

## FINAL DRAFT

Tomassini, L., Bertella, G., Grasso, C. & Lenzi, C. (2022) The space of animal justice in wildlife sanctuaries: a posthuman perspective, *Journal of Ecotourism*, DOI: 10.1080/14724049.2022.2122480

## THE SPACE OF ANIMAL JUSTICE IN WILDLIFE SANCTUARIES: A POSTHUMAN PERSPECTIVE

Tomassini, L. <sup>(a)(b)</sup>, Bertella, G. <sup>(c)</sup>, Grasso, C. <sup>(d)</sup>, Lenzi, C. <sup>(d)</sup>,

<sup>(a)</sup> Academy of International Hospitality Research, NHL Stenden University of Applied Sciences, Leeuwarden, The Netherlands

<sup>(b)</sup> University of Groningen, Campus Fryslân, Leeuwarden, The Netherlands

<sup>(c)</sup> School of Business and Economics, UiT The Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø, Norway

<sup>(d)</sup> EticoScienza, Turin, Italy

### ABSTRACT

The growing debate on the Anthropocene epoch urges a critical reflection on the relationship between human and non-human animals. This paper reflects on the space of animal justice in wildlife sanctuaries from a post-human perspective. Our perspective on wildlife sanctuaries relies on posthumanism and its potential in terms of offering both a new epistemology and a theoretical grounding for an approach to justice that is not anthropocentric. In so doing, we also draw on concepts of animal geography and the sociology of space. In line with posthumanism, we adopt a methodology inspired by pluralism, openness, interdisciplinarity and creativity. Our narrative approach combines a thematic analysis with vignettes and features of narrative analysis. Our findings challenge the perception of wildlife sanctuaries as an ideal 'just' space for wildlife and present a posthuman stance on interaction between human and non-human animals, seeking justice for the latter.

### Keywords

*Animal space, Animal justice, Posthumanism, Wildlife Sanctuaries, Eco-tourism*

### PROLOGUE

Author 3: *I volunteered at this sanctuary because the photos showed volunteers sleeping with monkeys, walking cheetahs... in my full ignorance, I thought that was the real way to help animals! Looking at this picture now ... I feel ashamed and guilty! At the time of the picture, I had a herpes outbreak; nothing serious for me ... but herpes can be transmitted to animals and be fatal ... and that monkey died a few days after that picture was taken, maybe because of me.*



- Author 1: *In the picture you look very happy, since you were unaware, I guess...*  
Author 3: *Yes, I would never say it wasn't beautiful because I would lie, but afterwards I realised that it was wrong and ... nobody had warned me about the risk of transmitting diseases to the monkeys!*
- Author 2: *...and the monkey? How do you think he was feeling when the picture was taken?*  
Author 3: *... mm... that's always difficult to say. He was not in pain or stressed ...the monkeys were imprinted with human beings. Now... I look at this picture and there is nothing just in it: no justice for the animal who was treated like a baby doll... and then died, and no justice for me, an unexperienced student, a young volunteer... and a future ethologist.*
- Author 4: *It is often like this: where there is no justice for the animals, there is no justice for the people either; whether they are volunteers, employees or members of the local community.*
- Author 1: *... but what would a just situation look like?*  
Author 4: *Well ... we also have some positive experiences of "good" sanctuaries where animals are rescued and put in a free open environment, without cages, free to create social relationships, groups, families...The hosted species are usually chosen in accordance with requisites of cohabitation with the other species and humans.*
- Author 2: *... do the visitors interact with the animals?*  
Author 4: *No, there is no physical interaction between visitors or volunteers and animals, as you can see in this picture of us there:*



- Author 1: *...and, for example, how does this “good” sanctuary pay its costs?*
- Author 4: *Well... they need donations, and they sell guided tours, but still... everything is organised in a way that the animals and their welfare are the priority. To put it simply... it's all a matter of how the animals are managed.*
- Author 1: *... mm...so...the animals are managed responsibly, respectfully... but still viewed as resources...*
- Author 3: *... yes, no matter whether the sanctuary is public or private, the animals are considered a heritage and resources to be protected, to be used for educational purposes, or commercial ones ...*
- Author 2: *... the power is clearly on the human side ...*
- Author 3: *Ultimately, it's a matter of how this power is used ... the commercial aspect of sanctuaries can push in the wrong direction ...*
- Author 4: *There are associations trying to reconcile the commercial aspect with good animal welfare... I'd say ... justice. Networks of sanctuaries that, eventually, might be preferred by the most responsible tourists ... still, it is all quite messy, with huge differences from country to country...often a political and institutional commitment is missing...different laws and regulations ... different tourists ...*

## INTRODUCTION

The prologue sets the context for this research that explores the space of animal justice in wildlife sanctuaries from a posthuman perspective. The use of the prologue vignette relies on our methodology being inspired by auto-ethnography, creativity and dialogue, and it allows an emphasis on some key aspects concerning human-wildlife relations (Jenkins et al., 2020; Blanchard et al., 2022). Our position is that such relations need to be rethought in the light of the growing debate on the Anthropocene epoch and its impact in terms of global issues like climate change, loss of biodiversity, and widespread injustice perpetrated by humans towards other animal species (Bertella, 2019). Concern about anthropogenetic mass and the increasing appropriation of the physical space by humans (Elhacham et al., 2020) is mirrored in a growing apprehension about the enduring human-driven dominance of the relational space between human and non-human animals (Philo & Wilbert, 2000; Khazaal & Almiròn, 2021). This in turn highlights the urgency of establishing a more complete approach to animal justice in the Anthropocene (McArthur, 2021).

This paper contributes to the above debates by reflecting on the space of animal justice in wildlife sanctuaries from a posthuman perspective. The focus on wildlife sanctuaries integrates the concept of space, as articulated above, with that of tourism, recognising that the latter is a sector highly representative of the modern era, as well as of neoliberal capitalism and its commodification of lives, goods, spaces and experiences more generally (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2020). Animal justice is an emerging issue in tourism studies (Winter, 2020; Fennell & Sheppard, 2021; Jamal & Higham, 2021; Kline, 2022). Our study focuses on eco-tourism and, more precisely, on wildlife sanctuaries, which are relevant to animal justice as they are conceived to offer a safe environment for animals whose life in the wild would be threatened (Thomsen, 2021; Thomsen et al., 2021b).

