



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Why look at taxidermy animals? Exhibiting, curating and mourning the Sixth Mass Extinction Event*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/167244/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

O'Key, D [orcid.org/0000-0002-2833-4999](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2833-4999) (2021) Why look at taxidermy animals? Exhibiting, curating and mourning the Sixth Mass Extinction Event. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 27 (6). pp. 635-653. ISSN 1352-7258

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2020.1844276>

---

© 2020 Dominic O'Key. This is an author produced version of an article published in *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>



**Why Look at Taxidermy Animals? Exhibiting, Curating and Mourning the Sixth Mass Extinction Event**

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Heritage Studies</i>
Manuscript ID	RJHS-2020-0290.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Natural history, Critical heritage, Extinction, Taxidermy, Posthumanism

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4 **Why Look at Taxidermy Animals? Exhibiting, Curating and Mourning the**  
5 **Sixth Mass Extinction Event**  
6  
7

8  
9 Dominic O'Key

10  
11 *School of Philosophy, Religion and History of Science, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK*

12  
13  
14 Email: [d.e.okey@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:d.e.okey@leeds.ac.uk)

15  
16  
17 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2833-4999>  
18

19  
20 Notes on Contributor: Dominic O'Key is a Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the University of  
21 Leeds. His current research explores the cultural meanings of the Sixth Extinction in museums,  
22 heritage, critical theory and contemporary literature. His writing has appeared in journals such as  
23 *parallax* (2019) and *LIT: Literature, Interpretation, Theory* (2020), and in books such as *Animal*  
24 *Biography* (Palgrave, 2018), *Texts, Animals, Environments* (Rombach, 2019) and *Literature and*  
25 *Meat Since 1900* (Palgrave, 2019). He is currently writing a monograph about contemporary  
26 literature and human-animal relations, due for publication with Bloomsbury in 2021.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Abstract

What role do museums play in elevating the Sixth Mass Extinction Event within public consciousness? How is an increasing awareness of human-made extinctions and global biodiversity loss transforming the representational techniques employed by natural history curators? And what are the prevailing ideologies and emotional registers of contemporary exhibitions about anthropogenic extinctions? This essay answers these questions by analysing recent natural history exhibitions which explore and communicate the Sixth Extinction through the affects of grief, loss and sadness. By unfolding a tripartite analysis, one which brings together natural history curatorial practices, theoretical critique from critical heritage studies and environmental humanities, *and* anti-institutional activists such as Extinction Rebellion, I make the argument that while these exhibitions have the potential to develop posthumanist practices of curation that disrupt the dominant anthroponormativity of natural history, there remain unresolved questions surrounding their representational reliance on mourning.

Keywords: Natural history; Critical heritage; Extinction; Posthumanism; Taxidermy

## Why Look at Taxidermy Animals? Exhibiting, Curating and Mourning the Sixth Mass Extinction Event

### Introduction

How to engage in world making across species? How to work toward world making that enhances the lives of others? And how to do all this in the time of extinctions, knowing, as we must, that we are living amidst the ruination of others?

—Deborah Bird Rose, *Wild Dog Dreaming* (2011, 51)

What role do museums play in elevating the Sixth Mass Extinction Event within public consciousness? How is an increasing awareness of human-made extinctions and global biodiversity loss transforming the representational techniques employed by natural history curators? And what are the prevailing ideologies and emotional registers of contemporary exhibitions about anthropogenic extinctions? In Autumn 2019, Bristol Museum in the UK offered a small but noteworthy response to these questions. In ‘Extinction Voices’, the museum re-presented and hence re-imagined its permanent World Wildlife Gallery. Ordinarily, the Gallery presents tens of the museum’s taxidermic specimens in glass display units, offering contextual information such as taxonomic categorisations and dates of donation. But for ‘Extinction Voices’, the museum’s staff – led by senior curator Isla Gladstone – sought to repurpose their existing collections in order to foreground wildlife endangerment. To do so, the museum’s curators carefully shrouded thirty-two of the gallery’s displayed animals in black veils. The shrouded animals were labelled with strung tags stating in bold font whether the corresponding species, metonymically represented by the individual animal on display, is listed as vulnerable, endangered, critically endangered or extinct, according to the IUCN’s Red List (International Union for the Conservation of Nature). As the taxidermy rhino, tiger, giraffe,

1  
2  
3 chimpanzee, kākāpō and koala became partially obscured from public view, the museum's  
4 atmosphere was temporarily transformed. What was once a wildlife gallery that replicated many  
5 of the longstanding representational strategies of natural history exhibitions – taxidermy  
6 specimens presented in display cases in naturalistic and action poses – now stood as a sombre,  
7 contemplative, even funereal space. Through the installation of black veils, Bristol's curators  
8 deliberately obscured what Rachel Poliquin has described as taxidermy's 'captured liveliness'  
9 (2012, 50), depicting the museum's individual animals as if they were mourning for their  
10 species. But they also implicitly called on the exhibition's visitors to mourn with and for  
11 endangered and extinct wildlife. In a time of increasing public consciousness about climate  
12 change and its interrelation with extinction, 'Extinction Voices' reimagines the kinds of  
13 spectacle usually promised by natural history displays.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 In recent years, many museums in the global north have variously embraced, allowed,  
24 acquiesced to and paid lip service to contemporary demands and debates surrounding  
25 decolonisation and climate change (Newell et al. 2017; Giblin et al. 2019). These crucial  
26 conversations have been somewhat less prevalent within natural history museums and collections  
27 (Das and Lowe 2018), in which 'natural' objects have tended to stand as naturalised and thereby  
28 neutralised specimens without a history or politics. Bristol Museum is something of an outlier,  
29 then. But that does not mean that it is alone in its curatorial rethinking of the assumed  
30 representational strategies of natural history galleries. In fact, there is what we might call a first  
31 wave of critical exhibitions on extinction that display extinction not simply as 'natural' history,  
32 but as a historical feature of specific social relations and economic modes of production that  
33 requires urgent public attention. This includes museums in London, Paris and Cambridge,  
34 Massachusetts, that I will be discussing below, as well as others such as the National Museum of  
35 Scotland, National Museum of Australia, and the Smithsonian National Museum of Natural  
36 History. Cognisant of the notion that we are living through the Sixth Extinction, a human- or,  
37 better, capitalist-produced mass extinction event which threatens to diminish as much as half of  
38 the planet's flora and fauna by this century's end (Barnofsky et al 2011; Kingsford et al 2019;  
39 Kolbert 2014), these curatorial interventions exhibit their collections in new ways in order to  
40 foreground the specific *anthropogenic* roots of recent and ongoing extinctions.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In this essay, I wish to bring critical heritage studies into conversation with the  
4 environmental humanities in order to think about the particular ways in which natural history  
5 museums and exhibitions are communicating the Sixth Extinction to their visiting publics. By  
6 exploring Bristol Museum's 'Extinction Voices', and by juxtaposing its curatorial decisions with  
7 other collections-based exhibitions in the global north, I seek to build two main arguments. First,  
8 I will argue that while natural history museums have predominantly trained and reproduced the  
9 habitus of anthropocentrism, what Donna Haraway calls 'the fantasy of human exceptionalism'  
10 (2008, 11), critical curation about extinction has the potential to unsettle anthropocentrism by  
11 fostering an ethic of care, stewardship and responsibility beyond the human. My contention is  
12 that the development of more-than-human or *posthumanist* curatorial practices promises not  
13 simply to transform the abiding anthroponormative gaze of natural history – a gaze which  
14 affirms the norms of human superiority – but to also offer an institutional coming-to-terms-with  
15 extinction, in which museums confront their own historic complicities with mass extinction.  
16  
17 Second, I will argue that those galleries and curators that *do* engage with anthropogenic  
18 extinction tend to do so mournfully, through the affective register, resonances and rituals of grief  
19 and loss. While mourning is a powerful tool for capturing imagination and drawing attention to  
20 extinction, I suggest that there remain a number of questions that require further scrutiny: what is  
21 at stake, ethically and politically, when extinction is exhibited as a primarily mournful  
22 phenomenon? What does it mean to be invited to mourn nonhuman extinctions within natural  
23 history spaces? And to what extent might a curatorial reliance on eco-mourning, which positions  
24 loss as the most appropriate emotional response to extinction, also generate new problems or  
25 limitations that require critical attention? In other words, what is the political unconscious of  
26 exhibiting extinction mournfully?  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 At one level, then, this essay analyses contemporary curatorial practices of exhibiting  
45 anthropogenic extinction. In doing so, it traces what limits and possibilities there are for heritage,  
46 'as a series of contingent and emergent modes of caring for, valuing, and assuming an ethical  
47 stance toward the future' (Harrison 2015, 39), to develop new non-anthropocentric modes of  
48 conservation and display. But by asking these questions I also want to stage a broader theoretical  
49 intervention into the prevailing cultural meanings of the Sixth Extinction. For it is not just in this  
50 first wave of critical natural history exhibitions that extinction is displayed as a fundamentally  
51 mournful phenomenon. In the environmental humanities, too, scholars have so overwhelmingly  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 approached mourning through the lenses of grief, sadness and loss that many recent publications  
4 have attempted to reconceive extinction through positivity, joy and irreverence. In the final part  
5 of this essay, then, I bring together curatorial and institutional practices, theoretical critique from  
6 critical heritage studies and environmental discourses, *and* anti-institutional publics,  
7 communities, coalitions and groupings in order to unsettle the apparent oppositions between  
8 seriousness and play, mourning and joy, that pervade both museum spaces and scholarly  
9 discussions of the Sixth Extinction. At stake in this discussion is nothing less than the  
10 relationship between heritage and biodiversity, and thereby a rethinking of the responsibilities of  
11 public institutions in a warming world. Anthropogenic extinctions are, as Ashley Dawson puts it,  
12 ‘an under-acknowledged form – and cause – of the contemporary environmental crisis’ (2016,  
13 9). In order to engage responsibly with ecological collapse, museums must develop new  
14 approaches for communicating extinction.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

