pertaining to the lawful killing of domestic animals, organised by classification and custody. Florida Statute § 828.05 describes two options for the lawful destruction of injured or diseased domestic

animals in custody of law enforcement, veterinarians, or shelters: ‘shooting the animal or injecting it with a barbiturate drug.’ Section 828.058 extends the legal killing of domestic animals in the custody of ‘public or private agencies, animal shelters, or other facilities which are operated for the collection and care of stray, neglected, abandoned, or unwanted animals’, without any requirement of injury or illness.

The history of § 828.058 reveals that death by barbiturate injection was not always the only accepted mechanism to kill shelter cats. In 1993, subsection (3) was removed from § 828.058. Prior to this change, death by gassing was allowed by exception in both statutes. Meanwhile, § 828.065, pertaining to the destruction of pet store animals, has not been revised. Outcome statistics are only public record for animal sheltering agencies, as per § 823.15. Pet stores, as well as privately-owned wildlife trappers, are not required to make these statistics public.

Death by gassing is one of the most visceral topics in animal advocate protests against shelter killing.

Volunteers play a key role in resisting programmes associated with high-kill shelters (Guenther, 2017). Pictures of pets killed in shelters are shared by shelter workers and volunteers in online communities (De Mello, 2016); exposing pet death-making practices spurs protests, email campaigns to legislators, and viral calls-to-action aimed at local politicians. Of all the types of abuses alleged in shelter killing of pets, death by gassing garners significant reactions. Despite overwhelming advocate pressure and public demand to end killing shelter pets by gassing, no pressure has spurred legislative changes for the invisible pets dying in the custody of pet stores and trappers, since these outcomes are not publicly known.

Unwanted wildlife laws: when living in public means dying in private

Death statistics for animals killed by private trappers are not publicly available, so cat death-by-trapper is invisible to debates concerning the LRSA. Legislative revisions to prohibit gassing pets have focused only on deaths in shelters. What happens to TNR cats who are processed and returned to the streets, no longer protected by the laws for pets in shelter custody?

Srinivasan (2013) argues that depending on custody or space, a pet can be recast as *pest* and a different set of management techniques may be implemented. Making shelter cats live through TNR results in potential future death as nuisance wildlife.

Cats in the custody of wildlife trappers are vulnerable to the killing techniques allowed by nuisance wildlife laws. According to Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC), trapping and disposal of all ‘nuisance’ species must meet the species-specific requirements of the AVMA Guidelines for Euthanasia of Animals (Underwood et al., 2013). The Florida State Statutes, Administrative Code, and Wildlife Commission provide no further regulation of methods for killing ‘nuisance’ species.

The AVMA Guidelines divide methods of euthanasia into two categories: ‘Acceptable’ and ‘Acceptable with Conditions’ (2013, p. 15, 26, 45). Euthanasia in carbon monoxide or carbon dioxide gas chambers is listed as ‘Acceptable with Conditions’ for both cats and dogs in the AVMA guidelines; thus, is *legal* for wildlife trappers to kill cats by gassing.

The novel classification of cats as free-roaming through Miami’s TNR-only programme renders them killable wildlife. Legal incongruence reflects the public focus on humane

death for species associated with domestic spaces and shelter pets, whereas laws governing the killing of unwanted urban wildlife fail to receive analogous public attention or revision.

Discussion: confronting incongruous killing

The problem is to learn to live responsibly within the multiplicitous necessity and labor of killing, so as to be in the open, in quest of the capacity to respond in relentless historical, non-teleological, multispecies contingency. Perhaps the commandment should read, "Thou shalt not make killable."

Haraway, 2008, p. 80

Vast entanglements of harm and care remain underexplored (Srinivasan, 2014), and the emergent potentials of life after 'humane' management interventions demands a critical reimagining of individual worlds (Ruddick, 2017). Coexistence beyond the boundaries of wild and domestic demands greater understanding of nonhuman lifeworlds and novel work to reanimate our understanding of how urban space is negotiated (Barua & Sinha, 2019). It is common for urban wildlife to be unwelcome; many species commonly found in urban spaces are unwanted, or as regarded a 'trash animals' (Nagy & Johnson, 2013). Despite recent interest in novel potentials for urban nonhumans in more-than-human research (Lorimer, 2015; Marris, 2013), most human interactions with nonhuman 'pest' or 'nuisance' species remain strained (Rupprecht, 2017). Theoretical appreciation for coexisting with urban animals does not translate into tolerance. As Rupprecht (2017) describes in an international quantitative study of human perception of sharing urban spaces with wildlife, attitudes and policies vary by species and space.