When designed to provide specialised habitats where the animals can express species-specific behaviours, wildlife sanctuaries tend to be perceived as ideal (Doyle, 2017). We criticise that perception from an animal justice perspective grounded in posthumanism and its potential in terms of offering both a new non-anthropocentric epistemology and a theoretical basis for justice (Braidotti, 2013; Ferrando, 2019).

To discuss the space of animal justice in wildlife sanctuaries, we draw on animal geography studies (Buller, 2014; 2015; 2016; Urbanik, 2012; López & Quintero, 2021) and interweave these with studies of the sociology of space, recognising however that the 'social' is not purely a human domain and that space may be conceived relationally via a flat ontology (Latour, 2006; 2018). Space is understood as made of multiple connections and relationships, and thus as imbued with asymmetric power-relations (Massey, 2005). In line with posthumanism, we adopt a methodology inspired by pluralism, openness, interdisciplinarity and creativity that is grounded in the different educational backgrounds, professions, and expertise of the four authors (Ulmer, 2021). Using a narrative approach with unstructured interviews and an open dialogic setting, we examined the accounts of the two authors who are ethologists and recall their first-hand experiences regarding the practices and spaces of human-animal interaction within different sanctuaries. This methodological approach resulted in a set of scenarios relevant to animal justice in the sociological space of wildlife sanctuaries. Two main themes were identified: animal space and the different relations occurring in wildlife sanctuaries, and animal justice and affirmative ethics in wildlife sanctuaries. Our findings challenge the perception of wildlife sanctuaries as an ideal 'just' space for wildlife, disclose the potentialities of embracing posthuman methodology in tourism studies, and present a posthuman stance on human and non-human animals' relational space, seeking justice for the latter.

## **POSTHUMANISM AND NON-HUMAN ANIMALS**

Posthumanism is an ethical position that broadens moral concerns to all earthlings and non-human entities (Braidotti, 2006; Haraway, 2003; 2006). It does so by questioning the anthropocentric cultural dominance and by relegating humanity back to one of many natural species.

Posthumanism challenges humanism and the classical ideal of man as the measure of all things (Braidotti, 2013). Humanism conceives the human being as autonomous from nature by virtue of its intellectual faculties, its distinctive capacity of speaking and its cognitive abilities, conveying to the human being the status of being a unique animal, superior to other animals and creatures (ibid.). Such humanist conceptualisations have informed Western philosophy, strengthening a pervasive dualism between nature and culture (ibid.). In contrast, posthumanism denies that dualism by conceiving the human as entangled with the environment and nature (Latour, 2007; 2018; Braidotti, 2013).

Posthumanism postulates a networked sociological space where all the ‘actants’—as Latour (2007) names the human and non-human earthlings inhabiting the world—are interconnected and interdependent in a flat ontology (Latour 2007; 2018). Such an approach draws on a rhizomatic subjectivity and epistemology conceptualised by Deleuze and Guattari (1987) as anti-hierarchical, without centre or periphery, without a beginning, middle, end, or a privileged point of view. Drawing on Deleuze and Guattari (1987), Braidotti (2013) elaborates on the posthuman as ‘Becoming-animal’ (p. 67), as ‘Becoming-earth’ (p. 81), and as ‘Becoming-machine’ (p. 89). Hence, the posthuman condition presents a human subjectivity co-created with non-human entities (Hayles, 1999). In Braidotti’s words:

“I define the critical posthuman subject within an eco-philosophy of multiple belongings, as a relational subject constituted in and by multiplicity, that is to say a subject that works across differences and is also internally differentiated, but still grounded and accountable”. (2013, p. 49)

The posthuman approach argues that advanced capitalism is a bio-capitalism in which non-human animals (from here on referred to as ‘animals’) have been turned into commodified bodies, tradable and exploitable in the global market. Again, using Braidotti’s words:

“The challenge today is how to deterritorialize, or nomadize, the human–animal interaction, so as to by-pass [...] the dialectics of otherness [...] The posthuman in the sense of post-anthropocentrism displaces the dialectic scheme of opposition, replacing well-established dualisms with the recognition of deep *zoe*-egalitarianism between humans and animals [...] An ethology of forces based on Spinozist ethics emerges as the main point of reference for changing human–animal interaction. It traces a new political frame, which I see as an affirmative project in response to the commodification of Life in all its forms, that is the opportunistic logic of advanced capitalism” (2013, p. 71-72).

Our research on animal justice and wildlife sanctuaries draws on the emerging interest in posthumanism within tourism studies (Cohen, 2019). The initial attempts to explore the theoretical, ethical and epistemological implications of posthumanism in tourism have identified novel lines of research (Cohen, 2019; Guia & Jamal, 2020; Guia, 2021; Kline, 2022; López López & Venegas, 2021). For Guia and Jamal (2020), posthumanism offers a novel theoretical framework through which to investigate neo-colonialism, neoliberalism and post-anthropocentrism. Guia (2021) discusses posthumanism and affirmative relational ethics as a promising ethical approach to countertrend the commodification and depoliticisation of justice in tourism. Such an ethical approach “rests on an enlarged sense of interconnection between self and others, including the

non-human or ‘earth others [...] bases the ethical relation on positive grounds of joint projects and activities” (Braidotti, 2013, p. 190). Such joint projects and activities are described as aiming to an affirmation of hope that is rooted in and develops through ordinary micro-practices of everyday life (ibid.).

In this paper, we interweave some of the main tenets of posthumanism with the spatial turn of social sciences . This is presented in the next section, in which we argue that the animal space in tourism places and practices has not yet received sufficiently forceful reflection.

## **ANIMAL SPACE**

Our study combines features of posthumanism with central ideas from the sociology of space since both these theoretical lenses share the advocacy of the creation of multiple ethical relations with ‘multiple’ subjects within an active space. We draw on the spatial turn of social sciences (Sheller, 2017) and its interplay with the mobilities paradigm (Sheller & Urry, 2006), with a focus on Massey’s (2005) ruminations on space. Both posthumanism (Braidotti, 2006; 2013) and Massey’s theories focus on the urgency of prompting multiple ethical relationships and links of affectivity and responsibility in an open mobile space constituted by encounters with multiple others in a logic of interdependence. We combine this theoretical framework with insights from the literature on animal geographies (Buller, 2014; 2015; 2012; Urbanik, 2012; Philo & Wilbert, 2000) so as to offer a comprehensive exploration of animal space and its justice. In line with studies acknowledging that the ‘social’ is not purely a human domain (e. g. Croft et al., 2008; Krause et al., 2009), we posit that the sociological space of animal justice should be relationally conceived in a logic of human/animal ethical interdependence.