### 27 **Why Look at Taxidermy Animals?**

28  
29 I want to begin by asking: Why look at animals in our ‘time of extinctions’ (Rose et al 2017, 2)?  
30 What is at stake in the natural history museum, as a space of traditionally optical engagement,  
31 when visiting publics look at the taxidermy specimens of critically endangered or extinct  
32 animals? These questions recall the title of John Berger’s influential essay ‘Why Look at  
33 Animals?’, a polemic which usefully and provocatively frames any discussion of what it means  
34 to see animals. Published in *About Looking* (1980), a collection of essays that continued Berger’s  
35 political-aesthetic project of ‘critical seeing’ (Sperling 2018, 189), ‘Why Look at Animals?’ is a  
36 touchstone for making sense of how capitalist modernity transforms human-animal relations.  
37 From nineteenth-century industrialisations up to the period of late-twentieth-century ‘corporate  
38 capitalism’ (2009, 3) from which Berger was writing, capitalist modernity reorganises the social  
39 relations between humans and other animals, breaking the social and spiritual community  
40 between ‘man and nature’ (Berger 2009, 3). ‘Before this rupture’, Berger writes, ‘animals  
41 constituted the first circle of what surrounded man’ (2009, 3), even serving a ‘magical function’  
42 within pre-capitalist imaginaries as ‘messengers and promises’ (2009, 4). Yet after this rupture,  
43 ‘in the last two centuries, animals have gradually disappeared. Today we live without them’  
44 (2009, 11). Yes, Berger writes, animals were slaughtered in older civilisations. But this was  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 permissible because these communities still regarded animals with an imaginative and animistic  
4 generosity. In pre-capitalist life, Berger says, ‘a power is ascribed to the animal, comparable with  
5 human power but never coinciding with it. The animal has secrets’ (2009, 5). Today, though,  
6 because capitalism creates an ‘ecological rift’ (Foster et al. 2010) between humanity and nature,  
7 this intimacy has been destroyed. Animals have now been systemically ‘marginalised’ within the  
8 ‘theoretical as well as economic’ domains (Berger 2009, 13).  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14 Despite Berger’s insistence on the marginalisation of animals in modernity, he also  
15 presents animals’ disappearance as contradictory. As a writer who remained indebted to Marxist  
16 dialectics, Berger foregrounds the idea that modern animals find themselves concomitantly  
17 extinguished *and* exhibited, destroyed *and* preserved, killed *and* conserved. ‘Everywhere animals  
18 disappear’ (2009, 26), but they also paradoxically ‘multiply’ (2009, 14) because they have been  
19 commodified, ‘co-opted into the *family* and into the *spectacle*’ (2009, 15). Berger speaks of  
20 household pets, animal toys and Beatrix Potter cartoons as symbolic appropriations of animals –  
21 as infantile humanisations – that disastrously obscure their nonhumanity, their otherness. If he  
22 were writing today, Berger may well argue that the conservation tourist industry and  
23 documentary series such as *Planet Earth* similarly fold together family and spectacle in ways  
24 that intensify the simultaneous multiplication and marginalisation of animal life. When Berger  
25 speaks of animals’ disappearance from human life, then, he is speaking about how capitalism  
26 alienates human-nonhuman bonds.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37  
38 Beginning an essay on museums and the environmental humanities with Berger’s  
39 analysis of zoo animals may appear counterintuitive. Indeed, ‘Why Look at Animals?’ does not  
40 address natural history collections or museum spaces, nor is it readily cited within the literature  
41 of extinction and multispecies studies that I will later address. But Berger’s arguments are  
42 nonetheless crucial because they lay the groundwork for a critical understanding of the museum  
43 as a product of modernity, that is, as a social institution birthed out of – and to this day still  
44 negotiating – the seemingly irreconcilable contradictions between destruction and preservation,  
45 extinction and exhibition. Indeed, Berger’s analysis of the modern public zoo, as ‘another kind of  
46 museum’ (2009, 21), is especially illuminating in this regard. For Berger, the zoo is a site of  
47 inauthentic interspecies encounters that, more than any other public institution, testifies to the  
48 disappearance of animal life. Zoos are ‘endorsements of modern colonial power’, he writes, that  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 capture and display animals as ‘a symbolic representation of the conquest of all distant and  
4 exotic lands’ (2009, 21). Because of this, the zoo stands not as a form of ‘compensatory’ (2009,  
5 26) apologia to the planet’s dwindling wildlife, but as a ‘demonstration’ of capitalism’s  
6 ‘remorseless’ marginalisation of nature (2009, 26). Thus Berger writes that zoo animals  
7  
8 ‘constitute the living monument to their own disappearance’ (2009, 26):  
9

10  
11  
12 Public zoos came into existence at the beginning of the period which was to see the disappearance  
13 of animals from daily life. The zoo to which people go to meet animals, to observe them, to see  
14 them, is, in fact, a monument to the impossibility of such encounters. (2009, 21)  
15  
16

17  
18 For Berger, the zoo invites human visitors to encounter living animals face-to-face. Yet these  
19 animals are deadened by their physical imprisonment, and appear to visitors as no more than  
20 zombified representatives of a declining species, as what Theodor Adorno described as  
21 ‘allegories of the specimen or the pair who defy the disaster that befalls the species *qua* species’  
22 (2005, 115). This is compounded by the fact that modern zoos claim an ‘independent and civic  
23 function’ in society, cultivating an image of themselves as ‘another kind of museum, whose  
24 purpose was to further knowledge and public enlightenment’ (2009, 21).  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 From Berger’s analysis of the zoo, we can develop a critical awareness of the optical  
32 regimes of natural history exhibitions, which abide by what Lynn Nyhart calls a ‘dual  
33 arrangement’ of spatial organisation, coupling a limited set of displays aimed at the general  
34 public with a much larger collection available only to researchers (2009, 200). If zoo animals are  
35 the living dead, then taxidermy animals might be described as the lively double dead, having  
36 been mastered and revived in death – shaped, contorted, animated and displayed – in such a way  
37 that cultivates another form of optical mastery. Jacques Derrida calls this kind of optical  
38 sovereignty the ‘autopsic gaze’, as it ‘inspects, sees, looks at’ and altogether ‘neutralises’ the life  
39 and force of the animal, transforming an active subject into a passive object (2009, 296).  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 Elsewhere, Donna Haraway’s foundational essays on the dioramas of the American Museum of  
47 Natural History clarify how museums have privileged the eye as the ‘critical organ’ of encounter  
48 (1989, 29). The museum’s halls and display units function as visual technologies that inculcate  
49 and reward an anthropocentric gaze of patriarchal mastery. Haraway shows how the practice of  
50 taxidermy in particular seeks to ‘produce permanence, arrest decay’ (1989, 55), and is driven by  
51 a desire ‘to represent, to be whole; it is a politics of reproduction (1989, 30).  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Taxidermy is not a fixed phenomenon with fixed meanings. As an organised craft and  
4 technology of artifice, taxidermy has undergone major transformations across modernity: from  
5 the early natural history curiosities of the Wunderkammer, to the building of encyclopaedic  
6 collections, to the post-war professionalisation of natural history heritage and an attendant  
7 natural sciences shift from taxonomy to ecology, to today's focus on the conservation of species  
8 and their habitats (Andrews 2013). If in the past taxidermy pertained to a form of natural  
9 authenticity and a myth of pristine nature, today natural history museums have to varying  
10 degrees attempted to reclaim authenticity by drawing attention to both the inauthenticity of  
11 taxidermy and the entanglement of humans and nature. Despite declining in popularity across the  
12 twentieth century, numerous genres of taxidermic practice still abide today, including hunting  
13 trophies and rugs, fashion accessories, preserved pets, and cryptozoological specimens. But these  
14 distinct styles and articulations are unified, Rachel Poliquin reminds us, by a 'melancholic aura'  
15 that is emitted by the 'unsettling fusion of animal form and human longing' (2012, 218). In the  
16 museum space, taxidermy animals stand as witnesses to natural history's relationship with  
17 anthropogenic extinction: at once a cause and a symptom of species loss, yet also an alarm bell  
18 for and bulwark against it. The transforming spectacles of nature developed in natural history  
19 museums thus testifies to how interspecies relations have changed in modernity.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 'Why Look at Animals?' is a foundational but disputed text. Berger's critique of  
34 capitalist alienation helps make sense of the profound changes to interspecies life in modernity.  
35 Moreover, the essay offers a powerful reminder that humans and animals live side by side,  
36 sharing a planet, and that any attempt to arrest capitalist alienation must include a recovery of  
37 human-animal relations. Yet Berger's arguments ultimately rely on an uncritical elevation of pre-  
38 capitalist multispecies relations, a fuzzy periodisation of modernity, and euphemistic  
39 articulations of 'marginalisation' and 'disappearance' that mystify the bloody putting-to-death of  
40 animals in the world's industrialised slaughterhouses. What's more, Berger's argument valorises  
41 linguistic signifiers over and above visual ones. As Jonathan Burt puts it, Berger's underlying  
42 hypothesis that 'real' animals have been displaced by images of animals leads him to adopt an  
43 'anti-imagist' (2005, 206) attitude which abandons the very dialectics of the gaze he seeks to  
44 address. Anat Pick, building on Burt's criticisms, adds that Berger's anti-imagist position risks  
45 an 'extinctionist impulse that desires the end of images, or even the end of the debased modern  
46 animal' (Pick 2015, n.p.). Because Berger rebukes modernity for its appropriation of animal  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 images, and because he yearns to recover a pre-capitalist human-animal bond, he cannot imagine  
4 a future reconciliation of modernity's paradoxical extinction and conservation of nonhuman life.  
5 He does not attempt to rescue animal images, nor read them against the grain; the visualised  
6 animal is, for him, 'irredeemable' (Berger 2009, 28). Berger's dialectical thought therefore  
7 disappears alongside the very animals he describes. As Burt points out, the period of modernity  
8 that Berger talks about is also the period in which animals started to become the recipients of  
9 welfare and rights in philosophical and political thought, as well as in legislation. Thus  
10 modernity's transformation of human-animal relations, even if it entails 'a shift from an  
11 integrated relationship to an alienated one between human and animal', also brings about a  
12 countervailing force: 'the beginning of the institutionalisation of animal-centred issues' (Burt  
13 2005, 212) in welfarist and rights movements.