Individual cats in Miami's TNR-only biopolitical technique slip through the legal, political, and ethical loopholes that emerge as a result of the public's concern for humane treatment of free-roaming or homeless cats. Cats resist being made to work for Miami's politically motivated LRASA simply by living beyond being counted. Although cats are one of the most common species to be owned as a pet, cats are also associated with varying degrees of ferality that produces contingent mechanisms of feline world-making situated within specific spaces and relationships (Haraway, 2008). Holmberg (2015) argues that cats are defined according to two factors: their relationship with a human, or lack thereof, and the space they inhabit. When cats are suspended in liminal urban spaces, coexistence with urban wildlife subjects them to death-making techniques of 'nuisance' wildlife.

Miami's programme cuts through the political narrative of *life-saving*, exacerbates TNR cat vulnerability, and banishes cats to death-making techniques reserved for wildlife whose death statistics are not public. Whereas former culling programmes made cats killable through claims of ferality, using a framework of homelessness or 'cats as a social problem' to justify their death-making programme (Holmberg, 2015), Miami's TNR-only opens up questions about techniques of rendering urban animals killable.

Haraway (2008) demands analysis of historical and social contexts that guide human tolerance for making species killable. Death by gassing is wrapped up in histories of genocide. Death by injection carries with it contemporary public acceptance as the only legal method of killing humans. Since 1993, Florida law reflects these histories as revisions revoked gassing of shelter pets. The perpetual justification of *violent* wild death, while

advocating for *medical* domestic death, invokes new ways to think about the risk of hope and inescapable grief of life in the Anthropocene (Head, 2016). This case demonstrates a need to dissect the fissure in the public's demand to make domestic pets live, or die *more humane* deaths, and the continued acceptance of deaths considered to be *inhumane* for urban wild species with whom TNR cats coexist.

Regardless of behaviour, previous history, or skill, unowned cats are funnelled through the TNR-only programme and returned to the wild urban spaces across the county. Cats are recast from domestic to wild with a different set of laws, and their invisible deaths are lawful due to divergent legislation. The implementation of life-saving TNR must be situated within the LRASA, exposed as a programme to count them only at the moment of live release that simultaneously results in rejection from placement through adoption. Legal frameworks have not been revisited with this new technique in mind. If death-making techniques for wildlife had inspired equal concern in the public imaginary when the shelter animal killing laws were rewritten, perhaps this incongruous killing could be avoided.

This investigation into alleged animal cruelty and improper killing of cats has been closed, and the State Attorney has not brought charges against any trappers for killing cats by gassing. The trapper discussed here continues to gas cats with carbon dioxide. There is a recent reignition of community outrage for these death-making techniques being used on cats. It is unclear if outrage over inhumane deaths of TNR cats will result in public demand for revision of laws governing killing of urban wildlife.

Conclusion

In the densely populated urban spaces of Miami-Dade County, willingness to coexist with cats varies and often results in contentious exchanges between renters, owners, and HOAs. Life lived after being counted as a success in the biopolitical TNR-only technique in Miami make visible vulnerable life beyond the programme and new forms of death. A focus on the life and death-making practices and techniques of one species or one population is insufficient. Biopolitical techniques of counting and control do not exist in a vacuum. Cats who live beyond TNR by living through the precarious spaces to which they are returned resist being flattened into the biopolitical statistics that serve the political narrative of more humane animal management. When humans reject urban multispecies coexistence, cats become vulnerable to otherwise illegal methods of death-making techniques, conventionally reserved only for nuisance wildlife, and legally permissible through a lack of consideration of the entanglements of Miami's LRASA.

TNR cats are made to work for political narratives by being counted as live releases from shelters, but their vulnerability beyond these programme exceeds, disrupts, and makes visible incongruous death-making techniques for wild urban animals. Cats resist by living, and by opening up questions about the public's unequal concern for the various techniques used to manage and render nonhuman life killable. Cats gassed by wildlife trappers forces a reconsideration of the ethical and political negotiations that resulted in increased legal protections of their shelter counterparts.