Our approach is inspired by the spatial turn in social sciences (Lefebvre; 1984; De Gregory & Urry, 1985; Urry, 2000; Massey 2005), which investigates space in relational terms and stimulates the transition toward a mobile sociology (Sheller & Urry, 2006). Spaces and places are understood as the products of the socio-spatial relations set by the production system (Lefebvre, 1984; Massey, 2005) and as flows and networks (Sheller & Urry, 2006; Sheller, 2017). Massey (2005) elaborates space as relational; as the product of interrelations, the sphere of a contemporaneous plurality, always under construction, and thus as imbued with power relations. Hence, space is understood as active, dynamic, heterogeneous and as a political response to neoliberal capitalism and the social inequalities and unbalanced power-relations it generates (Massey, 2005). Bélanger and Silvey (2020) highlight how spatiality and (im)mobility, as well as spatial and mobility justice, are informed by and reproduce power differentials in society.

In the last decade, an increasing number of scholars have been investigating animal space though the lens of animal geography (Philo & Wilbert, 2000; Urbanik, 2012; Buller, 2014; 2015; 2016).

Philo and Wilbert (2000) discuss how human beings have always been entangled in social relationship with animals so that animals are constitutive of human society. They stress how human–animal relations have been filled in with power and oppression by humans so that animals have remained a powerless, marginalised ‘other’. Moreover, they present animal geography as a novel discipline that has evolved “to follow how animals have been socially defined [...] to discern the many ways in which animals are ‘placed’ by human societies in their local material places” (ibid, p. 5).

The human understanding of the places occupied by animals reflects the human approach to classificatory schemes and ordering of the world that—to some extent—locate animals in abstract places and animal spaces (Philo & Wilbert, 2000), as in the paradigmatic example set by the *Systema naturae* of Linneaus (1758). This abstract, static, classificatory understanding of animals has resulted in a disentanglement from the moral circle of humans and a commodification of animals (Braidotti, 2013; Kline, 2021). Animals are an otherness set apart from the open mobile relational heterogeneous space discussed by Massey (2005), and largely confined in separate (im)mobilities, forced displacement, and mono-dimensional relational spaces imbued with unbalanced power-relations (Khazaal & Almiròn, 2021). Owain (2021) argues that the different encounters which constitute human–animal relations inform, and are informed by, this spatiality. Consequently, any reflection on human–animal relations must tackle not only the sociological spatiality but also the geographical spatiality and its places of encounters. The different ways in which human and animal interact are often spatially constructed, such as “*farm* animals, *zoo* animals, *laboratory* animals, *wild* animals, *domestic* pets” (Owain, 2021, p. 265). In such places “the ethical invisibility of the *individual* non-human other is a key factor in the spatialisation of ethical relations” (ibid, p. 269). This results in an ethical and political invisibility of individual non-human others, lost in faceless crowds of their own and other species.

## ANIMAL JUSTICE IN TOURISM

Although an increasing number of tourism scholars have investigated animal ethics in the last decade, animal justice, despite being intrinsically relevant to ethical issues, has only emerged as a research topic among tourism scholars in the last few years (Fennell & Shepard, 2019, 2021; Winter, 2020). Among the animal ethics studies by tourism scholars, those concerning animal rights and ecofeminism are particularly relevant to justice. According to the animal rights position, animals have an intrinsic value deriving from their consciousness, intentionality and sentience, and such value makes them moral patients; i. e. beings who, although considered lacking the capacity to use moral principles in their choices and actions, deserve respect (Fennell, 2012). The deontological aspect of the animal rights position relies on the understanding of humans as moral agents and provides the basis for a discourse about justice in terms of obligations (O’Neill, 1997;

Donaldson & Kymlicka, 2011). A less anthropocentric way to frame animal justice is based on an understanding of animals and humans as belonging to a shared web of interactions with each other (Kline, 2022). This understanding of animals can be observed in those studies based on ecofeminism, which is a philosophical perspective that rejects dualisms based on unbalanced power relations, as is often the case in human–animal interactions, emphasising instead care and compassion (Bertella, 2019; Bertella et al. 2019). These studies, however, do not particularly emphasise the concept of justice.

A few recent tourism studies have discussed animal justice explicitly and extensively (Fennell & Sheppard, 2021; Guia, 2021; Kline, 2022). Fennell and Sheppard (2021) elaborate a justice framework based on the recognition of two fundamental approaches: a traditional normative one, as in the case of the animal rights position, and a virtue ethics one, as in the case of ecofeminism. This framework identifies four levels of justice: no justice, shallow, moderate, and deep justice, and provides some examples aiming to illustrate an ethical scale along which the treatment of animals in tourism can be measured. Guia (2021), meanwhile, discusses posthumanism as a novel ethical framework for a justice grounded in affirmative ethics, arguing that this justice is about ethical encounters, affective relations, and political responsibility for human and non-human others. Similarly, Kline (2022) argues that posthuman affirmative ethics and nomadic subjectivity can fulfil the ecofeminist ambition of going beyond dualisms based on unbalanced power relations. By denying the notion of animals as an otherness disconnected from humanities and diminished by an anthropocentric approach, the posthuman affirmative ethics commented on by Guia (2021) and Kline (2021) prompts a political solidarity and advocacy and offers a novel theoretical ground for animal justice in tourism.

Some valuable insights about animal justice in tourism are also offered by other studies concerning human-animal relations (Sayers et al., 2021) and multispecies ethnographies (Pacini-Ketchabaw et al., 2016) adopting a posthuman approach. Among the numerous studies that comment on the commodification of wildlife in tourism, some reflect critically on the inherent tension between eco-tourism and the captivity of wild animals (Wearing & Jobberns, 2010; Fennell, 2013). This topic refers both to welfare issues (e. g. Morrhouse et al., 2017; Font et al., 2019), and to the underlying anthropocentrism characterising such experiences (e. g. Bertella, 2019; Winter, 2020) that embed forms of wildlife commodification (Rizzolo, 2021) and unfair conservation practices that maintain neoliberal and neo-colonial approaches (Mbaria & Ogada, 2016). Adopting a posthuman approach, López López and Venegas (2021) argue that the commodification of non-human animals pervades the entire tourism space in all its complex relationships. They explore how posthumanism helps to conceive a new geography of animals allowing different relations grounded in an affirmative ethics and novel awareness of the animal world, both as individual non-humans and collectively. Although not explicitly discussing justice, such theorisations are relevant to our study as they



reinforce the potential of posthumanism as a fruitful approach to reconsider practices of eco-tourism, such as wildlife sanctuaries, which are the focus of this paper.