14  
15 By bringing together Berger and his critics, we can develop a more complex  
16 understanding of looking at taxidermy animals in a time of extinction, one which questions the  
17 autopsic and anthropocentric gaze while also cultivating other modes of attentive looking. As  
18 Pick puts it, 'the sheer diversity and complexity of animal imagery suggests that modes of  
19 looking, seeing, and recognition are possible that reconfigure the connections between visibility  
20 and ethics in favour of animals' (2015, n.p.). Berger's polemic, with its focus on ruptures and  
21 breaks, forecloses the possibility of seeing animals in modernity. But there are possibilities for  
22 human-animal encounters, immanent to modernity, that are worth fostering and fighting for.  
23 Some of these opportunities might well be realised within the museum space.

24  
25 What, then, are the modes of critical looking and seeing that we might expect from  
26 contemporary natural history exhibitions on anthropogenic extinction? Pick's essay analyses  
27 surveillance and tracking technologies that render endangered animals permanently visible to  
28 human spectators. Under this optical regime of totalising visibility, Pick writes, 'the possibility  
29 of *not-seeing* emerges as a more progressive modality of relation to animals', as it foregrounds  
30 'the mundane, civic notion of animal privacy that denies human eyes and their technological  
31 proxies unlimited access' (Pick 2015, n.p.). Something similar is at play in Bristol Museum's  
32 'Extinction Voices'. Although the exhibition's black veils intended to usher in a sombre  
33 atmosphere into the museum space, they also obscure the viewer's gaze, thus breaking the very  
34 expectations and traditions of sovereign seeing that the museum space so heavily relies upon.

1  
2  
3 The feminist art historian Griselda Pollock has argued that, in museums, ‘knowing,  
4 seeing, visually mastering, leaves the viewer centered and disembodied in a perfect fantasy’  
5 (2007, 13). ‘Extinction Voices’, in contrast, offers visitors the opportunity to not-see, thus  
6 breaking this fantasy of abstraction. In fact, the exhibition develops a representational strategy of  
7 non-representation which makes extinction visible by disrupting the autopsic gaze. By not-seeing  
8 the museum’s taxidermy animals, the viewer comes to see extinction all the more clearly. This  
9 non-representational tactic, which defamiliarises the museum’s staging of nature by  
10 denaturalising taxidermy, is strengthened by its juxtaposition with the rest of the museum, which  
11 remained the same. It also invites its visitors to situate themselves within the story of  
12 anthropogenic encroachment, displacement, endangerment and extinction. Entering the  
13 exhibition, the visitor encounters wall text that reads: ‘One million species are threatened with  
14 extinction because of humans – many within decades.’ ‘Look around this gallery. The covered  
15 animals are at high to extreme risk of dying out. Some are extinct already. They have no voice  
16 for their futures. But we can use ours.’ This frames the visitor not as a disembodied spectator  
17 who is disconnected from extinction, but instead as an actor or agent. The animals are veiled, the  
18 exhibition implies, because its visitors are all too responsible for nonhuman extinctions.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 This curatorial approach contains risks. By placing the burden of mass extinction on the  
32 individual visitor, and universalising them as a member of “humanity,” the exhibition  
33 problematically obscures the stark differences in scale between, say, the average museum  
34 visitor’s levels of consumption and pollution and that of extractive industries and their  
35 shareholders, whose impacts and responsibility dwarf that of any individual. Yet the exhibition’s  
36 universalising gesture also raises a painful truth: whether the museum’s visitors are responsible  
37 or not, they all stand to share or inherit a future planet impoverished by the loss of mass  
38 extinction.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

### 48 **Towards a Posthumanist Museum?**

49

50  
51 In recent years, museologists and critical heritage scholars have urged museums to rethink the  
52 prevailing assumption that they must remain a supposedly neutral zone of scientific and  
53 educational inquiry free from any commitments that may be deemed political. Robert R. Janes,  
54 for example, has developed a wide-ranging critique of the sector’s ‘fallacy of authoritative  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 neutrality' (2009, 59). For him, the contemporary world stands at a crossroads. The prevailing  
4 economic ideology of limitless growth has not only produced severe inequalities between and  
5 within societies, but has also exacerbated the plight of indigenous peoples and sharpened a major  
6 crisis in biodiversity. Museums have an important role to play in the future health of the planet.  
7  
8 As social institutions that are publicly owned, and as spaces with deep organisational histories  
9 that 'share a common body of knowledge, theory and methods' (2009, 14), museums are  
10 perfectly placed to develop methods and practices for 'advancing the collective good' (2009, 21).  
11  
12 However, the dominant mindset of boards of trustees and individual curators is that museums  
13 must protect their 'authority and respect by remaining aloof from activities that entail competing  
14 views and values' (2009, 57). The consequence of which is that museums have by and large  
15 'eschewed on both moral and practical grounds a broader commitment to the world in which  
16 they operate' (2009, 13). But due to privatisations and funding cuts, museums are increasingly  
17 run, or at least majority-funded, by corporations who are themselves special interest groups  
18 (2009, 59). By committing to "neutrality", museums commit themselves to the status quo, tacitly  
19 endorsing the very governments and corporations who drive today's deepening social inequities  
20 and biodiversity crises.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 For as long as the museum is positioned as a neutral arbiter and communicator of  
33 scientific facts, it will be difficult to fully acknowledge the institution's 'delicate, and often  
34 unstable, position in wider arrays of social influence, political power, commercial transaction,  
35 and cultural controversy' (Cameron 2015, 2). Indeed, this supposed institutional neutrality is  
36 rendered nonsensical by the realities of climate collapse and mass extinction, the scale and  
37 urgency of which demand new forms of advocacy and risk-taking. In place of authoritative  
38 neutrality, then, Janes calls for museums to foster purposeful stewardship (2009, 24), by which  
39 he means 'personal and organizational responsibility for the long-term care of public resources'  
40 (2009, 27). On first look, 'purposeful stewardship' sounds unobjectionable; which museums do  
41 not see themselves as stewards? But the point, Janes argues, is to build a form of committed  
42 stewardship that stands against the thoroughgoing erosion of planetary stewardship in recent  
43 years, from indigenous language loss to mass nonhuman extinctions. This global decline of  
44 stewardship is owed in large part to the dogma of economic growth, as well as to the  
45 philosophical dualisms and modes of instrumental realism that construct a norm of human  
46 exceptionalism, in which nature exists only 'to serve the interests of human beings, and that we  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 as humans, have dominion over the plants and animals' (2009, 53). Against the dominant model  
4 of anthroponormative capitalism, then, in which nature has been cheapened, yanked into  
5 'processes of exchange and profit, denominated and controlled' (Moore and Patel 2018, 48), the  
6 museum must now stand as a steward of life liberated from profit.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Museums will never solve these global problems alone. Indeed the sector currently stands  
12 in a historically weak position. In the UK context specifically, in the wake of the 2008 financial  
13 crash and the ensuing years of austerity economics, museums have seen dramatic cuts to their  
14 direct funding (Harvey 2016). A decade of austerity has seen a 40% reduction in local cultural  
15 spending (Stevens 2019), and many UK museums have courted wealthy donors in order to  
16 'diversify' their income (Neate 2019). A survey of 34 UK museums revealed a 35% decline of  
17 natural science curators in the past 10 years (Mulhearn 2013). Even before these years of  
18 austerity, Griselda Pollock and Joyce Zemans questioned the ways in which the museum was  
19 facing deep institutional crises: 'What has the museum become? What can the museum be now?  
20 What forces are directing its ever-increasing symbolic capital at the same time as it becomes less  
21 and less a public forum?' (2007, xxiv). Taking an even longer view, the historical trajectory of  
22 the museum can be narrated as a story of rise and fall: 'Museums have evolved through time',  
23 Janes writes, 'from the elite collections of imperial dominance, to educational institutions for the  
24 public, and now to the museum as "mall"' (2009, 183), at worst an appendage to consumer  
25 culture increasingly preoccupied with metrics and vanity architecture. Indeed as museums and  
26 natural history collections have come to play a more prominent role in the tourist and leisure  
27 industry, 'taxidermy objects have increasingly been used to provide audiences with  
28 "experiences" over more traditional and pedagogic encounters with natural science collections'  
29 (Andrews 2013, 30). Natural history heritage has itself been absorbed into the consumer  
30 ideologies of late capitalism.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 Despite these historic shocks to the sector, in fact we might even say *because* of them,  
47 museums have been called upon to cultivate what Judith Mastai terms 'a new institutional  
48 subjectivity' (quoted in Pollock and Zemans 2007, 30). This is especially pertinent in the context  
49 of climate collapse, an event that 'guides us to the very limits of the museum form' and troubles  
50 the very 'boundaries of the museum as well as its internal workings, structures and governance  
51 processes' (Cameron and Neilson 2015, 5). Steve Lyon and Kai Bosworth, elaborating what this  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 new institutional subjectivity might look like, propose that it is incumbent on natural history  
4 museums especially to ‘act as protectors of shared knowledge in the commons, educating publics  
5 about climate change, [while also offering] infrastructural support for grassroots activist  
6 organisation’ (2019, 175). Focusing on the ‘Natural History Museum’, a travelling museum  
7 created by the New York-based art and activist collective Not An Alternative, Lyon and  
8 Bosworth showcase how the NHM’s public programs transform museum practices. By  
9 highlighting the social and political character of nature, the NHM connects grassroots social  
10 movements to political struggles that centre around environmental injustice. If at their worst  
11 museums present climate change as an outcome of individual consumer habits or population  
12 growth, then at their best museums would foreground the economic and political forces that  
13 hasten environmental destruction, while also welcoming community-led activists within the  
14 institution itself.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Natural history museums are already in a strong position to contribute to the environmental movement. By connecting ‘movements to museums and museums to movements’, Lyon and Bosworth write, there can be ‘a growing coalition of museum workers, activist scientists, and front-line communities in order to lay the foundation for what we term the *museum for the commons*’ (2019, 175; their emphasis). The future natural history museum could thus be an educator, an advocate and an infrastructural hub for necessary environmental struggle. This would go some way to meeting the task set by Pollock and Zemans, who call for museums to become a ‘critical site of public debate distinct from the museum as privileged manager or professionalized administrator of cultural heritage, authorizing selective stories and formalized pasts’ (2007, xx). Despite cuts, museums still hold the required resources and public trust ‘to invent a new future for themselves and their communities, or at least help create an image of a desirable future—the essential first step in its realization. Museums are uniquely positioned to do so, with their mix of humanism, science, time-depth and societal respect’ (Janes and Sandell 2019, 17).

