INSTAGRANIMAL
– Animal Welfare and Ethical Challenges of Animal-Based Tourism

Erica von Essen, Johan Lindsjö, Adélaïde Fouache

Figure 1 : Symposium participants. Photo by Carol Kline

INSTAGRANIMAL

A symposium on the Ethics and Welfare Challenges in Animal-Based Tourism

PARTICIPANTS

Name, organization	Email address
Adélaïde Fouache, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	adfe0001@stud.slu.se
Adrian Franklin, University of Tasmania	adrian.franklin@utas.edu.au
Albin Gräns, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	albin.grans@slu.se
Anita Burkevica, Parken Zoo	anita.burkevica@parkenzoo.se
Anke Fischer, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	anke.fischer@slu.se
Brent Lovelock, University of Otago	brent.lovelock@otago.ac.nz
Carl-Gustaf Thulin, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	carl-gustaf.thulin@slu.se
Carol Kline, Appalachian State University	klinecs@appstate.edu
David Scott, Dalarna University	dsc@du.se
Ebba Alteg, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	ebba.alteg@gmail.com
Erica von Essen, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	erica.von.essen@slu.se
Erika Andersson Cederholm, Lund University	erika.andersson_cederholm@ism.lu.se
Henrik Lerner, Ersta Sköndal Bräcke University College	henrik.lerner@esh.se
Jennie Persson, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	jennie.persson@slu.se
Johan Lindsjö, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	johan.lindsjo@slu.se
Jonatan Borling, the adventure of carnivore conservation	jonatan.borling@gmail.com
Josefina Zidar, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	josefina.zidar@slu.se
Katherine Dashper, Leeds Beckett University	k.dashper@leedsbeckett.ac.uk
Lara Tickle, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	lara.tickle@slu.se
Lars Hallgren, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	lars.hallgren@slu.se
Linda Keeling, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	linda.keeling@slu.se
Linda Thelin, Rovdjurscentret Järvsö	linda@de5stora.com
Lisa Lundin, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	lisa.lundin@slu.se
Lotta Berg, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	lotta.berg@slu.se
Margareta Steen, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	margareta.steen@slu.se
Michael Jones, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	michael.jones@slu.se
Moa Samuelsson & Martyna Zelek, 4H Skokloster	Moa.Samuelsson97@hotmail.com
Muchazondida Mkono, The University of Queensland	m.mkono@business.uq.edu.au
Olle Torpman, Stockholm University	olle.torpman@slu.se
Roger Pettersson, World Animal Protection	rogerpettersson@worldanimalprotection.se
Viveka Hillegaart, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	viveka.hillegaart@slu.se
Wouter Blankenstijn	wouter.blankenstijn@slu.se
Xavier Font, University of Surrey	x.font@surrey.ac.uk
Åsa Fahlman, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences	asa.fahlman@slu.se

INSTAGRANIMAL– Animal Welfare and Ethical Challenges of Animal-Based Tourism

Erica Von Essen   SLU, Department of Urban and Rural Development, Division of Environmental Communication, erica.von.essen@slu.se

PhD, associate professor at the Division of Environmental Communication, Department of Urban and Rural Development, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU). Von Essen's research areas include hunting, human-wildlife relations, conservation conflicts and social movements.

Johan Lindsjö   SLU, Swedish Centre for Animal Welfare (SCAW), johan.lindsjo@slu.se

Doctor of Veterinary Medicine, Swedish specialist in diseases of dogs and cats, M.Sc. in wildlife health, Lindsjö is a qualified officer at the Swedish Centre for Animal Welfare (SCAW) and a lecturer at the Department of Animal Environment and Health, SLU. He is a resident in Animal Welfare Science, Ethics and Law (European College of Animal Welfare and Behavioural Medicine).

Adélaïde Fouache   SLU, Department of Urban and Rural Development, Division of Environmental Communication, adfe0001@stud.slu.se

Master student in Environmental Communication, writer and in charge of International Partnership for Fanimal, Adélaïde's thesis is focusing on the endangered Southern Resident Killer Whales of British Colombia, Canada, and how the locals' perception of these species help for their protection and conservation.

Preface

The organizers of the symposium, Erica von Essen and Johan Lindsjö, want to thank every participant for their active engagement and contributions to the symposium. Two people have been especially valuable to us. Jennie Persson assisted tirelessly during the planning and execution of the event. Masters student in Environmental Communication Adélaïde Fouache kindly took notes for us during the two-day proceedings, providing the basis for this report. Environmental Communication PhD student and presenter Lara Tickle supplied the catchy title back in June. Finally, former Environmental Communication student Anna Martin headed up the graphic design for the symposium poster, which we retained as our aesthetic template. To refer to a symposium term, this is the 'invisible labour' behind our work, and we are grateful for it.

The symposium and this report were borne in the wake of a series of animal tourism controversies. Three years after Cecil the Lion increased scrutiny on hunting tourists everywhere, and six years after Blackfish (2013) exposed problems with the sea park and captive wild animals industry, animal tourism continues to thrive and take new forms. At the same time, increasing attention and scepticism are also directed toward many practices. This indicates that the time is ripe for problematizing what we see as harms and acceptable standards in animal tourism.