Is public outrage over the gassing of cats enough to force a public debate about the legal gassing of other urban-dwelling nonhumans? Is it possible to find a way to escape the legacies of the LRASA, where making one life live ignores the potential for shared

vulnerabilities when other life is made die? Perhaps by addressing unequal human tolerance for living with nonhumans we can move toward more congruous and humane practices of coexistence.

Notes

1. The concept of the apparatus is not static (Foucault, 1980; Grove, 2013). This paper is not arguing that there is one set of consistent industry standards that result in clones of such a situation in other large urban shelters using TNR programs. This paper argues there is a trend toward pet sheltering management techniques focused on furthering a politically driven agenda of increasing live release numbers, and these techniques and practices are not apolitical, as they are often represented in veterinary science.
2. This paper employs the term 'pet' to distinguish from the specific conceptual use of 'companion' as developed by Haraway (2008). Additionally, Srinivasan (2013) makes a noteworthy argument for the duality of *pets* that are recast as *pest* depending on custody or space.
3. 'Vulnerability' is central to this paper and builds on Tsing's (2015) use related to precarity. She argues the need to think through vulnerability and the problem of precarious survival, and states '[p]recarity is a state of acknowledgment of our vulnerability to others. In order to survive, we need help, and help is always the service of another, with or without intent' (2015, p. 29). This case study traces nonhuman vulnerabilities when biopolitical techniques are implemented without consideration for the complex systems of power at play within the broader apparatuses of nonhuman animal management.
4. As discussed by Grove (2013), Foucault's lectures argue that power is exercised through specific techniques, and the analysis of resistance to these techniques makes visible underlying systems and strategies of power.
5. UC Davis, University of Florida, and Tufts University shelter medicine programs have produced hundreds of academic papers over the past decade, many addressing TNR-style techniques, services, and programs.
6. The use of LRASA as a concept is applied here to the specific use of TNR as a technique to increase live release rates in an urban government run shelter; however, this concept could also be applied to shelters in other regions or areas, where political concern for increased live release rates is a motivating factor.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the support of Dr. Jason Byrd, associate director of the William R. Maples Center for Forensic Medicine at University of Florida, and Lauren Martin, Esq, instructor of Animal Law, without whom this paper would never been possible. I also thank Dr. Kevin Grove for his tireless guidance, and Angelena Root, Esq and Rebecca Young for their unwavering commitment to helping me untangle these thoughts. Special thanks go to Dr. Andrea Mubi Brighenti, Dr. Andrea Pavoni, and three anonymous reviewers, without whom the clarity of these arguments would not be possible.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Notes on contributor

Jacquelyn Johnston is a PhD Student in the Global and Sociocultural Studies Department at Florida International University. Johnston spent over a decade working in nonprofit and government animal welfare organisations, earned an MBA from FIU and a MS in Veterinary Forensic Science from

University of Florida. She focuses on the political invocation of ferality in government programmes managing stray populations of dogs and cats and the arbitrary and contingent ways ferality is operationalised in animal welfare debates between domestic and wild life advocates.

ORCID

Jacquelyn Johnston  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2915-6725>