But if natural history museums are to face the challenges of the twenty-first century then it will also be important to critically interrogate the very ‘humanism’ that Janes highlights as an asset. By saying this, I do not mean to bulldoze over a complex history of intellectual thought, caricaturing humanism as a unified discourse that is equivalent with human exceptionalism. Nor



1  
2  
3 do I want to suggest that Janes himself adopts an uncritical definition of humanism. In fact, Janes  
4 builds his arguments for planetary stewardship on the idea that ‘nature does not belong to us’  
5 (2009, 53). Instead, I mean to argue that if natural history museums, as people-focused  
6 institutions, continue to see themselves as humanistic institutions, then they must develop forms  
7 of engagement that are vigilant about the premises, histories, assumptions and limits of this  
8 humanism. Indeed, any humanism worthy of the name should be *posthumanist*, insofar as it  
9 interrogates ‘that thing called “the human” with *greater* specificity, *greater* attention’ (Wolfe  
10 2010, 120; his emphasis). Posthumanism, according to Cary Wolfe, does not mean leaving  
11 behind the human, whether as species or subject. Neither does it seek to abandon the many  
12 advances of humanist thought. Rather, it names a mode of critical inquiry which questions the  
13 normative subjectivities and ‘fantasies of disembodiment and autonomy’ that have been  
14 ‘inherited from humanism itself’ (Wolfe 2010, xv). In other words, posthumanism tackles the  
15 contradictions of an Enlightenment humanism forged alongside capitalist and colonial  
16 expansion, a tradition which elevated a sense of autonomous personhood while also denigrating  
17 many of the planet’s other peoples, both human and nonhuman. My contention, then, is that  
18 museums should look to develop posthumanist practices and communities.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 What might posthumanism mean for heritage practices? Can we imagine a posthumanist  
32 natural history gallery that transforms the anthroponormative gaze, offering visitors the  
33 opportunity to look at animals differently? Recently, there have been a growing number of  
34 contributions to heritage studies from a broadly posthumanist angle (e.g. Fredengren 2015;  
35 Harrison 2015; DeSilvey 2017). The most pertinent intervention for my purposes comes from  
36 Colin Sterling, whose carefully argued essay evaluates whether the posthumanities offers  
37 ‘analytically insightful and socio-politically transformative’ (2020, 3) avenues for future  
38 heritage. Sterling identifies two distinct theoretical positions of posthumanist thought: after  
39 humanism, and post-anthropocentrism. He argues that while critical heritage’s attention to  
40 gender and race has already fostered powerful critiques of humanism, the question of ‘post-  
41 anthropocentrism’ raises significant challenges for heritage conservation, preservation,  
42 interpretation and care. To put it simply: how is it possible for heritage, a people-centred field, to  
43 stop centring people?  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 One way of answering this question would be to embrace the so-called new materialist  
4 strand of posthumanism and its methodological gambit to dissolve the boundaries between  
5 human and nonhuman, thus expanding our sense of ‘people’. In an entry on ‘posthuman museum  
6 practices’ (2018, 349) in Rosi Braidotti and Maria Hlavajova’s glossary of posthumanist terms,  
7 Fiona Cameron argues that museum objects are ‘actants (vital subjects)’ within an entangled  
8 world of human and nonhuman agents (2018, 351). Indebted to Bruno Latour, Maneul DeLanda  
9 and Jane Bennett, Cameron suggests that posthuman museum practices would foreground how  
10 each and every putatively static object is in fact a lively subject composed out of innumerable  
11 temporary relations and interdependencies (2018, 351). Cameron concludes that museums can  
12 foreground the ‘agentic or animated relationships we have to life’ by shifting ‘social subjectivity  
13 from the human to include the non-human world’ (2018, 352).  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 But this diversification of ontological subjectivity flattens out crucial differences and  
24 power imbalances. In its rush to hybridise and dissolve the subject/object binary, new  
25 materialism ultimately forgets the subject-object continuum, collapsing nature into culture and  
26 eliding the advantages of keeping these concepts *analytically* separate. As Colin Sterling makes  
27 clear, marshalling the critiques levelled at posthumanism by Kate Soper (2012) and Andreas  
28 Malm (2018), new materialism’s dissolution of nature and culture into naturecultures forecloses  
29 the ability to analytically differentiate and intervene (Sterling 2020, 5). Take, for example,  
30 Cameron’s principal example of posthuman practices: a charred plastic bucket, displayed in  
31 Museums Victoria, which was used to stop the spread of the 2009 ‘Black Saturday’ bushfires in  
32 Australia. Cameron argues that, as things stand, the museum’s presentation of the bucket reduces  
33 the item only to its instrumental use, a ‘static’ object that is merely ‘in the service of the human  
34 social’. Cameron calls for museums to grant ‘agential status’ (2018, 349) to the bucket, thereby  
35 creating an ‘inclusive vision of a shared world [that] has the potential to promote and enhance  
36 respect and ethical concern for diversity of both animate and inanimate things’ (2018, 352). Yet  
37 there is nothing to suggest that assigning subjectivity necessarily leads towards respect and  
38 ethical concern. And even if it did, it remains unclear what is really at stake in including this  
39 bucket within a world of acting subjects. Does it intensify or displace human responsibility? You  
40 cannot resolve entrenched anthroponormativities simply by pretending that all objects are now  
41 subjects.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 If, then, the new materialist approach comes up short, then how else might posthumanism  
4 inform heritage practices? In my view, it is important to return to posthumanism's central  
5 provocation, namely its questioning of the very implied 'human' subject who stands at the centre  
6 of heritage itself. From here, one can think of a posthumanist framework as bringing about an  
7 'ontological and epistemological' shift, dislodging 'a certain hubristic model of heritage as a  
8 human-centred project' (Sterling 2020, 3). By critically attenuating the anthropocentrism of  
9 heritage, posthumanist museum practices would look to create new ecological communities. I  
10 take this term from Mick Smith, who writes that the scale of anthropogenic extinction calls on us  
11 to reconsider our sense of community in such a way that situates the human within ecology and  
12 folds the ecological into our sense of community. For Smith, such efforts are 'ecologically  
13 posthumanist' in that they elucidate 'certain worldly possibilities that emerge from critiques of  
14 human exceptionalism and exceptionalism together' (2013, 26).

15  
16  
17 In sum, posthumanism offers a chance to develop a more-than-human sense of  
18 community with new strategies of care, preservation, responsibility, stewardship and display.  
19 More specifically, it promotes two immediate priorities for natural history museums in a time of  
20 mass extinction: to develop curatorial practices that aim to unsettle and transform the  
21 anthroponormative gaze, rather than reproducing it, and to draw attention to the museum itself as  
22 a place of extinction – as an institution which still plays a role in the story of the Sixth Mass  
23 Extinction. For if we consider natural history museums as active characters in the story of  
24 extinction, as public and research institutions which have actively sought out, commissioned and  
25 purchased nonhuman animal specimens for collection and exhibition (Poliquin 2012, 219), then  
26 we can frame posthumanist natural history as an attempt to confront historic participations in the  
27 destruction of nonhuman life. When curators re-present their existing natural history collections  
28 in order to tell the story of the Sixth Extinction, they also highlight the specific institutional  
29 histories – the people and events – that are inseparable from, and in some instances accountable  
30 for, an epoch of heightening biodiversity loss. As a kind of rigorous self-scrutiny, posthumanism  
31 promises to reimagine inheritance and stewardship beyond the human, to cultivate new modes of  
32 critical seeing between visiting subjects and exhibited objects, and all the while develop reflexive  
33 institutional engagements, in which museums work through their own troubling relationships  
34 with and responsibilities for anthropogenic extinctions.

## Exhibiting, Curating, Mourning

In an essay on eco-melancholia, Catriona Mortimer-Sandilands argues that although we are increasingly surrounded by evidence of environmental loss, there are still only a ‘few places in which to experience it *as* loss, to even begin to consider that the diminishment of life that surrounds us on a daily basis is something to be really sad about, and on a personal level’ (2010, 338). It might seem obvious that the museum is one of the few places in which environmental destruction can be experienced as loss. Yet as critical heritage scholars point out, there is nothing simple about the relationship between heritage practices and loss. There is in fact a fundamental tension between the heritage sector’s drive to conserve and prevent loss – its ‘loss aversion’ (Holtorf 2015) – and the fact that it is precisely this prospect of loss, risk and endangerment that helps produce heritage value in the first place (DeSilvey and Harrison 2018). At the same time, because heritage’s preservation practices are often framed as a battle to save objects from present endangerments, the objects themselves can be taken for granted, which thereby obscures their problematic pasts (May 2018). If these pasts are to be meaningfully thought through, then there comes a point at which ‘de-growing’ collections – re-evaluating, redistributing, re-using, reducing, and re-localising objects – is not simply a pragmatic but also an ethical practice (Morgan and Macdonald 2018). Postcolonial critiques of the museum have long argued that it is only by losing or giving up its collections gained through colonial genocides and ecocides that the museum will truly bear witness to and meaningfully work through the losses of colonialism and ecocide. For many critics, no matter how taxidermy specimens are reframed, they still stand as signs of anthropocentric mastery.