Content

Introduction

BACKGROUND

Taking #slothselfies, swimming with dolphins and bottle-feeding orphan tiger cubs form part of a growing global industry that sells embodied encounters with animals (Desmond, 1999; Bulbeck, 2005). In a time of "perpetual documentation" of our experiences (Tribe and Mkono, 2017, p.110), such interactions are lived out again on social media and reviewed on travel and booking platforms. Animal encounters are cherished within phenomena like 'Last Chance Tourism', 'Bucket List Destinations' and safari hunts for 'The Big Five' on. In short, it appears that an increasing demographic of tourists seek self-fulfillment through engaging with animals on holiday (Franklin, 2003). It also appears that in the near future, this demographic will widen and consume more voraciously.

Epithets like 'sustainable' and 'ethical' tourism have been at the forefront of critical tourism studies for a number of years (Todd, 2012). The exploitation of vulnerable others in tourism is a similarly recurring topic (MacDonald, 2005; Lovelock and Lovelock, 2013). Although relatively few tourism studies have focused on the welfare of the animals (Fennell, 2013), increasingly, the role and welfare of animals in tourism receive more attention (Hughes, 2001; Duffy and Moore, 2010; Carr and Broom, 2018). As an industry that is rapidly evolving and finding increasingly extreme ways in which to consume animals, we believe the future of this industry merits critical scrutiny. For instance, we must ask questions like:

What trends are we seeing in animal-based tourism? What new roles are we inventing for animals to provide leisure and self-realization to human tourists? Furthermore, what are the implications of such trends and human-animal interactions on animal welfare? What does this say about society and our ethical values?

THE EVENT

On August 27-28th 2019, a cross-disciplinary symposium was held at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU) in Uppsala to address some of these pressing questions. Over the course of two days, researchers and practitioners discussed human-animal encounters in ecotourism, zoo tourism, agritourism and hunting tourism. Taking as their basis a shared emphasis on experiencing the animal, these touristic contexts were considered as to their ethical dilemmas, their commodification of animals as props or products, and the conditions in which they house, display or employ tourism animals. The following report from the symposium collects the "modes of engagement […] that connect us to nature" and animals in tourism (Markwell, 2018) and

interrogates the ethical justifiability of the human-animal relations established as part of these. **Main aims of the symposium** were to look toward the future as to:

(1) Identify challenges in animal welfare and animal ethics in tourism.
(2) identify new animal tourism developments conceptually or empirically
(3) explore and suggest needed regulative responses on the part of governments, international bodies or pressure from animal protection and rights NGOs and consumers of tourism, to secure the development or enforcement of welfare standards,
(4) to develop calls for future research on animal-based tourism, both disciplinary and across disciplines.

RESEARCH CONTEXT

In the report that follows, proceedings from the symposium are presented. We summarize presentations and plenary reflections. We then synthesize key themes that were discussed on the basis of the presentations, toward the end of the second day of the symposium. The report functions in part as a state of the art of animal-based tourism as seen from the perspectives of researchers across diverse disciplines, including animal welfare, animal and environmental ethics, veterinary medicine, ethology, species and environmental conservation, geography, communication, tourism & leisure studies, sociology, philosophy and anthropology. In part, the symposium and its report, to our knowledge, serve as the first interdisciplinary collection of the diverse contexts of animal tourism – agri-, hunting-, eco-, and zootourism. These contexts have previously been treated separately, in imported consumptive/non-consumptive or capture/semi-capture and wild divisions (Shani, 2009; Lovelock, 2015a). Because recent research is increasingly destabilizing the boundaries between forms of animal tourism, moreover, our symposium takes the opportunity to examine shared motifs, drivers and challenges across these contexts of animal tourism.

DISPOSITION

The report is structured as follows. First we present a background on animal-based tourism, including basic definitions, fields of study that have addressed this phenomenon, and key research perspectives. On the basis of these issues in animal-based tourism, we motivate the selection of invited researchers and practitioners to the symposium: the participants' global reach, their range across disciplines, their scope across animal species and animal contexts, and their complementary of perspectives in relation to one another.

Each session, which has been constituted thematically and crossdisciplinarily, (rather than divided separately into nature science, social science, ethics, etc.) through summaries circulated prior to the symposium, is subsequently summarized as to its talks and the ensuring discussion. A more thorough synthesis of themes is presented in chapter two. These themes were chosen during the

symposium by the organizers with input from participants, and formed the basis for targeted group discussions in a workshop session.

At the end of each of these five themes is a short section containing next steps on three levels: *directives to policy*, *guidelines to tourists*, and *calls for further research*. The report concludes with a brief scoping toward the future and a summary of the symposium contributions to practice and research. The authors of this report want to clarify that due to the extent and diversity of animal-based activities, the symposium and the consequent report do not cover all aspects of animal-based tourism. Scientific names of wild and semi-domesticated animal species are included when identified.

SELECTION OF SYMPOSIUM SPEAKERS

Erica von Essen and Johan Lindsjö started a process of literature reviewing and surveying tourism research centers globally that showcased prominent researchers writing about animal-based tourism, animal welfare and ethics. A list of fifteen researchers was generated at first stage and presented as part of the application for the grant supporting the symposium. These researchers were then reached out to and personally invited by email. A desire was to span the three contexts of animal tourism: agritourism, hunting tourism and ecotourism.