References

- Allen, M., & von Essen, E. (2018). Animal Resistors: On the Right of Resistance and Human Duties of Non-Return and Abolition. *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, 15(6), 4–30.
- Anderson, K. (1997). A walk on the wild side: A critical geography of domestication. *Progress in Human Geography*, 21(4), 463–485.
- Barua, M., & Sinha, A. (2019). Animating the urban: An ethological and geographical conversation. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 20(8), 1160–1180.
- Berkeley, E. P. (2004). *TNR past, present, and future*. Bethesda, MD: Alley Cat Allies.
- Braverman, I. (2016). *Animals, biopolitics, law: Lively legalities*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Brighenti, A. M., & Pavoni, A. (2018). Urban animals—domestic, stray, and wild: Notes from a bear repopulation project in the Alps. *Society & Animals*, 26(6), 576–597.
- Cavanagh, C. J. (2018). Political ecologies of biopower: Diversity, debates, and new frontiers of inquiry. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 25(1), 402–425.
- Colling, S. (2018). Animal agency, resistance, and escape. In A. Matsuoka & J. Sorenson (Eds.), *Critical animal studies: Towards trans-species social justice* (pp. 21–44). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield International.
- Crețan, R. (2015). Mapping protests against dog culling in post-communist Romania. *Area*, 47(2), 155–165.
- Dayan, C. (2015). *With dogs at the edge of life*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- De Mello, M. (2016). *Mourning animals: Rituals and practices surrounding animal death*. Lansing, Michigan: MSU Press.
- Despret, V. (2016). *What would animals say if we asked the right questions?* (Vol. 38). Minneapolis, MN: U of Minnesota Press.
- Fitzgerald, A. J. (2010). A social history of the slaughterhouse: From inception to contemporary implications. *Human Ecology Review*, 17(1), 58–69.
- Foucault, M. (1980). The confession of the flesh. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1977* (pp. 194–228). New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Grove, K. (2013). Biopolitics. In C. Death (Ed.), *Critical environmental politics* (p. 22). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Guenther, K. M. (2017). Volunteers' power and resistance in the Struggle for shelter animal Survival. *Sociological Forum*, 32(4), 770–792.
- Haraway, D. J. (2008). *When species meet* (Vol. 3). Minneapolis, MN: U of Minnesota Press.
- Head, L. (2016). *Hope and grief in the anthropocene: Re-conceptualising human–nature relations*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Holmberg, T. (2015). *Urban animals: Crowding in zoocities*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Howell, P. (2015). *At home and astray: The domestic dog in victorian Britain*. Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia Press.
- Janda, R., & Lehun, R. (2016). The conflict of human and nonhuman laws. In I. Braverman (Ed.), *Animals, biopolitics, law: Lively legalities* (pp. 175–192). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Levy, J. K., Isaza, N. M., & Scott, K. C. (2014). Effect of high-impact targeted trap-neuter-return and adoption of community cats on cat intake to a shelter. *The Veterinary Journal*, 201(3), 269–274.
- Lorimer, J. (2015). *Wildlife in the Anthropocene: Conservation after nature*. Minneapolis, MN: U of Minnesota Press.

- Lynch, M. J. (2019). To protect and kill: US fish and wildlife service's management of human–wildlife conflict, 1996–2011. *Society & Animals*, 27(2), 174–196.
- Marris, E. (2013). *Rambunctious garden: Saving nature in a post-wild world*. London, UK: Bloomsbury Publishing USA.
- Nagy, K., & Johnson, P. D., II. (2013). *Trash animals: How we live with nature's filthy, feral, invasive, and unwanted species*. Minneapolis, MN: U of Minnesota Press.
- Neumann, R. P. (1998). *Imposing wilderness: Struggles over livelihood and nature preservation in Africa* (Vol. 4). Berkeley, CA: Univ of California Press.
- Philo, C. (1998). Animals, geography, and the city: Notes on inclusions and exclusions. In J. R. Wolch & J. Emel (Eds.), *Animal geographies: Place, politics, and identity in the nature-culture borderlands* (pp. 51–71). New York, NY: Verso.
- Povinelli, E. A. (2006). *The empire of love*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ruddick, S. M. (2017). Rethinking the subject, reimagining worlds. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 7(2), 119–139.
- Rupprecht, C. D. (2017). Ready for more-than-human? Measuring urban residents' willingness to coexist with animals. *Fennia-International Journal of Geography*, 195(2), 142–160.
- Spehar, D., & Wolf, P. (2018). The impact of an integrated program of return-to-field and targeted trap-neuter-return on feline intake and euthanasia at a municipal animal shelter. *Animals*, 8(55), 1–14.
- Srinivasan, K. (2013). The biopolitics of animal being and welfare: Dog control and care in the UK and India. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 38(1), 106–119.
- Srinivasan, K. (2014). Caring for the collective: Biopower and agential subjectification in wildlife conservation. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 32(3), 501–517.
- Thierman, S. (2010). Apparatuses of animality: Foucault goes to a slaughterhouse. *Foucault Studies*, 9, 89–110.
- Tsing, A. L. (2015). *The mushroom at the end of the world: On the possibility of life in capitalist ruins*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Underwood, W., Leary, S. L., Anthony, R., Cartner, S., Corey, D., Grandin, T., ... Meyer, R. (2013). *AVMA guidelines for the euthanasia of animals: 2013 edition*. Schaumburg, IL: American Veterinary Medical Association.
- Van Patter, L. E., & Hovorka, A. J. (2018). 'Of place'or 'of people': Exploring the animal spaces and beastly places of feral cats in Southern Ontario. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 19(2), 275–295.
- Wolch, J. (1998). Zoopolis. In J. R. Wolch & J. Emel (Eds.), *Animal geographies: Place, politics, and identity in the nature-culture borderlands* (pp. 119–138). New York, NY: Verso.