This relationship between heritage and loss is becoming even more difficult in a time of environmental change, when the entire notion of conserving for the future, so foundational to heritage, looks more and more unsustainable in a planet ravaged by declining biodiversity and rising temperatures and sea levels. In light of these profound challenges to heritage, Caitlin DeSilvey and Rodney Harrison call on natural and cultural institutions to accept the ‘inevitability of loss’, to rethink loss as a form of change, and to thereby develop new understandings of loss as ‘potentially generative and emancipatory, facilitating the emergence of new values, attachments and forms of significance’ (2020, 3). Museum exhibitions, as the frontlines of the

1  
2  
3 institution's engagement with the public, certainly offer the space to experience extinction as a  
4 personal and collective loss. How, then, can museums embrace the potentiality of loss without  
5 also depicting extinction as inevitable? How can exhibitions provide a space for the public to  
6 encounter extinction as an ongoing loss, but also as one that can – and should – be mitigated?  
7  
8 The sheer heterogeneity of the global natural history community prevents a single, unifying  
9 theory. But even so, it is striking how contemporary curatorial efforts to communicate mass  
10 extinction are united in their representational reliance on mourning. In this section, then, I wish  
11 to pay closer attention to 'Extinction Voices' and situate it within a wider context, a nascent  
12 first wave of critical exhibitions about the Sixth Extinction. By comparing its representational  
13 strategies with two other exhibitions on extinction, I will show how the exhibition develops a  
14 dynamic between mourning and action which attempts to represent and counter the loss of  
15 extinction. Doing this will not only allow us to see how mourning is presented as a route towards  
16 environmental care, but will also frame the question of whether Bristol Museum's 'Extinction  
17 Voices' can be thought of as an example of posthumanist museum curation. Throughout, my aim  
18 is to ask to what extent the curation of eco-mourning opens up new ways of engaging with  
19 extinction.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 As an inexpensive and neatly executed curatorial effort in a museum outside of London,  
32 and one that generated national press attention too (Morss 2019), 'Extinction Voices' offers a  
33 visually arresting example of how museums can re-present their permanent collections in order  
34 to respond to the Sixth Extinction. It shows how local museums, working on tight budgets and  
35 within the context of deep funding cuts, can curate their extant large collections in order to  
36 intervene in topics surrounding climate change. At the same time, it is a case study in how  
37 exhibitions and heritage practices are being formulated in response to global scientific reports  
38 and local community accountability. For in their promotional materials for the exhibition,  
39 Bristol's curators write that the exhibition was prompted by two institutional encounters which  
40 brought home the urgency of anthropogenic extinction. First, museum staff read the  
41 Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services' (IPBES) 2019 Global  
42 Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. A major report conducted by a  
43 multidisciplinary panel, it concludes that one million species are currently threatened with  
44 extinction, and therefore that 'biodiversity – the diversity within species, between species and of  
45 ecosystems – is declining faster than at any time in human history' (IPBES 2019, 10). Second,  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Bristol Museum also received letters from thirty-one local school children, who asked that the  
4 museum explain to its visitors the colonial history behind its taxidermy tiger. Every taxidermy  
5 animal is the outcome of a complex story of human-animal relations. As Donna Haraway writes,  
6 ‘behind every mounted animal, bronze sculpture, or photograph lies a profusion of objects and  
7 social interactions among people and other animals’ (1989, 27). Bristol’s tiger is no exception,  
8 one of thirty-nine tigers shot by George V’s hunting party in India in 1911. ‘Extinction Voices’  
9 therefore responds to specialist biodiversity reports on the one side and situated community  
10 questions on the other by turning inward, towards its own extant collections. In doing so, the  
11 exhibition forges a link between mass extinction and the imperial histories and ideologies of the  
12 museum itself, thus confronting Bristol Museum’s own historic participation in anthropogenic  
13 extinction. ‘Extinction Voices’ thus utilises historical collections in order to shape new narratives  
14 and engage with the difficult legacies surrounding taxidermy in the first place.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 As I noted above, Bristol Museum is just one of a small number of museum institutions  
26 in the global north – either natural history museums or museums with natural history collections  
27 – that have harnessed the tones and motifs of loss in order to exhibit anthropogenic extinction.  
28 Take, for example, the Room of Endangered and Extinct Species (La Salle des Espèces  
29 Menacées et des Espèces Disparues) at the National Museum of Natural History in Paris. Here,  
30 the museum utilises a low-light that stands in marked contrast to brightly illuminated and lively  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
The Room of Endangered and Extinct Species houses around 260 animal and plant  
species, the majority of which have buckled under the acute pressure of decades of hunting and  
habitat loss. Some animals, such as Schomburgk’s deer, the great auk, and the Mauritian flying  
fox, are exhibited as whole specimens. Others, like the Kangaroo Island emu, are only presented  
as incomplete skeletons. The half-formed emu thus stands in physical testimony to the  
fragmentation and irreplaceable losses of extinction.

Elsewhere, Christina Seely’s exhibition ‘Next of Kin: Seeing Extinction Through the  
Artist’s Lens’ adopted similar visual methods. Installed at the Harvard Museum of Natural  
History in Winter 2016, the exhibition displayed glass cabinets of disembodied skulls and horns



1  
2  
3 taken from the university's Comparative Zoology archives, all again shadowed by deliberately  
4 low lighting. The centrepiece of this exhibition, though, was Seely's 30x40 inch light box  
5 portraits of endangered species, including a sable antelope, Siberian tiger, maned wolf, pig-tailed  
6 macaque, and mountain anoa. Seely's ten daguerrotype portraits transform in response to  
7 ambient light. In the controlled ambience of the exhibition, the large scale kinetic portraits depict  
8 the animals' faces with a sharp intensity, their eyes gazing directly at the viewer. But as visitors  
9 enter and leave the gallery, momentarily flooding the space with natural light, the pictured – or  
10 better, captured – animals slowly fade to white, appearing only as ghostly traces that are barely  
11 perceptible. The viewer is powerless to stop the animals fading into nothing, but the portraits  
12 nonetheless implicate the spectator in the animal's disappearance: once the animal is little more  
13 than a trace, the mirrored glass comes to reflect the outline of the human visitor who stands  
14 before it. Because the visitor's image eventually replaces that of the animal, Seely's portraits  
15 centre in order to then decentre their spectators. Seely's exhibition gives visitors a space to  
16 encounter the gaze of animals while also reflecting on their own positionality and responsibility  
17 as these animals disappear.

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30 The biologist E. O. Wilson describes our current epoch as the 'Age of Loneliness' (2002,  
31 77). This a doubled loneliness, Wilson implies, at once gesturing to the nonhuman species that  
32 are increasingly becoming the 'last' of their kind and to the human communities who stand to  
33 inhabit a planet depleted of biodiversity. As the late Deborah Bird Rose puts it, we are entering  
34 'a new era of solitude, one marked [...] by the actual loss of co-evolved life. As Earth others  
35 depart, never to return, we face a diminishing and impoverished world, and equally, we face  
36 new, agonizingly lonely, questions about the meaning of our existence' (2011, 10). Seeley's light  
37 box portraits, Paris's Room of Endangered and Extinct Species and Bristol's 'Extinction Voices'  
38 can be understood as three curated responses to this 'Age of Loneliness'. Collectively, they  
39 deploy the emotional register of grief and loss in order to transform the gallery and exhibition  
40 space into a kind of funeral for extinct animals.

41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 Yet what makes 'Extinction Voices' different from these other exhibitions is its  
50 representation of mourning as a fundamentally *dynamic* process, that is, as a pathway that leads  
51 towards action. The exhibition's wall displays, for instance, inform visitors about the global  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 impacts of pollution, habitat loss, poaching and climate change on wild animal populations. They  
4 also call upon on visitors to act:  
5

6  
7 Can you imagine a world without these animals? One million species are threatened with  
8 extinction, because of humans. Many will be lost within decades. Look around this gallery. The  
9 covered animals are at high to extreme risk of dying out. Some are extinct already. They have no  
10 voice for their futures. But we can use ours.  
11  
12  
13

14 In this passage, 'Extinction Voices' mobilises an affective dyad comprising of the reactive and  
15 the proactive. By this I mean that the exhibition calls on its visitors to do the work of mourning:  
16 to experience grief and loss, and to then transform these sentiments into a form of action,  
17 imagined here in the metaphor of the 'voice'. The assumption that the exhibition makes is that,  
18 by eliciting the former, it can open up the possibility for the latter. Written notes, pinned to the  
19 gallery's walls, communicated not only a sense of sadness at the vanishing natural world, but  
20 also expressed anonymous demands and ideas: 'stop global warming', 'SAVE ANIMALS!!!',  
21 'don't burn forests', 'part of the problem > part of the solution', 'no plastic go vegy' [sic].  
22 Although other exhibitions have been solely preoccupied with the loss of extinction, Bristol's  
23 curators position mourning as the first half of a story towards action. They welcome and  
24 incorporate more explicitly politicised messages within the exhibition itself.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Within the environmental humanities, much has been made of this dialectic between  
35 mourning and action, grief and possibility. Indeed, the emerging literature in extinction studies  
36 has foregrounded how an understanding of loss is generative for cultivating future environmental  
37 care. In *Recovering Lost Species in the Modern Age* (2019), for example, Dolly Jørgensen argues  
38 that 'we need to recognise that feelings of loss can motivate past and future environmental  
39 action' (2019, 11). Focusing on reintroduction, rewilding and de-extinction initiatives, Jørgensen  
40 tells a story of how emotions serve as the primary motivations for recovering lost animals. For  
41 Jørgensen, recent efforts to recover and restore nature are fundamentally 'nostalgic practices'  
42 that rely on discourses of longing and belonging in order to justify 'future-oriented action' (2019,  
43 4). In *Flight Ways* (2014), Thom van Dooren develops a theory of mourning extinctions through  
44 his encounters with the Hawaiian crow, the most endangered corvid species on the planet.  
45 Hawaiian crows are now extinct in the wild, made up of only around one hundred birds in  
46 captivity, and are widely thought to mourn and sing for one another in death. For van Dooren, to  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 mourn these crows, indeed mourn *with* them, is to undo ‘any pretense toward exceptionalism,  
4 instead drawing us into an awareness of the multispecies continuities and connectivities that  
5 make life possible for everyone.’ (van Dooren 2014, 126). Van Dooren thus suggests that by  
6 mourning the Hawaiian crow we also mourn ‘the loss of a world that *includes us*’, grieving ‘the  
7 countless deaths that constitute this time of extinctions’ (2014, 18).  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 By bringing this environmental humanities literature into contact with critical heritage  
13 studies, and by remembering the claims of posthumanism, we can articulate the potential of an  
14 exhibition such as ‘Extinction Voices’. First, the exhibition’s strategic non-representation  
15 disrupts the assumed subject-object relations of the anthroponormative gaze, thereby offering an  
16 opportunity for critically seeing mass extinction. Second, the exhibition’s accompanying text  
17 reveals the imperial histories of extinction and, in doing so, situates the museum *within* the story  
18 of colonial mastery. And third, the exhibition tasks its publics with imagining a ‘world without  
19 these animals’ in order to ‘voice’ their resistance to such a world. By prompting visitors to grieve  
20 for a worse future, the curators seek to empower their publics to speak up, and speak now, for a  
21 better one. Although the exhibition’s political imagination is individualised and vague – as I will  
22 show below – its intervention into climate change and extinction appears to break with the  
23 fallacy of neutrality and takes on active responsibility for fostering environmental thought.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