News of the symposium spread by word of mouth in the spring and summer of 2019, adding additional researchers to the participation list. An important criterion for inclusion was complementarity of theoretical perspectives and academic disciplines. The symposium also extended personal invitations to practitioners of animal-based tourism. Hence, major travel agents were contacted; as were Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) related to ecotourism and 4H associations. Other prominent actors that were deemed to have some sort of connection to displaying animal tourism, such as social media umbrella organisations, were also invited.

Eventually, the symposium was invite-only for speakers, but the presentations were open to the public. It was advertised in advance on social media and on the websites of different stakeholders and Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU). A press release was sent out ahead from SLU and a pre-symposium news item on hunting tourism was presented on *Svensk Jakt*, the Swedish Hunting Association's magazine website. At the time, the symposium gained press attention and the organisers spoke to both radio and TV media, including P1 (*P1-morgon*, *Vetenskapsradion*), P4 Uppland and TV4, who aired a small segment on animal tourism and animal selfies on *Efter Fem*. The symposium had over fifty attendees over the two days who came to listen to the talks.

Chapter 1: From Beasts to Instagranimals: Literature Review of Animal Tourism

TYPES

Animal tourism is one of the fastest growing sectors worldwide (Rodger et al., 2007). Tourists can experience animals, who may be enclosed, domestic, on farms, in zoos or in the wild. Reflecting this diversity of human-animal interactions, animal-based tourism has been subject to a multitude of typologies in tourism studies:

- Consumptive vs. non-consumptive, e.g. fishing vs. catch-and-release fishing, or hunting vs. wildlife viewing;
- Featuring animals as wild, semi-wild or captive; e.g. safari parks, zoos, sanctuaries or through mobile wildlife exhibitors;
- In enclosures or natural habitats (Carr, 2009);
- Destructive vs. constructive animal tourism;
- Seeing the animal as an essential component, an enhancement of the experience, or incidental to a tour (Coghlan and Buckley, 2012);
- Profiling tourists in terms of their preferences and dispositions when engaging with animals – hardcore, dedicated, mainstream or casual;
- Natural vs. contrived settings (Cohen, 2012);
- Tourism ON nature vs. IN nature (Burns et al., 2011)

The expanding repertoire of animal tourism however means that new forms of engagement defy categorization into ideal types. More problematically, when it comes to dividing types on the basis of positive or negative impacts as above, the literature makes it clear that we have epistemic uncertainties about the consequences of our animal-tourism interactions. Research indicates that there is arguably no such thing as 'low-impact' non-consumptive wildlife tourism, but that all forms invariably involve degrees of stress for the animals (Lovelock and Lovelock, 2013).

Dobson (2012) proposes that consumptive and non-consumptive wildlife tourism can be morally demarcated on the basis of intention to harm, vs. harm as unintended outcome or harm as part of the rationale (Moorhouse et al., 2017). Still, the actual effects of the animal encounter may vary considerably. Instances of wildlife watching may be detrimental both to the individual animal and the population or species.

On the other hand, trophy hunting, which has a clear intent to take an animal's life, may still generate substantial revenue toward the conservation of the hunted, or other, species in the wild. Indeed, this increasingly forms part of the motivation for trophy hunting. Hence, scholars recognize the difficulty of importing normative typologies to distinguish types of animal tourism in terms of good and bad (Lovelock, 2015a). Some argue that ideal types are unhelpful to work with (Lovelock, 2008; Markwell, 2018). The authors believe the justifiability of animal-based tourism rather depends in large part on its execution and impact in practice.

Other typologies of animal-based tourism have focused more directly on the context. Extinction and last-chance tourism, for example (Higham and Neves, 2015) draw visitors based on rarity and exclusivity. 'Danger' or 'muscular' tourism (Franklin, 2003) refer to mostly male-marketed holidays that emphasize physical rigor and existential authenticity. This is sometimes a subset of hunting tourism, that caters to 'tough-minded Darwinian types' (Cartmill, 1993, p. 149) embarking on a hunting trip that involves skill, exertion and virtues of self-sufficiency. Thus, wild boar (*Sus scrofa*) hunting in Italy (Weibel-Orlando, 2009) or Tasmanian seal (*Arctocephalus forsteri*) hunting approximating 'macho shootouts' (Bulbeck, 2005, p. 62) sells masculinity as achievement, and cumbersome hunting trips often involve the tourists inhabiting the role of hunting hero (Campos et al., 2017). Wilderness tourism is sometimes also demarcated as a category or a mode in which animals can be experienced in relatively uncontrived or untouched ways, such as trekking to see gorillas and gibbons in their natural habitats (Moorhouse et al., 2019). Though as Rose and Carr (2018) note, few touristic spaces today are unaffected by human influence (p. 266). A growing category of animal tourism also intersects with 'deviance' or 'dark tourism', involving taboo interspecies interactions, or visiting places of death (such as Chernobyl, where wild animals have now found sanctuary) (Stone and Sharpley, 2013).