## METHODOLOGY

To explore the space of animal justice in wildlife sanctuaries, we adopted a methodology inspired by pluralism, interdisciplinary, openness and creativity. Posthumanism invites methodologies that value different sources and forms of knowledge (Ulmer, 2021). Such pluralism is particularly important in the context of eco-tourism due to the relevance of the natural environment and its inhabitants to this form of tourism (Chakraborty, 2021). Moreover, as stressed by Guia and Jamal (2020, p. 2–3):

“Posthumanist methodologies are thus needed in tourism research if we are to challenge the habitual anthropocentric gaze taken by tourism researchers [...] to rethink our conceptions of tourists’ experiences [...] to challenge tourists’ visual imagery (as well as that of hosts), which tends to reproduce ‘everyday banalities’ [...] to identify and avoid indefensible binaries of ‘either-or’ commonly used in research projects.”

For our study, we relied on affirmative creativity and, more precisely, on “thinking with” and “thinking differently”, and on the value ascribed to memory and imagination (Braidotti, 2013; Haraway, 2016; Pacini-Kethbaw et al., 2016; Cohen, 2019; Jenkins et al., 2020). In order to gain some empirical insights into wildlife sanctuaries, the academic authors invited as co-researchers two ethologists who have volunteered in several sanctuaries worldwide. Working with a small sample of participants is a common practice in qualitative narrative studies based on first-person accounts (Riessman, 1993). About sample size and thematic saturation, Guest et al. (2020, p. 13) stress: “typically 6-7 interviews will capture the majority of themes in a homogeneous sample”. Nevertheless, several studies - aiming at deeply scrutinising participants’ first-person accounts by unpacking their stories - use smaller samples of three participants (e. g. Bredvold & Skálén, 2016; Carless & Sparkes, 2008; Slekar, 2005). Thus, our sample of four participants is methodologically consistent and it is aligned with the aim of our study and its theoretical framework.

The first-person accounts of the two ethologists constituted the raw material of the study, which was developed further during two unstructured conversations with both ethologists that occurred online in June–October 2021 and lasted approximately one hour each. Both conversations were in Italian (since all the authors are Italians) and were characterised by a rather informal tone deriving by a shared concern and passion about the animal world, as commented openly at the beginning of the first meeting. This shared concern and passion helped to build trust and reciprocal respect among the authors. Although the academic authors were mostly responsible for the analysis and presentation of the findings, the ethologist authors had an active role in revising the drafts.

Regarding the conversations, the first one adopted a narrative approach recognising its strengths in exploring a situation through its recount and representation (Czarniawska, 2004; Riessman, 1993). The ethologists recounted their first-hand experiences of the practices and spaces of human–animal interaction within wildlife sanctuaries. In addition, they shared several pictures taken during their experiences at different sanctuaries. This conversation was transcribed, and a thematic analysis was performed. The use of a thematic analysis permitted a flexible approach to the data analysis as well as offering a rich and accurate account of the data (Nowell et al., 2017; Walters, 2016). We performed such data analysis via a reiterated reading of the transcriptions that allowed to unpack the narrative data while developing a set of codes. This permitted the identification of meaningful themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Such analysis resulted in the identification of two main themes, namely: animal space and the different relations occurring in wildlife sanctuaries; and animal justice and affirmative ethics in wildlife sanctuaries.

The second conversation adopted an open co-creative approach to explore and discuss further the identified themes using concrete examples from the ethologists' experience. In their considerations about multispecies research, Pacini-Kethbaw et al. (2016) observe that our humanness is not a limitation, but on the contrary can be a valuable starting point to entering the animal world. In line with this position, we engaged in the conversation both cognitively and emotionally, reporting our thoughts and feelings about relevant topics emerging from the stories and reported examples shared by the ethologists. This led to a collective and disruptive form of reflexivity, embodying a process of meaning-making through which individuals cooperate to try to make sense of a specific issue that is perceived as particularly challenging. This form of reflexivity has some traits in common with what some posthuman scholars qualify as diffraction (Jenkins et al., 2020). Diffraction is about multiple truths, which is related to reflexivity and indicates a critical consciousness about the messy and entangled aspects of reality (Haraway, 2016). In several cases, we reflected openly on the numerous practical and conceptual challenges concerning wildlife justice, both in general and in relation to eco-tourism, making explicit our doubts and dilemmas. As part of these reflections, we also commented on our potential role, as ethologists and academics, in promoting critical thinking about such issues, and considered possible limitations arising from our common Western background while attempting a geographical posthuman engagement with these issues (Sundberg, 2014).

To bring order to our thoughts and elaborate further on our reflections, the transcription of the second conversation has been used to deepen and critically discuss the identified themes. In doing so, we adopted imagination, which is recognised as having a central role in posthuman reflections about human–animal relations (Sayers et al., 2021). Although there are various options for applying imagination to research, we opted for the development of vignettes. Vignettes are

recognised as useful for reflection and communication in posthuman research (Pacini-Kethbaw et al., 2016; Jenkins et al., 2020) and are emerging as valuable tools in tourism and leisure studies aiming to represent the animals' perspective (e. g., Wilkinson, 2018; Bertella, 2021). The vignette presented as the prologue of this paper includes two pictures and can be considered as a sketch that effectively summarises and communicates the most critically important issues that emerged during the conversations. Of these issues, the second theme concerning animal justice and affirmative ethics emerged as particularly complex, and a set of vignettes was employed to capture that complexity as fully as possible.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section discusses the two key themes that emerged during the semi-structured conversations among the authors so as to present a multifaceted and complex picture of wildlife sanctuaries. For clarity of exposition, these themes are presented in separate sections; nevertheless, it is important to stress that the themes are not completely distinct from each other, and several cross-cutting threads connect the findings and discussion on animal space, animal justice, and the role of tourism. Before presenting and discussing of the two themes, it is needed a clarification about how the two ethologist authors recount the different types of sanctuaries.