### 36 **Beyond mourning?**

37  
38 My aim in this article has been to examine how civil society organisations such as natural history  
39 museums are changing their curatorial practices in a time of increasing public knowledge about  
40 anthropogenic species extinctions. By turning to ‘Extinction Voices’, and juxtaposing its  
41 emphasis on loss with other examples of exhibitions and galleries on extinction, I have shown  
42 how mourning is tasked with producing action. In this regard, Bristol Museum conceives of  
43 mourning as a form of affective labour, as what Sigmund Freud once theorised as *Trauerarbeit*  
44 (1957, 244) – literally grief-work, the work or working-through of grief. The grief-work of  
45 Bristol Museum’s ‘Extinction Voices’ recasts the natural history gallery as a public space for  
46 nonhuman remembrance in which visitors are invited to grieve for their animal neighbours. Such  
47 grieving, the exhibition implies, will also spur future environmental concern, care, and  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 intervention. To put this in a more Freudian register: by mourning these animals, the visitor  
4 cathects to the planet.  
5  
6

7 To conclude, though, I want to reconsider the question of mourning and its relationship  
8 with the current mass extinction event. For is the predominant focus on grief and loss quite as  
9 powerful, as effective, or as necessary as these exhibitions and scholars imply? Do these  
10 emotions really produce future action? Which other emotional registers and responses are out  
11 there, ready to be drawn from and mobilised both within the museum space and in the  
12 scholarship on extinction? And what does all of this mean for curatorial practices in this current  
13 moment of extinction and climate collapse? I ask these questions because, within the  
14 environmental humanities, eco-mourning is currently being called into question for its putatively  
15 backward-looking, nostalgic impulses, as well as for its hegemonic stranglehold over  
16 environmental discourses.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Two books will guide us towards a critique of eco-mourning: Ursula K. Heise's  
26 *Imagination Extinction* (2016) and Nicole Seymour's *Bad Environmentalism* (2019). First, Heise  
27 argues that extinction must be approached with affirmation and complexity rather than the kinds  
28 of negation and reduction which she sees as being closely linked to eco-mourning. Heise is  
29 concerned with how environmental discourses narrate similar 'stories of decline [which] seek to  
30 mobilise readers' emotions through the lament, melancholy and mourning' (2016, 34). Heise  
31 notes that verbal and visual representations of endangered species are dominated by elegiac  
32 modes that remain enraptured by the 'aura of "the last"' (2016, 72). Yet there are other  
33 environmental discourses, she argues, that push beyond eco-mourning towards 'a more  
34 affirmative vision of our biological future' (2016, 13). For Heise, forms such as the database, the  
35 list and the catalogue, represented by the IUCN Red List, offer an aesthetic-scientific possibility  
36 to 'desentimentalise' extinction (2016, 76). Desentimentalising extinction would help move  
37 environmental discourse beyond its preoccupation with eco-mourning, and in doing so shift  
38 attention from the elegiac focus on charismatic endlings towards a more complex understanding  
39 of the scale of mass extinction.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Seymour shares Heise's suspicion of eco-mourning. But she even doubts the efficacy of  
52 database aesthetics to escape the trappings of environmental discourse, as she posits that the use  
53 of scientific graphs and data, commonly associated with top-down, expert knowledge, risk a  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 didactic and instrumentalised standpoint (2019, 46). *Bad Environmentalism* begins from the  
4 position that environmentalism is dominated by valences of sincerity and seriousness that  
5 oscillate between eco-pessimism and -optimism. Environmentalism, defined here as ‘a  
6 description of nature, as a social movement, and as a code of behavioural imperatives’ (Jaquette  
7 Ray 2013, 11), is pervaded by ‘despair and hope, gloom/doom and optimism [that] are often  
8 merely different sides of the same coin, a coin that represents humans’ desire for certainty’  
9 (Seymour 2019, 4). Seymour sets out to critique the dominant structure of feeling of  
10 contemporary environmental discourse as it is practiced by environmental activists,  
11 environmentally-themed artworks, nature writers and ecocritics alike. Seymour’s point is that  
12 future environmental movements, artworks, writing and criticism must embrace alternative  
13 structures of feeling. These other forms of environmental affects, the book’s titular ‘bad  
14 environmentalisms’, include so-called inappropriate and improper responses to climate change  
15 such as ‘irreverence, ambivalence, camp, frivolity, indecorum, awkwardness, sardonicism,  
16 perversity, playfulness, and glee’ (2019, 4).  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 But what is at stake in shifting environmental responses and conversations towards these  
29 ‘dissident, often-denigrated’ (Seymour 2019, 6) sensibilities? First and foremost, Seymour  
30 proposes a corrective to the longstanding and ‘basic environmentalist assumptions: that  
31 reverence is required for ethical relations to the nonhuman, that knowledge is key to fighting  
32 problems like climate change’ (2019, 5) – hence Seymour’s difference from Heise, whose  
33 analysis places more faith in scientific discourses’ in counteracting the elegiac consciousness of  
34 environmentalism. The texts that Seymour analyses across her book all ‘do’ environmentalism  
35 without loving nature. For her, Sherman Alexie’s short stories, the MTV Jackass-style nature  
36 show *Wild Boyz* (2003–06) and Isabella Rossellini’s *Green Porno* (2008) utilise aesthetics which  
37 transform conventional understandings of how to represent nature. Also at stake in the book’s  
38 argument is a queer intervention into the heteronormativity of environmentalism. If  
39 environmentalism’s sincerity and seriousness are profoundly *straight*, then Seymour turns to the  
40 writing of Lee Edelman, Jack Halberstam and José Esteban Muñoz in order to call for camp and  
41 play. The major question of Seymour’s book thus becomes: ‘how might reclaiming gaiety and  
42 other contrarian modes enable us to create new modes of resistance, new forms of community,  
43 and new opportunities for inquiry into environmental crisis’ (2019, 24)?  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
These interventions demand critical thinking about the role played by museum exhibitions and natural history collections in actively shaping the story of the Sixth Extinction for visiting publics. Even if *Imagining Extinction* and *Bad Environmentalism* do not focus on museums and heritage practices, and even if Seymour's analysis neglects the relationship between climate change and species extinctions, both texts provoke reflection on the potentially inhibiting by-products of current mournful attachments to extinction: a nostalgic and ahistorical vision of a previously pristine wilderness now long gone, a romantic reverence for nature which elides its fundamental ambivalence towards us, a preoccupation with charismatic animals instead of the so-called uncharismatic, "ugly" or "boring" species, all of which is laden with an overriding negativity that militates against the very idea that eco-mourning is a process of working-through.

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
As my case studies make clear, contemporary curatorial practices surrounding anthropogenic extinction tend to couple a preexisting scientific emphasis on the 'facts' of extinction with an overtly emotive standpoint that oscillates between despair and hope. 'Extinction Voices' exhibition is a case in point, insofar as it attempts to imbue its existing galleries with an urgent emotional and political message, repurposing permanent collections for a new climate, and therefore communicating extinction within the bounds of sincerity, seriousness and straightness. Following Heise and Seymour, we might therefore question whether 'Extinction Voices' ultimately challenges or reproduces the cultural meanings of extinction. On the one hand, does the exhibition's sole use of taxidermy specimens buy into the iconography of flagship and charismatic species, thereby eliding the invertebrates whose extinction is already too 'quiet' (Eisenhauer 2019)? If we pin our imagination of extinction to an individual animal, then do we fail to see species as 'vast intergenerational lineages', as Thom van Dooren puts it (2014, 12), thus obscuring all the lives, lifeways and interspecies relations that have already been lost to the world? On the other, does the exhibition's indexical function, which ultimately conceives of each animal as a stand-in for its species, risk eliding the particularity of *this* animal in *this* space and *its* specific history that brought it to Bristol's collections? The exhibition tells the story of its tiger, but what of the other animals on display? And, undergirding all of this, what sort of environmentalism is implied by this mourning ritual? Does the mourning veil itself imply a process of acceptance and moving on? But do we want to move on from these extinctions? What does it mean that it is the taxidermy animals themselves, not the human visitors, who are