DRIVERS OF ANIMAL TOURISM

Why are such niche even deviant forms of engagement with animals sought by tourists today? Research has located drivers behind animal-based tourism above all in the context of modernity. While traveling to experience animals has also been a historical practice in colonial trips (Desmond, 1999), the appeal of interacting with animals is now said to alsostem from desires to escape the inauthenticity of everyday modern life (Cohen, 2007). Conditions of modern life, moreover, are seen as 'synthetic', artificial and ephemeral, while nature and animals are healing roots to which we may return for fulfillment (Franklin, 2003). Following environmental degradation and alienation from nature, animal tourism may help alleviate anxiety about the state of the world on the part of tourists (Higham and Neves, 2015). In the context of an uncertain modernity, Franklin (1999) suggests that interspecies encounters hold appeal insofar as animals are "available, reliable, stable, and predictable in their relations with humans at a time when human social relations are the opposite" (pp. 194-195).

In the literature on drivers for such tourism, re-connecting with animals is said to be psychologically good (Burns, 2015), physically reinvigorating (Franklin, 2012) and spiritually fulfilling (Swan, 1995), especially for urban residents who experience alienation from nature (Higham and Neves, 2015). Holidaying with animals brings opportunities of self-discovery and 'really living' (Cohen, 2007, p. 257). This is particularly true when encounters are predicated on a degree of danger or existential authenticity in relation to wild animals (Simon, 2019): going hunting, trekking through the wilderness or shark-diving. To be sure, animal tourism does not just deliver individual spiritual fulfilment; it is increasingly a social practice of identity positioning and status signalling (Rojek, 2000; Green and Jones, 2005). Animal tourism, then, is extensively used for bragging online (Mkono and Holder, 2019) and as a 'story to tell at home' (Keul, 2018, p.186).

The popularity of animal-based tourism is predicated in large part on upholding a divide between nature and culture. A "separation by both time and distance […] and dailiness" (Bulbeck, 2005, p. 187) is what bestows the animal with its appeal. The animal encounter offers to temporarily overcome these divides and reconcile man to his natural heritage: as an outdoorsman, as a carer for animals, farmhand or horse-rider. Desmond (1999) terms this a continual recalibration of a delicate balance between access and denial of access to animals, with tourism a mediator of this access.

FORMS OF ENGAGEMENT WITH ANIMALS

Animal-based tourism as a conceptual vehicle tends to offer activities that go beyond the visual in order to overcome this distance: emphasizing embodied engagement and multisensory experience (Everett, 2008). The animal itself may inhabit diverse roles, ranging from a spiritual commodity (Cloke and Perkins, 2005); a mode of transportation; a labourer in the background (Lovelock and Lovelock, 2013) or "unpaid employee" (Mkono and Holder, 2019, p. 2); a front-stage performer (Markwell, 2015); a marker of place (Danby et al., 2019); a 'facilitator' of leisure (Fennell, 2014, p. 984) or the ultimate sacrifice as game. Animals in this industry are frequently commoditized into souvenirs or toys (Bertella, 2018; Keul, 2018). Some stories in recent years focus on the rescue of tourism animals to sanctuaries open to tourists, with no or limited direct human interaction with the animals (World Animal Protection, 2015). In such situations, animals may be perceived as rescuees.

The literature on animal tourism is now pointing to more fruitful perspectives of seeing human-animal entanglements in terms of *relations* rather than roles. That is, central to the experience are interspecies interactions (Bertella, 2014): touching, tasting, smelling, touching, feeding, nursing animals. Such 'hands-on' engagement and proximity is what creates memorability for tourists in animal tourism (Campos et al., 2017), not the static representations of animals on their own. Animal tourism, to Mavhunga (2011), is about experiencing the animal "through the kinetics of its everyday life" (p. 33). Hence, a degree of spontaneity and autonomy is often valued in the animal encounters. Animals are valued, within reason, as 'active agents' (Lovelock and Lovelock, 2013).

In a recent sub-activity of animal tourism, agritourism breaks down barriers between producers and consumers and appeals to lost connections to the material and the agrarian heritage of modern urban dwellers (Everett, 2008; Daugstad and Kirchengast, 2013). It is seen to be driven by nostalgia and calls for authenticity (Chhabra et al., 2003). Farm animals are the key attraction (Carr, 2009), but also the evocation of lost intimacy between the farmer and the consumer (Sayre and Henderson, 2018). It appeals as a reality that is both familiar and exotic (Bertella, 2014)

EFFECTS ON ANIMALS – WELFARE, ETHICS AND OUR ACTIONS

While the drivers, satisfactions and preferences of end-users in animal tourism are extensively mapped, the effects of these interactions on animal welfare are understudied and underacknowledged. Today, few people would disagree that animals are sentient beings (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, Fennell, 2013). Research intimates that tourists' desire for close contact and high visibility of the animals they come to see typically clashes with the animals' need for integrity (Shani and Pizam, 2008), natural behavior, space and satisfying social environment, balanced nutrition and proper husbandry and medical care (review in Moorhouse et al., 2015; Winders, 2017). For example, Schmidt-Burbach et al., (2015) found that elephants (*Elephas maximus*), Pig-tailed macaque (*Macaca nemestrina*) and tigers (*Panthera tigris*) were often kept in severely inadequate welfare conditions at facilities open to tourists in Thailand.