The first-person accounts of the ethologist authors highlight the differences between the sanctuaries that they referred to as 'real' sanctuaries versus those referred to as 'fake'. The ethologists described and discussed with the other two authors alternative scenarios where fundamentally different power relations and relational spatialities occur, from the basis of the following understanding of a wildlife sanctuary:

*Following the definition of the International Associations of Wildlife Sanctuaries, a Sanctuary is a place that is organised for the recovery of wildlife in difficulty and, once the sanctuary has offered the needed treatments, it releases the wildlife back into nature. This is what it should be. There isn't breeding, it isn't a zoo, it isn't a wildlife exposition. There is no contact with the animal: I mean the minimum contact that is required to treat the animal. But they are not humanised, not cuddled [Author 3].*

A 'real' sanctuary is articulated as an open space geographically confined for the (im)mobilities of animals, relying on the visitors' entry fees for its own subsistence. A 'real' sanctuary mediates the human–animal encounters for educational and safety purposes, hosting rescued animals that are chosen for their capacity to co-live with other species while not being dangerous for humans. The animals' freedom to move and establish social relationships, and their wellbeing, are central

elements in 'real' sanctuaries. Interestingly, the wellbeing of humans is also commented on and related to job opportunities and fairness:

*A sanctuary is important also for the local people since it provides jobs for local people since (...) it does not hire foreigners. A sanctuary hires local persons while giving opportunities to foreigners, like us, to volunteer for few months [...]. It provides a job to the people living in the nearby village. Volunteers never "steal" a job of a local person. In addition to the wellbeing of animals, the wellbeing and safeguarding of the local population is valued; the two things are interconnected [Author 4].*

Conversely, a 'fake' sanctuary is articulated as a space where animals are kept in cages for most of the time, and the human–animal interaction is a commodified asset attracting tourists and, as shown in the prologue, volunteers. The staff are mainly international, and the sanctuary does not provide jobs for the local community. The marketing of the sanctuary for commercial purposes is prioritised, disregarding the wellbeing and safety of both humans and animals. For example, a 'fake' sanctuary is described as follows:

*(...) the Sanctuary's role starts and ends exactly at the beginning of the chain of exploitation of that animal. This is a lifecycle where the animal is used for tourism from the beginning till the end. [...] There were just few local people working there; also, the volunteers, coordinators, the vets... they were all American, or Australian... [...] The baboons were living in tiny cages. The cubs were imprinted on human beings. They were given to volunteers... who had to put the diaper on them, truly like they were babies! Then you were sleeping with this little monkey... (...) in the morning, when it was time, you had to go back to the manual tasks, and the monkeys were put back in their cages [...] Nearby, there was a school (...). All the activities of volunteers with the children were not truly for the children. So, children were photographed, the teachers made us have lots of pictures with children, they made us colour the face of the children. Everything was really exploited for tourism [Author 3].*

### **Animal space and the different relations occurring in wildlife sanctuaries**

The articulation of the relational spatialities and power relations of 'real' and 'fake' wildlife sanctuaries casts light on the fundamental conundrum of wildlife sanctuaries: their *raison d'être* as well as their constructed relational space, animal (im)mobilities and their commodification (Sheller, 2017; Philo & Wilbert, 2000; Khazaal & Almiròn, 2021; Klein, 2022). Exploring such places from a posthuman perspective allows one to stress that an anthropocentric approach is persistent in both the 'real' and 'fake' sanctuaries, in so far as the decisions regarding the rescue, maintenance and choice of the hosted species is a function of the danger they represent for human beings and the

interest they can trigger in visitors. Hence, wildlife sanctuaries iterate unbalanced power-relations between humans and animals (Philo & Wilbert, 2000). This is particularly evident in ‘fake’ sanctuaries, where the animals not only do not have a value *per se*, as individuals (Owain, 2021), but are also treated as an embodied ‘otherness’ to touch, cuddle, observe, photograph and commodify. Such constructed spaces stage a form of wildlife consumption (Rizzolo, 2021) and iterate a neo-colonial, neo-liberal commodification of human and animal lives (Mbaria & Ogada, 2016). Even in ‘real’ sanctuaries, the intrinsic value and the agency of the animals is not prioritised, and animals are largely conceived either as an attractive factor for paying tourists or as a heritage to be managed for anthropocentric concerns and interests. Humans, like staff, local community members (e. g. school children), and international volunteers, are mainly actors entangled in a network of commodified relations, despite some efforts to socialise tourism (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2020) and, more specifically, to socialise animal-based tourism (Kline, 2022).

The relational spatialities of wildlife sanctuaries, and the interplay between human and animal space, appears to be ambiguous and far from the open multiple heterogeneous spatiality constituted by ethical encounters and relations with multiple others in a logic of ethical constructive interdependence within an active space (Braidotti, 2013; Latour, 2007; 2018; Massey, 2005). Tourism can play a pivotal but ambiguous role in this animal space. It can provide economic means via visitors’ entrance fees, but it can also disrupt the wildlife sanctuaries’ core mission of supporting animal wellbeing and rescue by reinforcing the commodification of wildlife (Rizzolo, 2021; Mbaria & Ogada, 2016). It can also provide, in line with eco-tourism principles, ethical encounters to raise awareness about wildlife by providing a transformative educational experience (Bertella, 2011; 2019; Doyle, 2017; Thomsen et al., 2021a). The ambiguous role of tourism is expressed, for example, with the following words:

*Unfortunately, in several places, the definition of Sanctuary has become a bit dirty from the point of view of tourism... They started understanding that people wanted to see the animals (...) to take part in conservation projects. And then, in many cases, these sanctuaries also became reproductive centres [Author 3].*

### **Animal justice and affirmative ethics in wildlife sanctuaries**

In the first-person accounts of the ethologist authors, and the broader discussion among the four authors, animal justice was constructed as a controversial issue that can be tackled from different perspectives that do not necessarily converge—e. g. the animal perspective, the human perspective, or the biological perspective. The theme of animal justice is presented in a dialogical form conveying the four authors’ points of view.