1  
2  
3 made to wear veils? Finally, although the exhibition asks us to imagine a world without these  
4 animals, does it prompt any personal or collective imagination of a future in which these animals  
5 survive, or even flourish? While the exhibition's mission statement momentarily conjures a 'we'  
6 who could 'use' their voice, the exhibition does not offer any possibility for a collective voicing,  
7 let alone gesture to how such a voicing might be organised and utilised outside of the museum  
8 space.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14 Similar questions might be directed at another recent example of museums exhibiting  
15 anthropogenic extinction: the London Natural History Museum's (NHM) unveiling of 'Hope' the  
16 blue whale. The museum purchased the whale's 4.5-tonne skeleton in 1891 after the whale  
17 beached on the coast of the harbour town of Wexford, Ireland. The whale, then nameless, was  
18 taken into the NHM's collections before being displayed in the mammals gallery in 1934. For  
19 over eighty years, the whale remained in the same place. But in 2017, the museum named the  
20 whale – Hope – and remounted its 25.2-metre long skeleton in Hintze Hall, thus replacing  
21 'Dippy' the diplodocus as the museum's icon and major focal point of its largest public gallery.  
22 In a press release, the NHM styles 'Hope' as 'a symbol of humanity's power to shape a  
23 sustainable future. Blue whales were hunted to the brink of extinction in the twentieth century,  
24 but were also one of the first species that humans decided to save on a global scale' (NHM  
25 2017). By re-presenting the whale skeleton, the NHM seeks to draw attention to 'humanity's'  
26 role in shaping species extinctions for better and for worse. In a recent article in the *Science*  
27 *Museum Group Journal*, Pandora Syperrek and Sarah Wade write that Hope not only 'tells a tale  
28 of a species ruthlessly hunted for financial gain and saved from extinction by international  
29 cooperation via a whaling moratorium', but also symbolises the NHM's commitment to  
30 engaging the public in ecological issues (2020, n.p.).  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 Yet the limits and contradictions of this curatorial statement were thrown into relief when  
45 Extinction Rebellion (XR) targeted NHM as a key site of their summer protests in 2019. On  
46 Earth Day, XR members flooded the exhibition hall and staged a collective die-in directly  
47 underneath 'Hope'. In their article on 'Hope', Syperrek and Wade claim XR's die-in as a protest  
48 against the Sixth Extinction. This is true. But what they do not write is that this was also a protest  
49 against the NHM itself. Syperrek and Wade attempt to incorporate XR's action into a narrative of  
50 how museums like the NHM are facing the extinction crisis. However, XR intentionally chose  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the NHM as a site of struggle because the museum was publicly advocating for sustainability  
4 while also hosting closed-door awards dinners for the Petroleum Group of the Geological  
5 Society. XR arrived at the NHM with three demands: 1) to cancel a formal awards dinner they  
6 were hosting for the Petroleum Group of the Geological Society, 2) to declare a climate  
7 emergency, and 3) to cut any and all ties with the fossil fuel industry. On their website, XR write  
8 that ‘The Natural History Museum must be a pioneer in taking positive action in the midst of our  
9 climate and ecological emergency. Instead they are taking money from and bolstering the very  
10 industry doing the most to make our living world natural history’ (Lowe 2019). The die-in, as an  
11 organised lying-down and politicised occupation of public space, is a common tactic of non-  
12 violent civil disobedience movements, and environmental activists have utilised the die-in since  
13 at least the 1970s (Ross 2015). For XR, the die-in served as a performative critique of the  
14 museum’s fossil-fuel ties. By staging the die-in underneath the blue whale skeleton, XR revealed  
15 that ‘Hope’ is at best at odds with the NHM’s stated institutional commitments to a sustainable  
16 future, or at worst a form of deliberate institutional and curatorial greenwashing. The die-in  
17 declares that as long as the NHM continues to invest in the fossil fuel industry, there is no hope  
18 for mitigating the Sixth Extinction.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 My point here is not to exalt XR. In fact, I agree with the criticisms levelled against the  
32 group that their abiding political philosophy of ‘beyond politics’ leaves them without a robust  
33 understanding of the coloniality of ecological crisis (Rosenow 2019) nor a structural critique of  
34 the police (Wretched of the Earth 2019). XR is increasingly stratified, and many local and global  
35 groups have developed a level of autonomy that allows them to break with the dominant  
36 institutional positions of XR UK. Nevertheless, XR’s underlying approach means that that its  
37 formulation of a ‘just transition’ away from carbon insufficiently addresses the immense  
38 redistribution of wealth needed to contest, adapt to, or mitigate the uneven impacts of ecological  
39 collapse, and its stated ‘theory of change’ – namely, mass arrests in order to choke the state’s  
40 legal and police infrastructure – is built on shaky social science research (Berglund 2019) and an  
41 uncritically colour-blind understanding of police interactions that actively endangers people of  
42 colour.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52  
53 Even so, I want to end by suggesting that XR’s die-in at the NHM simultaneously calls  
54 into question the debates about posthumanist museum practices within critical heritage studies  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 *and* the debates about eco-mourning and environmental affects within the environmental  
4 humanities. Although XR conceived of their action as purely a critique of the NHM's ties to  
5 fossil fuel companies, and although the group tends to focus on human rather than nonhuman  
6 extinction, the die-in still resonates beyond its own intended ends. It illuminates, for instance, the  
7 apparent gulf between natural history representations of anthropogenic extinction and  
8 meaningful environmental action. Its anti-institutionality creates a productive tension between  
9 curation and public engagement. It also shows how eco-mourning and joyful play need not be  
10 opposed with one another. In other words, by reading the die-in closely and in juxtaposing with  
11 the natural history museum as an institution, we can think more critically about the role of  
12 museums in a time of climate change and mass extinction. It is not enough, the die-in reveals, for  
13 museums to simply exhibit or represent the Sixth Extinction without also leveraging their  
14 institutional resources to help prevent it. As Lyon and Bosworth put it, museums must also 'sign  
15 open letters, endorse movements and campaigns, and form broad coalitions within and beyond  
16 the museum sector. They can host community meetings and operate as meeting spaces for  
17 activists, organise training sessions and consultations, stage prop-building workshops before  
18 demonstrations, and host panel discussions and film screenings on pressing contemporary issues  
19 with thought-leaders in environmental justice and science for the common good' (2019, 181).  
20 They can also divest from fossil fuel-intensive industries. Moreover, the die-in is a public ritual  
21 that holds elegy and play in a generative contradiction. Those who collectively organised and  
22 participated in the die-in did not jettison mourning in favour of frivolity. In fact, a die-in is  
23 nothing other than an act of public mourning *infused* with play and performance. Contemporary  
24 eco-street movements like XR make strategic use of performance, play, camp, ritual and  
25 ceremony in their own struggles against environmental devastation. By turning to this moment of  
26 activist insurgency, then, we begin to deepen the questions regarding representational and  
27 exhibitionary practices in contemporary museums while also complicating the environmental  
28 humanities' dissensus concerning the dominant affects of environmentalist discourses. The die-in  
29 mounts a challenge to museum investment portfolios *and* questions the apparent oppositions  
30 between seriousness and joy.

31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

Protest movements have long been animated by this generative juxtaposition between loss and action, grieving and anger, melancholia and spectacle. XR's public die-in at the NHM was not a spontaneous display of public sorrow. It was, rather, a strategically organised,

1  
2  
3 mediatised and theatrical show. It was a spectacle that occupied and thus claimed the museum as  
4 a key site of public struggle for the planet's future. A die-in, then, underscores the urgent need  
5 for a broader coalition of museums and movements in our time of extinction. It challenges  
6 natural history museums to develop new posthumanist practices of representation in concert with  
7 political commitments to stewardship and conservation. The die-in, thought of finally as its own  
8 form of exhibition, also counters prevailing ideas of the museum exhibition itself. Indeed the  
9 Latin etymology of exhibition means 'to hold out'. A collective die-in underneath a whale  
10 skeleton is, then, a public holding-out for environmental justice.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

## 20 **Acknowledgements**

21  
22 This essay benefited from critical and close readings by Mareike Vennen, Liz Stainforth, Lily  
23 Dessau and Stefan Skrimshire.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## 29 **References**

- 30  
31 Adorno, T. W. 2005. *Minima Moralia: Reflections from Damaged Life*. Translated by E. F. N.  
32 Jephcott. London & New York: Verso.  
33  
34  
35 Andrews, E. L. 2013. "Interpreting Nature: Shifts in the Presentation and Display of Taxidermy  
36 in Contemporary Museums in Northern England." PhD thesis.  
37 [http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/6637/1/Thesis%20Hard%20Copy%20with%20Figures%2015-05-](http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/6637/1/Thesis%20Hard%20Copy%20with%20Figures%2015-05-14.pdf)  
38 [14.pdf](http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/6637/1/Thesis%20Hard%20Copy%20with%20Figures%2015-05-14.pdf).  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 Barnosky, Anthony D., Nicholas Matzke, Susumu Tomiya, Guinevere O. U. Wogan, Brian  
44 Swartz, Tiago B. Quental, Charles Marshall, Jenny L. McGuire, Emily L. Lindsey, Kaitlin C.  
45 Maguire, Ben Mersey, and Elizabeth A. Ferrer. 2011. "Has the Earth's Sixth Mass Extinction  
46 Already Arrived?" *Nature*, March 2: 51–57.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51 Berger, J. 2009. *About Looking*. London: Bloomsbury.  
52  
53 Berglund, Oscar. 2019. "Extinction Rebellion Uses Tactics that Toppled Dictators – But We  
54 Live in a Liberal Democracy." *PolicyBristol Hub*.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 [https://policybristol.blogs.bris.ac.uk/2019/07/18/extinction-rebellion-uses-tactics-that-toppled-](https://policybristol.blogs.bris.ac.uk/2019/07/18/extinction-rebellion-uses-tactics-that-toppled-dictators-but-we-live-in-a-liberal-democracy/)  
4 [dictators-but-we-live-in-a-liberal-democracy/](https://policybristol.blogs.bris.ac.uk/2019/07/18/extinction-rebellion-uses-tactics-that-toppled-dictators-but-we-live-in-a-liberal-democracy/). Accessed 22 May 2020.

5  
6  
7 Bird Rose, D. 2011. *Wild Dog Dreaming: Love and Extinction*. Charlottesville, VA: University  
8 of Virginia Press.

9  
10  
11 Bird Rose, D., T. van Dooren, and M. Chrulw, eds. 2017. *Extinction Studies: Stories of Time,*  
12 *Death, and Generations*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

13  
14  
15 Burt, J. 2005. "John Berger's 'Why Look at Animals?' A Close Reading." *Worldview* 9 (2):  
16 203–18.

17  
18  
19 Cameron, F. 2018. "Posthuman Museum Practices." In *Posthuman Glossary*, ed. By Rosi  
20 Braidotti and Maria Hlavajova. London: Bloomsbury.

21  
22  
23 Cameron, F. and B. Neilson. 2015. *Climate Change and Museum Futures*. London: Routledge.

24  
25  
26 Dawson, A. 2016. *Extinction: A Radical History*. New York: O/R Books.

27  
28  
29 Derrida, J. 2009. *The Beast and the Sovereign, vol 1*. Edited by Michel Lisse, Marie-Louise  
30 Mallet, and Ginette Michaud. Translated by Geoffrey Bennington. Chicago: University of  
31 Chicago Press.

32  
33  
34 DeSilvey, C. 2017. *Curated Decay: Heritage Beyond Saving*. Minneapolis & London: University  
35 of Minnesota Press.

36  
37  
38 DeSilvey, C. and R. Harrison. 2018. "Anticipating Loss: Rethinking Endangerment in Heritage  
39 Futures." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 26 (1): 1–7.

40  
41  
42 Eisenhauer, N., Bonn, A. & A. Guerra, C. 2019. "Recognizing the quiet extinction of  
43 invertebrates." *Nature Communications* 10 (50). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-07916-1>.