In the context of performing zoo animals, animal welfare principles are shown to be stretched to entertain the visitors (Bertella, 2018). Often, animals are 'broken down' into compliant subjects in order to interact with visitors (Fennell, 2014). Animals may be drugged to enable close contact (photos, selfies, etc.) and abused during performances (World Animal Protection, 2015; Schmidt-Burbach, 2017). At other times, trophy bucks in hunting tourism have been so severely bred for large antlers that they have trouble holding their heads up (Simon, 2019).

Activities which are seemingly perceived as good for the animals may be permitted under green- or humane washing and eco-labeling schemes (Moorhouse et al., 2017; Winders, 2017). Individuals are removed from wild populations and there is risk of disease transmission (Moorhouse et al., 2015). Encounters of animals in the wild, such as wildlife-spotting and swimming with dolphins (*Delphinus sp.)* may disturb individual animals and group dynamics (Jacobson and Lopez, 1994; Meissner et al., 2015). In fact, impact on individual animals can have negative effects on a group or population level, especially if these are populations at risk (Moorhouse et al., 2015).

The welfare of domestic and semi-domestic animals in animal-based tourism is also a concern. For example, Ojuva (2018) discussed the need to consider physical and mental well-being; possibilities to perform species-typical behavior, freedom from disease, adequate housing and enclosures, breeding, nutrition, hydration, rest and training methods in dogs (dog-sledding), horses and reindeer (*Rangifer tarandi*) used in animal-based tourism in Lappland, Finland. The report

also emphasizes the importance of information from tour operators to tourists on how to handle the animals properly.

A primary facilitating mechanism for poor animal welfare standards in animal-based tourism has been located in the way the tourism industry and the 'holiday phenomenon' is set up in the first place. The 'attitude-behavior gap' in tourism (Juvan and Dolnicar, 2014) suggests that an individual's positive attitude toward animal rights or environmental sustainability in their everyday life are ultimately not a reliable predictor of their holiday choices. Kline (2018) argues that people 'leave their ethics at home' while travelling because they are removed in time and place from routine and normalized contexts of everyday life. This can result in cognitive dissonance, but becomes managed through justifying tropes that neutralize morally deviant behavior when on holiday (Moorhouse et al., 2017). Tenbrunsel and Messick (2004) term this phenomenon 'ethical bleaching', allowing the suspension of traditional ethical norms. A popular idiom for this is the 'When in Rome' effect. It means that animal welfare principles and interactions with animals become subject to cultural relativism (Lovelock and Lovelock, 2013). As such, tourism comes to be seen as "a zone of permissiveness and indulgence which should not be judged by the ethical criteria deployed in daily life (Cohen, 2018, p. 6).

The tourism disconnect effect may be exacerbated in the context of animals and nature as nature is seen to be an escape area, a source of pleasure (Wang, 2000) and "providing a chance to be delinquent" (Bulbeck, 2005, p. 148). Codes of conduct thus prove difficult to operationalize and implement. Research suggests codes are only ever effective insofar as end-users have been involved in their development (Lovelock and Lovelock, 2013). Nevertheless, some insist that codes are "no better than a band-aid for a bullet wound" (Mason and Mowforth, 2007, p. 46) and Moorhouse et al. (2017) observe that neoliberalisation and regulatory vacuums in tourism means the onus of regulation often falls on tourists themselves, who are "poorly equipped for this role" (p. 513).

More optimistic research indicates that post-modern tourists are increasingly discerning consumers, whose choices and preferences on holiday go toward their identity and status. This means that changes in visitor tastes may may improve animal welfare standards (Shackley, 1996). Equally, Bertella (2018) suggests there may be value in close encounters with animals insofar as they trigger emotional and cognitive responses that support caring attitudes and critical reflections. Kline (2018) likewise points to interacting with animals on holiday as providing tourists with new insights, new knowledge and new experiences of animals that would not have taken place in their everyday routines, suggesting scope for learning. Fostering moral reflection on the part of tourists (Lovelock, 2015b) may therefore be seen as a way forward not just for improving animal welfare standards in tourism, but as progressing animal rights in society broadly.

1. BASIC DEFINITIONS AND FRAMEWORK

In this introductory session, two speakers were featured to provide overviews of key terms and perspectives from within their respective fields: environmental and animal ethics and animal welfare.

Formulating Ethical Arguments
Olle Torpman, SLU

In Olle Torpman's presentation, the source of much contention and disagreement over animals or environmental issues was said to stem from differences in values. Within this are defined concepts of intrinsic and instrumental value, and anthropocentrism and non-anthropocentrism.

The basis for including or excluding animals within moral consideration was explained to be sentience, consciousness and rationality. Torpman emphasized that not all humans living today approximate these characteristics ("marginal cases"), but that we nevertheless grant them an exception and view them as moral subjects with rights.

The presentation was followed by a discussion on the plurality of different perspectives within the non-anthropocentric school of thought, including sentientism, biocentrism and ecocentrism. Here, people noted an ethical dilemma or tension between honoring the welfare of an individual animal vs. that of a population, species or ecosystem of several organisms, who might be individually sacrificed for the benefit of the whole. Torpman emphasized that the discussion proceeds in a descriptive ethics capacity, in the sense of not delving into normative ethics, such as animal rights or contractarian principles or utilitarism, but involving norms of right and wrong.