- Author 4: Animal justice is often understood as guaranteeing rights to animals. This perspective is anthropocentric... like conferring something human to animals, as if being animals would not be enough (...) I believe that the concept of 'right', understood as justice from a legal, human perspective, is dangerous.*
- Author 1: So, what should be justice for animals?*
- Author 4: It should be guaranteeing to the animal the possibility to be an animal ... as an individual and as a member of a species forming social groups and having a life proper for an animal (...) In my opinion, justice must be connected to respect: this is the most complete and fair vision of justice.*
- Author 3: I agree. To me, giving justice to animals is part of giving justice to nature without interfering excessively (...) I mean, in Africa, there was a tortoise that had turned on its back. Our instinct was to turn it back it since it was there, in front of us, and we could save its life, but the ranger said "no" ... he was right.*
- Author 2: But probably that tortoise wanted to be turned and justice for that animal would have meant to intervene and turn it. Moreover, isn't keeping the focus on species, and not on individuals, paradoxically, anthropocentric? Because we want to maintain the ecosystem in which our species can survive...*
- Author 3: It depends on what the cause of the animal's distress is ... I mean ... most of the species are in danger as a result of the direct or indirect effects of humans. About that tortoise... the ranger was right. We can assume that it was overturned because it had a fight with another male so—according to the law of nature and justice in nature—the winning male should be the one continuing the species. It would have been different, however, if a human had overturned the tortoise ... ..*

Animal justice is here articulated as 'becoming animal' (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Braidotti, 2013); giving up an anthropocentric perspective while trying to embrace a broader interconnected point of view, such as the one of a posthuman nomadic subjectivity (Braidotti, 2013). Nevertheless, this elaboration of justice, understood as a respect for—and a restoration of—the dimension of being a wild animal, seems to conflict with the aforementioned animal spatialities and relational space. In such animal spatialities and relation space a deep justice, grounded in a posthuman affirmative ethics, and made up of ethical encounters, affective relations and actions carrying political responsibility for humans and animals appears still to be a work in progress (Guia, 2021). The theme of animal justice and its practical implementation appears extremely complex and multifaceted in the context of wildlife sanctuaries. Nevertheless, the findings shed light on the opportunities for application of affirmative ethics (Braidotti, 2013), deep justice (Fennell & Shepard, 2021), political responsibility and solidarity (Guia, 2021; Kline, 2022) that arise in such anthropocentrically-constructed places. Once the human-made negative impacts on wildlife are

acknowledged (Elhacham et al., 2020; McArthur & Wilson, 2021), animal justice can arise in sanctuaries in a way that supports the eco-touristic vision of anthropocentrically-constructed places that restore wildlife wellbeing while providing educational activities and raising awareness.

*Author 4: Sanctuaries exist to provide the animals with the possibility to have the life they had, or they should have had, if man had allowed it. So, a 'real' sanctuary is part of the discourse about justice in terms of respect and giving a second opportunity.*

*Author 2: Ok, but not all the animals kept in sanctuaries are there because they were in vulnerable conditions on account of human activities...I mean, there is maybe a grey area.*

*Author 1: I agree, and I wonder, then, to what extent sanctuaries can be a place of justice for animals?*

*Author 4: Sanctuaries can be a place of justice when they are not thought of just as tourist attractions... they must be thought, firstly, as places for animal wellbeing. Then, tourism can play an important role for educational purposes. I mean, sanctuaries can help build a different approach to nature and wildlife and, as such, can be an important place of justice.*

*Author 3: Yes, sanctuaries' power goes beyond saving the single individual, and it is about educating. First, a sanctuary has to present the animals to the visitors: how they arrived there, why they are in captivity, ... telling their stories. Of course, the goal of a sanctuary can be saving a specific elephant, recovering it, taking care of its wellbeing... taking care of the individual. But it should be, somehow, also taking advantage of that individual in the sanctuary for a bigger educational scope and global message.*

Our findings suggest that the space of animal justice in wildlife sanctuaries can be associated with several of the types of justice identified by Fennell and Sheppard (2021). These include 'no justice' and 'intermediate justice', but not the most radical kind of justice— 'deep justice'. The findings suggest that the highest type of justice accomplishable in wildlife sanctuaries is the intermediate one and that type of justice can emerge along two main trajectories. One trajectory consists of conceiving such places as opportunities for actions of affirmative ethics and responsibility for humans and animals in a logic of interdependence and affective ethical relationships (Braidotti, 2013). This means that wildlife sanctuaries can contribute to socialising animal-based tourism (Kline, 2022) whereby the tourism phenomenon—instead of being conceived as a profit-driven industry triggering wildlife commodification and exploitation (Kline, 2022; Rizzolo, 2021)—should be rethought as a practice with social power for ecological and social justice, where the social is not purely a human domain (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2020; Fennell & Sheppard, 2021).

The second trajectory for affirmative ethics and intermediate justice in wildlife sanctuaries (Braidotti, 2013; Fennell & Sheppard, 2021) consists of the political commitment and proactive engagement of trade associations and non-profit international organisations aiming at reconciling the commercial and ethical aspects of wildlife sanctuaries (Font et al., 2019). Here, Author 3, for instance, describes World Animal Protection as a particularly valuable non-profit international organisation as it lists points that can be used to distinguish an ethical sanctuary from an unethical one and it provides guidelines for animal welfare to support conservation and not just wildlife exposition. Trade associations and non-profit organisations raise awareness as corporate social responsibility actors prompting affirmative ethics actions and decisions for animal welfare in tourism. Interestingly, our findings suggest that such a trajectory develops the habit of weighing costs and benefits for all involved, both animals and humans.

## Conclusion

This research has explored the space of animal justice in wildlife sanctuaries through a posthuman perspective. The premise was the opportunity to rethink human–animal relations in the light of the debate on the Anthropocene epoch and its relationship with a range of global issues, among which is the unjust treatment of animals in tourism. The focus on eco-tourism and, in particular, wildlife sanctuaries, was chosen as the latter tend to be perceived as positively contributing to animal welfare and wellbeing, as well as to transformative educational experiences for the tourists. This research challenged this vision. The findings suggested that there is a fundamental lack of justice in wildlife sanctuaries, especially in terms of deep justice, and also a lack of a genuine commitment and, presumably, capacity to viewing and treating animals as having an intrinsic value. Nonetheless, the space of animal justice in wildlife sanctuaries was found potentially to emerge as an intermediate form of justice along two trajectories. One is related to actions of affirmative ethics and responsibility for humans and animals in a logic of interdependence and affective ethical relationships. The other concerns the political commitment and proactive engagement of trade associations and non-profit international organisations aiming at reconciling the commercial and ethical aspects of wildlife sanctuaries.