44  
45  
46 Foster, J. B., B. Clark and R. York. 2010. *The Ecological Rift: Capitalism's War on the Earth*.  
47 New York: Monthly Review Press.

48  
49  
50 Fredengren, C. 2015. "Nature:Cultures:Heritage, Sustainability and Feminist Posthumanism."  
51 *Current Swedish Archaeology* 23: 109–130.

- 1  
2  
3 Freud, S. 1957. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Works of Sigmund Freud*. Translated by  
4 James Strachey. The Hogarth Press: London.  
5  
6  
7 Giblin, J., I. Ramos and N. Grout. 2019. "Dismantling the Master's House: Thoughts on  
8 Representing Empire and Decolonising Museums and Public Space in Practice: An  
9 Introduction." *Third Text* 33 (4–5): 471–486.  
10  
11  
12  
13 Haraway, D. 1989. *Primate Visions: Gender, Race, and Nature in the World of Modern Science*.  
14 London: Routledge.  
15  
16  
17 Haraway, D. 2008. *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.  
18  
19  
20 Harrison, R. 2015. "Beyond 'Natural' and 'Cultural' Heritage: Toward an Ontological Politics of  
21 Heritage in the Age of Anthropocene." *Heritage & Society* 8 (1): 24–42.  
22  
23 doi:10.1179/2159032X15Z.00000000036.  
24  
25  
26 Harvey, A. 2016. *Funding Arts and Culture in a Time of Austerity*. London: New Local  
27 Government Network.  
28  
29  
30 Heise, U. K. 2016. *Imagining Extinction: The Cultural Meanings of Endangered Species*.  
31 Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.  
32  
33  
34 Holtorf, C. 2015. "Averting Loss Aversion in Cultural Heritage." *International Journal of*  
35 *Heritage Studies* 21 (4): 405–421.  
36  
37  
38 IPBES. *Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*.  
39 <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3553579>. Accessed 10 March 2020.  
40  
41  
42 Jaquette Ray, Sarah. 2013. *The Ecological Other: Environmental Exclusion in American*  
43 *Culture*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.  
44  
45  
46 Janes, R. 2009. *Museums in a Troubles World: Renewal, Irrelevance or Collapse?* London:  
47 Routledge.  
48  
49  
50 Janes, R. and R. Sandell, eds. 2019. *Museum Activism*. London: Routledge.  
51  
52  
53 Jørgensen, D. 2019. *Recovering Lost Species in the Modern Age: Histories of Longing and*  
54 *Belonging*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Kingsford, R. T., J. E. Watson, C. Lundquist, O. Venter, L. Hughes, E. L. Johnston, J. Atherton,  
4 M. Gawel, D. A. Keith, B. G. Mackey, C. Morley, H. P. Possingham, B. Raynor, H. F. Recher,  
5 and K. A. Wilson. 2009. "Major Conservation Policy Issues for Biodiversity in Oceania."  
6  
7  
8 *Conservation Biology* 23 (4): 834–40.  
9

10 Kolbert, E. 2014. *The Sixth Extinction: An Unnatural History*. London: Bloomsbury.

11  
12  
13 Lowe, Jamie. 2019, "18 June: Extinction Rebellion meet with Natural History Museum ahead of  
14 action." Tues 18 June. [https://rebellion.earth/2019/06/18/18-june-extinction-rebellion-meet-with-](https://rebellion.earth/2019/06/18/18-june-extinction-rebellion-meet-with-natural-history-museum-ahead-of-action/)  
15 [natural-history-museum-ahead-of-action/](https://rebellion.earth/2019/06/18/18-june-extinction-rebellion-meet-with-natural-history-museum-ahead-of-action/).  
16  
17

18  
19 Lyon, S. and K. Bosworth. 2019. "Museums in the Climate Emergency." in *Museum Activism*,  
20 Robert R. Janes and Richard Sandell. London: Routledge.  
21

22  
23 Malm, A. 2018. *The Progress of This Storm: Nature and Society in a Warming World*. London:  
24 Verso.  
25

26  
27 May, S. 2018. "Heritage, Endangerment and Participation: Alternative Futures in the Lake  
28 District." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 26 (1): 71–86.  
29

30  
31 Moore, J. W. and R. Patel. 2018. *A History of the World in Seven Cheap Things*. London: Verso.  
32

33  
34 Morgan, J. and S. Macdonald. 2018. "De-Growing Museum Collections for New Heritage  
35 Futures." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 26 (1): 56–70.  
36

37  
38 Morss, A. 2019. "Museum shrouds endangered wildlife exhibits in mourning veil." *Guardian*  
39 Wed 14 Aug. [https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/aug/14/museum-shrouds-](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/aug/14/museum-shrouds-endangered-wildlife-exhibits-in-mourning-veil)  
40 [endangered-wildlife-exhibits-in-mourning-veil](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/aug/14/museum-shrouds-endangered-wildlife-exhibits-in-mourning-veil).  
41  
42

43  
44 Mortimer-Sandilands, C. 2010. "Melancholy Natures, Queer Ecologies." In *Queer Ecologies:*  
45 *Sex, Nature, Politics, Desire*. Ed. By C. Mortimer-Sandilands and B. Erickson. Bloomington and  
46 Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press: 331–358.  
47

48  
49 Mulhearn, D. 2013. "Facing Extinction." *Museums Journal*, April (2013): 24–29.  
50

51  
52 Natural History Museum. 2017. "Blue whale skeleton 'Hope' takes centre stage in Museum." 13  
53 July. [https://www.nhm.ac.uk/press-office/press-releases/blue-whale-skeleton-takes-centre-stage-](https://www.nhm.ac.uk/press-office/press-releases/blue-whale-skeleton-takes-centre-stage-in-museum.html)  
54 [in-museum.html](https://www.nhm.ac.uk/press-office/press-releases/blue-whale-skeleton-takes-centre-stage-in-museum.html).  
55  
56

- 1  
2  
3 Neate, R. 2019. "Austerity Forcing Arts Institutions to Accept Gifts from Billionaires."  
4 *Guardian* Friday 22 March. [https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2019/mar/22/austerity-forcing-](https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2019/mar/22/austerity-forcing-arts-institutions-to-accept-gifts-from-billionaires)  
5 [arts-institutions-to-accept-gifts-from-billionaires.](https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2019/mar/22/austerity-forcing-arts-institutions-to-accept-gifts-from-billionaires)  
6  
7  
8  
9 Newell, Jennifer, Libby Robin and Kirsten Wehner, eds. 2017. *Curating the Future: Museums,*  
10 *Communities and Climate Change.* London: Routledge.  
11  
12  
13 Nyhart, Lynn K. 2009. *Modern Nature: The Rise of the Biological Perspective in Germany.*  
14 Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.  
15  
16  
17 Pick, A. 2015. "Why Not Look at Animals?" *NECSUS* 4 (1). [https://necsus-ejms.org/why-not-](https://necsus-ejms.org/why-not-look-at-animals)  
18 [look-at-animals.](https://necsus-ejms.org/why-not-look-at-animals)  
19  
20  
21 Poliquin, R. 2012. *The Breathless Zoo: Taxidermy and the Cultures of Longing.* University Park,  
22 PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.  
23  
24  
25 Pollock, G., and J. Zemans. 2007. *Museums After Modernism: Strategies of Engagement.*  
26 Oxford: Blackwell.  
27  
28  
29 Rosenow, D. 2019. "Rapid Response: More haste, less speed – Why Extinction Rebellion needs  
30 to slow down." *Discover Society*. [https://discoversociety.org/2019/04/30/rapid-response-more-](https://discoversociety.org/2019/04/30/rapid-response-more-haste-less-speed-why-extinction-rebellion-needs-to-slow-down/)  
31 [haste-less-speed-why-extinction-rebellion-needs-to-slow-down/.](https://discoversociety.org/2019/04/30/rapid-response-more-haste-less-speed-why-extinction-rebellion-needs-to-slow-down/)  
32  
33  
34 Ross, D. 2015. "The Die-In: A Short History." *Active History*.  
35 [http://activehistory.ca/2015/06/the-die-in/.](http://activehistory.ca/2015/06/the-die-in/)  
36  
37  
38 Seymour, N. 2019. *Bad Environmentalism: Irony and Irreverence in the Ecological Age.*  
39 Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.  
40  
41  
42 Smith, M. 2013. "Ecological Community, the Sense of the World, and Senseless Extinction."  
43 *Environmental Humanities* 2: 21–41.  
44  
45  
46 Soper, K. 2012. "The Humanism in Posthumanism." *Comparative Critical Studies* 9 (3): 365–  
47 378. doi:10.3366/ccs.2012.0069.  
48  
49  
50 Sperling, J. 2018. *A Writer of our Time: The Life and Work of John Berger.* London: Verso.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Stevens, A. 2019. "Local Cultural Spending Down 40% Since Beginning of Austerity."  
4 *Museums Journal* 29 May 2019. <https://www.museumsassociation.org/museums->  
5 [journal/news/29052019-local-cultural-spending-ifs-report](https://www.museumsassociation.org/museums-journal/news/29052019-local-cultural-spending-ifs-report).  
6  
7

8  
9 Sterling, C. 2020. "Critical Heritage and the Posthumanities: Problems and Prospects."  
10 *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. <<https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2020.1715464>>.  
11  
12

13 Syperrek, Pandora, Sarah Wade, Miranda Lowe and Richard Sabin. 2020. "Curating Ocean  
14 Ecology at the Natural History Museum: Miranda Lowe and Richard Sabin in conversation with  
15 Pandora Syperrek and Sarah Wade." *Science Museum Group Journal* 13.  
16  
17 <<http://dx.doi.org/10.15180/201314>>.  
18  
19

20  
21 Van Dooren, T. 2014. *Flight Ways: Life and Loss at the Edge of Extinction*. New York, NY:  
22 Columbia University Press.  
23

24  
25 Wilson, E. O. 2002. *The Future of Life*. New York, NY: Knopf.  
26

27  
28 Wolfe, C. 2010. *What is Posthumanism?* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.  
29

30  
31 Wretched of the Earth. 2019. "An Open Letter to Extinction Rebellion." *Red Pepper*.  
32 <https://www.redpepper.org.uk/an-open-letter-to-extinction-rebellion/>.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60