How do we define and measure animal welfare?
Linda Keeling, SLU

Linda Keeling's presentation focused on what we mean by, and use to measure, animal welfare. She provided a short history of animal welfare as a concept and movement starting to recognize animals' ability to feel pain and suffer. She presented the five freedoms as still influential guidelines in ensuring animal welfare:

(1) Freedom from hunger and thirst
(2) Freedom from discomfort
(3) Freedom from pain, injury and disease
(4) Freedom from fear and distress
(5) Freedom to express normal behaviour

The five freedoms are aspirational guidelines and are difficult to fully achieve in practice. In addition to this, only one of the freedoms is a positive freedom, with the overwhelming focus on negative freedom and freedom from restraints of various kinds. *Animal protection* was further distinguished from *animal welfare*, in terms of the latter stipulating what is done or what needs to be done to protect animals, and the latter referring to the animal's perception and perspective. A second distinction in this context was made between risk assessment and welfare assessment. Here, an animal may have good welfare but be in a high-risk environment for deteriorating welfare, or be on a poor level of welfare but be situated in a low-risk, good environment. This kind of risk assessment is hence an input-based approach to animal welfare through environmental factors, involving the external premises like food and bedding material, while she exemplified the response of the animal to the external inputs as an outcome-based welfare measure.

The presentation summarized the main accepted welfare indicators: mortality, injury, disease, abnormal behavior, and physiological changes associated with stress. These span across five domains: nutrition, environment, physical health, behavior and mental health. Further, the concept of *'one welfare'* was presented, emphasizing the links between animal and human welfare, insofar as both depend on a well-functional ecological environment (https://www.onewelfareworld.org/).

SESSION 2: TOURISTS AND THEIR RESPONSIBILITY

The 7 Sins of Wildlife Tourism
Lara Tickle, SLU

In this session, PhD student Lara Tickle presented a working paper titled the Se7en Sins of Wildlife Tourism, co-authored with Erica von Essen. Tickle outlined socio-psychological and moral challenges for tourists on holiday that allow them to neutralize the cognitive dissonance they might experience when behaving in ways that are inconsistent with their moral norm system. The sins are as follows:

(1) **The pay effect** –leading tourists to want to get their money's worth from holidays. This also puts pressure on tour operators to 'deliver' and insure that tourists get a return on their investment.

(2) **The tourism bubble –** tourists embrace some exotic elements during their holiday, but are also creatures of comfort and bring norms, conveniences and ways of being at home with them. This means that they struggle to see beyond their bubble, often added to by the staffing of tour operators by Western guides to insulate from culture shock, and the full impact of their engagement with animals.

(3) **Last chance tourism** – loving something to death was indicated as a challenge in nature tourism generally, and in wildlife tourism specifically. Here, rare and endangered animals carry significant appeal, and tourists going to these places may place additional pressure on already vulnerable environments and species. Being the last one to see something, moreover, was seen to be almost on par with being the 'first' person to see something in terms of status.

(4) **The bucket list** – in a culture driven by check-lists of 'things do go before you die', 'places to go in your life', experiencing certain animals often ranks high in one's lifetime. Swimming with dolphins is one such example, but this may be broadening as there are more forms of animal tourism available. Tourists may be preoccupied with ticking things off their list and disregarding animal welfare implications.

(5) **When in Rome, do as the Romans do** – tourists often succumb to cultural relativism, in part to live out hedonistic desires and selves in a context removed from home, and in part to be respectful of local culture.

This means one is less likely to criticize deviant practices abroad, and make concessions of trying new unethical things.

(6) **Disneyfication** – overwhelmingly, animals in tourism become commoditified into caricatures and props. This removes their specific meanings and origins and makes them into mass culture products that can be sold and increase the exploitation of animals.

(7) **Self-deception** – the desire to 'do good' on holiday is also strong among several tourist demographics. Volontourism and ecotourism appear unproblematic, virtuous forms of travel whose names and framing alone may blind tourists to actual or hidden harms. Feeding animals, for example, is rarely unproblematic but is compatible with savior and hero narratives traveling to marginalized contexts.

The discussion connected these sins to implications for animal welfare. Cultural relativism emerged as a central topic, where participants suggested that part of broadening your horizons when travelling could also have positive impacts. Hence, tourism may be a site for learning. 'When in Rome' was also likened to 'What Happens in Vegas', insofar as it creates a zone of permissiveness that may license unethical behavior. A critical question was raised as to whether tourism, because of these sins, was inherently bad and that it was a negative association to be a tourist.

Into the mind of the trophy hunter: A social media analysis
Muchazondida Mkono, University of Queensland

Muchazondida Mkono presented **Into the mind of the trophy hunter: A social media analysis.** Her research showed how hunters rationalize trophy hunting in social media, since Cecil the Lion. Some hunters, it seems, are ostensibly proud, unapologetic and happy to explain their rationale for trophy hunting especially online. Their narratives reveal a disjunction between how the majority of contemporary society views trophy hunting, and hunters' self-evaluations, which are based on consequentialist ethics.