This study contributes to the still scant literature about animal justice in tourism. In particular, its contribution relies in the discussion of this emerging issue from a posthuman perspective, and in the adoption of a multidisciplinary approach deriving from various literatures, including, in addition to philosophy, theories of the sociology of space and animal geography. An ethology perspective was also included through a methodology based on the close collaboration of the two tourism academic authors with the two ethologist authors. Based on our experience, we strongly recommend tourism scholars who adopt posthumanism in their studies to experiment with



collaborative and disruptive methodologies across disciplines. This research strived to adopt a methodology that could represent a plurality of the perspectives relevant to the phenomena of animal justice and wildlife sanctuaries. This attempt was grounded in the research's reliance on the first-person experience of the ethologist authors, and, importantly, on the use of dialogue and vignettes to deepen and make explicit potentially relevant issues. This methodology led to fruitful engagement with complex aspects, mainly due to the openness and critical thinking characterising the conversations among the authors. Still, we recognise the possibility to explore more disruptive methodologies that, ideally, could contribute to capture the animals' point of view. In the specific case, the possible difference between justice for animals and animal justice, i. e. justice as understood by animals, could be explored and lead to a fundamental reconceptualization about what justice is.

Among the study's limitations, we acknowledge two aspects that future studies might take as points of departure for further elaboration of a truly posthuman perspective on animal justice in eco-tourism. The first concerns the authors' belonging to Global North and Western cultures and the related risk of universalising and upholding a Eurocentric approach to investigating the space of animal justice in wildlife sanctuaries belonging to different socio-cultural contexts. The second aspect is that our study does not adhere to the posthuman vision of a methodology free from the human gaze. Clearly, that limitation is very difficult to overcome. Although scientific knowledge and imagination might help, the most honest and realistic way to explore how eco-tourism can support animal justice might be to suspend any definitive answer and adopt a precautionary approach by limiting as much as possible any human attempt to name, analyse and interfere in animal matters. Future studies might investigate to what extent such a precautionary approach can be applied, with the aim to deepen our understanding of the animal world and to manage eco-tourism practices.

## References:

Batavia, C., Nelson, M. P., Bruskotter, J. T., Jones, M. S., Yanco, E., Ramp, D., Wallach, A. D. (2021). Emotion as a source of moral understanding in conservation. *Conservation Biology*, 35, 1380 - 1387.

Bélangier, D., Silvey, R. (2020). An Im/mobility turn: power-geometries of care and migration. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46 (16), 3423-3440.

Bertella, G. (2011). Wildlife Tourism and Natural Sciences Knowledge: Challenges and Critical Factors, *Scandinavia Journal of Hospitality Tourism*, 11 (1), 97-114.

Bertella, G., Fumagalli, M., William-Grey, V. (2019). Wildlife Tourism through the co-creation lens, *Tourism Recreation Research*, 44 (3), 300-310.

Bertella, G. (2019). Sustainability in Wildlife Tourism: challenging the assumptions and imagining alternatives, *Tourism Review*, 74 (2), 246-255.

- Bertella, G. (2021). Animal-based experiences and animal experiences: farm animals' perspective on human leisure in rural settings. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 24 (5), 631-645.
- Blanchard, L.A., Hatakeyama, S., Kawasaki, A. (2022). Making waves: Peace Boat Japan as a model of sustainable peace through tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 30 (2-3), 600-617-
- Braidotti, R. (2006). Posthuman, All Too Human: towards a new process ontology. *Theory, Culture, & Society*, 23 (7-8), 197-208.
- Braidotti, R. (2013) *The Posthuman*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Braidotti, R. (2019). A Theoretical Framework for the Critical Posthumanities. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 36 (6), 31-61.
- Braun, V., Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
- Bredvold, R., & Skålén, P. (2016). Lifestyle entrepreneurs and their identity construction: A study of the tourism industry. *Tourism Management*, 56, 96–105.
- Buller, H. (2014) Animal geographies I. *Progress in Human Geography*, 38 (2), 308–318.
- Buller, H. (2015). Animal geographies II: Methods. *Progress in Human Geography*, 39 (3), 374-384.
- Buller, H. (2016). Animal geographies III: Ethics. *Progress in Human Geography*, 40 (3), 422-430.
- Carless, D., & Sparkes, A. C. (2008). The physical activity experiences of men with serious mental illness: Three short stories. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 9 (2), 191–210.
- Chakraborty, A. (2021). Emplacing non-human voices in tourism research: The role of dissensus as a qualitative method. *Tourism Geographies*, 23 (1-2), 118-143.
- Cohen, E. (2019) Posthumanism and tourism. *Tourism Review*. 74 (3), 416-427.
- De Gregory, D., Urry, J. (1985). *Social Relations and Spatial Structures*. Springer.
- Czarniawska, B. (2004). *Narratives in social science research*. Sage.
- Deleuze, G. Guattari, F. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Donaldson, S., and Kymlicka, W. (2011). *Zoopolis: A political theory of animal rights*. Oxford University Press.
- Doyle, C. (2017). Captive wildlife sanctuaries: Definition, ethical considerations, and public perception. *Animal Studies Journal*, 6 (2), 55–85.
- Elhacham, E., Ben-Uri, L., Grozovski, J., Bar-On, Y.M., Milo, R. (2020). Global human-made mass exceeds all living biomass. *Nature*, 588 (7838), 442–444.
- Fennell, D. A. (2013). Tourism and animal welfare. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 38(3), 325-340.
- Fennell, D. A., Sheppard, V. (2019). Tourism Operators on Trial: Pushing the Animal Justice Agenda Forward in Tourism in Spite of Theory. *TTRA Canada 2019 Conference*. 10. Retrieved from: [https://scholarworks.umass.edu/ttracanada\\_2019\\_conference/](https://scholarworks.umass.edu/ttracanada_2019_conference/)

- Fennell, D. A., Sheppard, V. (2021) Tourism, animals, and the scales of justice. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29 (2–3), 314–335.
- Ferrando, F. (2019) *Philosophical Posthumanism*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Font, X., Bonilla-Priego, M.J., Kantanbacher, J. (2019). Trade associations as corporate social responsibility actors: an institutional theory analysis of animal welfare in tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 27 (1), 118-138.
- Guest, G., Namey, E., & Chen, M. (2020). A simple method to assess and report thematic saturation in qualitative research. *PLoS One*, 15 (5), e0232076.
- Guia, J. (2021). Conceptualizing justice tourism and the promise of posthumanism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29 (2–3), 502–519.
- Guia, J., Jamal, T. (2020). A (Deleuzian) posthumanist paradigm for tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 84, 102982.
- Hayles, N.K. (1999). *How we became Posthuman: virtual bodies in cybernetics, literature, and informatics*. University of Chicago Press.
- Haraway D. (2003). *The Companion Species Manifesto: Dogs, People, and Significant Otherness*. Prickly Paradigm.
- Haraway D. (2006). A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late 20th Century. In (Eds.) Weiss J., Nolan J., Hunsinger J., Trifonas P., *The International Handbook of Virtual Learning Environments*, 117-158, Springer.
- Higgins-Desbiolles, F. (2020). Socialising tourism for social and ecological justice after COVID-19. *Tourism Geographies*, 22 (3), 610-623.
- Jamal, T., Higham, J. (2021). Justice and ethics: towards a new platform for tourism and sustainability. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29 (2–3), 143–157.
- Jenkins, N., Ritchie, L., Quinn, S. (2020). From reflection to diffraction: exploring the use of vignettes within post-humanist and multi-species research. *Qualitative Research*, 21 (6), 975-989.
- Lefebvre, H. (1984). *The Production of Space*. Blackwell Pub.
- Latour, B. (2007). *Reassembling the Social: an Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford University Press.
- Latour, B. (2018). *Down to Earth: Politics in the new climatic regime*. Wiley & Sons.
- Laws, E., Scott, N., Font, X., Koldowski, J. (2020). *The Elephant Tourism Business*. CABI
- Linnaeus, C. (1758). *Systema Naturae*, Vol. 1. CABI
- López López, Á., Venegas, J. G. Q. (2021). La geografía del turismo y la geografía de los animales intersectadas por la ética poshumanista. *Cuadernos de Geografía: Revista Colombiana de Geografía*, 30 (1), 86–105.
- Khazaal, N., Almiròn, N. (2021). *Like an Animal: Critical Animal Studies approaches to borders, displacement, and othering*. Brill.

- Kline, C. (2022). Socialising animal-based tourism. In (Eds.) Higgins-Desbiolles, F., Doering, A., Bigby, C.B., *Socialising Tourism: Rethinking Tourism for Social and Ecological Justice*, 195-213, Routledge.
- Masse, D. (2005) *For Space*. Sage.
- Mbaria, J., Ogada, M., (2016). *The Big Conservation Lie*. Lens & Pens Publishing.
- Mcarthur, J., Wilson, K. (2021). *Hidden: Animals in the Anthropocene*. Reed Wheel Weiser.
- Mishler, E. G. (2014). The interactional construction of narratives in medical and life-history interviews. In (Eds.) Gunnarsson, B. L., Linell, P., Nordberg, B., *The Construction of Professional Discourse*, 223-244, Routledge.
- Moorhouse, T., D'Cruze, N. C., & Macdonald, D. W. (2017). Unethical use of wildlife in tourism: What's the problem, who is responsible, and what can be done? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 25(4), 505-516.
- Nowell, L.S., Norris, J.M., White, D.E., Moules, N.J. (2017). Thematic Analysis: Striving to Meet the Trustworthiness Criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16, 1-13.
- O'Neill, O. (1997). Environmental values, anthropocentrism and speciesism. *Environmental Values*, 6 (2), 127-42.
- Owain, J. (2000). (Un)ethical geographies of human non-human relations. Encounters, collectives, and spaces. In (Eds.) Philo, C., Wilbert, C., *Animal Spaces, Beastly Places: new geographies of human-animal relations*, 267-289, Routledge.
- Pacini-Ketchabaw, V., Taylor, A., Blaise, M. (2016). Decentring the human in multispecies ethnographies. In (Eds.) Taylor, C.A., Hughes, C., *Posthuman research practices in education*, 149-167. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Philo, C., Wilbert, C. (2000). *Animal Spaces, Beastly Places: new geographies of human-animal relations*. Routledge.
- Riessman, C. K. (1993). *Narrative analysis*. Sage.
- Rizzolo, J. B. (2021). Wildlife Tourism and Consumption, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*. DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2021.1957903
- Sayers, J., Martin, L., Bell, E. (2021). Posthuman Affirmative Business Ethics: Reimagining Human-Animal Relations Through Speculative Fiction. *Journal of Business Ethics*. DOI: doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04801-8
- Santiago-Avila, F. J., Lynn, W. S. (2020). Bridging compassion and justice in conservation ethics. *Biological Conservation*, 248, 108648.
- Slekar, T. D. (2005). Without 1, where would we begin? Small sample research in educational settings. *Journal of Thought*, 40 (1), 79-86.
- Sheller, M. (2017). From Spatial Turn to Mobilities Turn. *Current Sociology*, 65 (4), 623-639.
- Sheller, M., Urry, J. (2006). The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning*, 38, 207-226.
- Sundberg, J. (2014). Decolonizing posthumanist geographies. *Cultural Geographies*, 21(1), 33-47.

- Thomsen, B. (2021). Wolf Ecotourism. In (Ed.) Fennell, D. A., *Routledge Handbook of Ecotourism (1<sup>st</sup> Ed.)* Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9781003001768
- Thomsen, B., Thomsen, J., Copeland, K., Coose, S., Arnold, E., Bryan, H., Prokop, K., Cullen, K., Vaughn, C., Rodriguez, B., Muha, R., Arnold, N., Winger, H., Chalich, G. (2021a). Multispecies livelihoods: a posthumanist approach to wildlife ecotourism that promotes animal ethics. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2021.1942893.
- Thomsen, B., Thomsen, J. Cipollone, M., Coose, S. (2021b). Let's save the bear: a multispecies livelihoods approach to wildlife conservation and achieving the SDGs, *Journal of International Council for Small Business*, 2 (12), 114-124.
- Treves, A., Santiago-Ávila, F. J., Lynn, W. S. (2018). Just preservation. *Biological Conservation*, 229, 134–141.
- Ulmer, J. B. (2017). Posthumanism as research methodology: Inquiry in the Anthropocene. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 30 (9), 832-848.
- Urbanik, J. (2012). *Placing Animals: An Introduction to the Geography of Human-animal Relations*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Walters, T. (2016). Using thematic analysis in tourism research. *Tourism Analysis*, 21(1), 107–116.
- Wearing, S., & Jobberns, C. (2010). Ecotourism and the Commodification of Wildlife: Animal Welfare and the Ethics of Zoos. In *Zoos and tourism* (pp. 47-58). Channel View Publications.
- Wilkinson, S. (2018). Being Camilla: The 'leisure'life of a captive chameleon. In (Eds. Carr, N., Young, J. *Wild Animals and Leisure: Rights and Wellbeing (1<sup>st</sup> ed.)*, 96-112. Routledge.
- Winter, C. (2020). A review of research into animal ethics in tourism: launching the annals of tourism research curated collection on animal ethics in tourism, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 84. DOI: 10.1016/j.annals.2020.102989.