Within this, Mkono problematized the role and power of social media and also the importance of the individual shot (Cecil) in terms of symbolic meaning. The Cecil the Lion Act was discussed as stopping importation of lion (*Panthera leo*) and elephants (*Loxodonta africana*) from three African countries to the US, completed in 2019. Three discourses were presented from the material on social media: *altruisation,* emphasizing hunting for the greater good of the species (through contributing financially to its protection); *euphemisation*, insofar as hunters overwhelmingly avoid incriminating jargon like 'kill' (saying instead 'took', or 'harvested'); and *scientification*, in which anti-emotionality rhetoric was prevalent. Hunters suggested that science was on their side, and that critics rely on emotion and are 'slaves to their emotion'.

Mkono suggested that wildlife tourism is becoming more contested after ´Cecilgate', subject to redefinitions and sustainability rhetoric. The discussion

that focused on drivers to hunt in the first place, in a world where hunting is arguably no longer necessary for survival. Cecil the Lion was seen to have been used by conservationists and animal rights activists. It was asked how the local populations around trophy hunting businesses feel – everyone talked about the plight of the lions, but not the communities.

Tourist, volunteer or both? Benefits and challenges for animal health and welfare
Johan Lindsjö, SLU

Johan Lindsjö's presentation examined the intersection of leisure and labour on holiday: how tourists increasingly want to 'do good' and engage in voluntourism. Such a mode of tourism is unpaid work, even paying for the opportunity. Several NGOs are profiling themselves in voluntourism, actively looking for volunteers either for wild animals or domestic, sometimes stray, animals. Lindsjö emphasizes the benefits of the trend, including giving animals needed attention, free care and help on site. When returning home, tourists can take away what they have learned and potentially experience an increased investment in animal welfare. Volontourists can also bring new knowledge and perspectives to local communities and vice versa.

The dark side to voluntourism, however, involves tourists' lack of knowledge when engaging with animals, as they are not required to have biology or veterinary backgrounds. This can give rise to unintentional harm to animals, disease transmissions, involve the misuse of money and resources and more. It was also emphasized that voluntourism is a 'quick fix' rather than a long-term solution that targets the structural causes of poor animal welfare practices. Indeed, demand for caring for orphaned, abandoned or mistreated animals may in some ways secure the continued existence of such practices. In this way, there is no system change. Lindsjö shared personal experiences as a veterinary volunteer, balancing the pleasures of holidaying with that of volunteering: a grey zone.

He noted some unsustainable activities and potential harm to animals as a result of inadequate knowledge among organisations and volunteers. In addition, voluntourism may be contentious insofar as it challenges local customs and traditions. Lindsjö provided the example of euthanasia. In Sweden, euthanizing pets with terminal illnesses or pain is common, but this is not a norm in Thailand, which means different values clash. In the discussion, voluntourism was cautioned as to being a neo-colonialist practice of 'white saviour' mentality that may potentially impose values on host communities and their ways of relating to animals.

SESSION 3: ANIMAL TOURISM AND SUSTAINABILITY

Animals, Tourism, and the Sustainable Development Goals
Carol Kline, North Carolina State University

Carol Kline facilitated a discussion on animal welfare standards in relation to the sustainable development goals. Her presentation summarized the ways in which animals currently feature in tourism: as food, in sport, in entertainment, in recreation and in status signalling. Animals as providing culinary delights that are symbolic of a certain place, notably kangarooes, whales and more, were identified as ethically contentious issues. Further, animals may be seen as both participants and spectators in sports, for example hunting or the blood sport of bull-fighting. Wildlife, increasingly, is an arena for sports (e.g. biking, walking), as are domestic animals (e.g. dog-sledding). Kline emphasized the role of gender stereotypes, environmental degradation, rules and regulations, animal rights and future generations.

Animals in captivity performing as entertainers are typically the subject of 'the tourist gaze', having been unnaturally trained and conditioned to perform certain behaviours. Within this context, there is a variation in tourist-animal distance. Some observe the spectacle on the sidelines, while others get close to animals in embodied, tactile encounters, as in swimming with dolphins. Kline identifies some physically and emotionally harmful training methods to get animals to perform for visitors; situations in which they have little or no agency, poor space and sometimes lack of medical care.

Ecotourism, meanwhile, presents itself as taking place in the wild and may incur benefits of environmental education. There is passive or active ecotourism (e.g. whale-watching, or actually touching the animals), and in many cases, animals may perform as 'beasts of burden' (as in hiking tourism); cultural mediators (semi-domesticated reindeer [*Rangifer tarandi*] in Sami tourism) and more. The latter raises additional concerns regarding colonial and ethnic appropriation and perpetuating the stereotype of indigenous people being close to animals.

In a recent phenomenon, animal selfies are a major frontier in animal-based tourism that has evolved from photos of wildlife within natural landscapes to contrived photos of human-animal interactions, e.g. elephant rides. 'Selfie' animals may reveal a darker side of tourism: many have been taken away from their families; are treated as props; are handled more than what is advisable and

in unacceptable conditions, and are sometimes sedated with drugs during the photo sessions, and there is the possibility for disease transmission.

Kline connected her presentation to the 17 UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/), asking where animal welfare, and sustainability in tourism, fits in. In Kline's presentation, the plenary was asked to actively contribute. Some contended that animals may be indirectly included in some positively connotated goals (e.g. good health and well-being), whereas others indicated the need for adding an 18th SDG for animal welfare. The SDGs were seen by Kline to delineate the most lofty and most basic needs of the world and as such may be the ideal framework for outlining our critical reflections on animal use, our questions regarding current power structures and political systems.

Nevertheless, integrating animal welfare in tourism in these may be recognised as complicated insofar as current SDGs are overwhelmingly about what humans should do with their surroundings. Other reflections centred on the directionality of the 'development' term in SD (involving growth) potentially needing to be replacing by sustainable living.

Ethical Dilemmas in Elephant Management for Tourism: A case from Hwange National Park, Zimbabwe
Michael Jones, SLU

Michael Jones presented a case in the context of tourism from Hwange National Park in Zimbabwe. His talk summarized the key ecological challenges to Hwange Park in recent decades, including seasonal fluctuations in water distribution and how artificial water supplies were created to increase the size of animal populations, making the park more attractive to game viewing tourists. Between 1960 and 1985, thousands of elephants (*Loxodonta africana*) were culled in an attempt to regulate the size of the elephant population in an area that contained too many herbivores for the carrying capacity of the land. The decision to cull elephants increasingly mobilized the discontentment of animal rights organizations, tour operators and the concerned public.

Today, the elephant population in Hwange is larger than ever, having grown from 14,000 in 1985 to 44,000 in 2017, increasing degradation of soil and vegetation and increasing competition with other species. Elephants are experiencing higher rates of mortality, especially among young and old animals, because of physical competition over the access to water as well as the distance of having to move between water and food resources. Jones noted that because it takes 50 years to repopulate the elephants and 500 years for the soil and vegetation to recover, elephant culling was prioritized to safeguard soil and vegetation. Elephant culling was abandoned because of international politics within the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) that affected the financial value of elephant products, such that the park management authority was unable to raise the necessary funds for culling operations. The elephant population is now so large that culling is not a practical solution to the problem. Hence, a question for Hwange is how to control the elephant populations in the most

humanely possible way: contraception, selling hunting, relocation and more. Jones emphasized the moral dilemma inherent in the elephants' commercial contribution to the park: photographic and hunting tourism provide revenue that contributes to the cost of park management. It also contributes to the development for smallholder farming communities who live close to a park and suffer livelihood loss from crop raiding elephants.

In the discussion that followed, it was acknowledged that Hwange National Park may be closer to a 'safari project' than a conservation project, because of its approach to managing and commodifying elephants. A strong pressure has been on attracting more tourists, and this is reflected also in the physical land-use changes in the park, including the water supply.

Figure 2: Elephants drinking from one of the small springs that were the only source of water in most of Hwange National Park during the dry season. Credit: Michael Jones

SESSION 4: TOURISM AGENTS AND THEIR RESPONSIBILITY

Animals in Tourism: Our Five Principles
Roger Pettersson, World Animal Protection

World Animal Protection's Roger Petterson contributed with an NGO's perspective on combating animal cruelty in tourism globally. As part of their 'Wildlife, not entertainers campaign' (2015), WAP mobilized the signatures of 1.6 million people in the name of animal welfare. Around the same time, TripAdvisor removed nearly all wild animal entertainment attractions from their site. 230 travel companies have taken an elephant-friendly pledge in which they commit to no longer promoting elephant rides or shows. Airline companies joined suit, removing trips involving captive dolphin attractions. Instagram, moreover, has issued a content advisory page on wild animal selfies. The campaign also caught the attention of World Association of Zoos and Aquariums (WAZA), responding to the prompt 'the show can't go on'.

World Animal Protection commissioned research to examine the conditions of tourism animals in 2015. It found that 3 out of 4 elephants (*Elephas maximus*) in Asia were living under unacceptable welfare conditions. Over 1200 zoos across the world were visited, finding that big cats were often placed in performative roles against loud music; dolphins were forced to perform; elephants were forced to offer themselves up as rides; and primates were dressed up as photo props for tourists. The outcome of the research was the recognition of the importance of needing to work with people, companies in the sector, governments, international policy forums and researchers.

World Animal Protection adheres to five principles:
- o   Animals belong in the wild
- o   Wild animals in entertainment is animal abuse
- o   See wild animals in the wild
- o   Visit responsible wildlife attractions
- o   Support our call to action

Captive wild animals. Are travel associations doing enough to protect wild animals in tourism?
Xavier Font, University of Surrey

Xavier Font elaborated on the investigative research he and his team had undertaken on behalf of World Animal Protection. The study had two purposes: to explore the factors leading to tour operator associations experiencing pressure to change their stance on animal welfare; and to evaluate the extent to which animal welfare is considered in international, sustainable tourism standards and guidelines. As part of this, Font and the University of Surrey had checked 62 national and international trade associations and were able to declare the following statistics:

- 21/62 had a page on sustainable tourism
- 6/62 had information on animal welfare
- 6/62 had pictures of wild animals as tourist attractions

Font presented the findings also from interviews with travel trade associations during this time, and found overwhelmingly a lack of acknowledgment of the issue of poor animal welfare standards. Instead, interviews revealed excuses, the denial of responsibility, the idea that 'money talks', the lack of public targets and enforcements. Good practices were far and few in between. However, Font identified three leading travel trade associations:

- **Association of British Travel Agents (ABTA)** – demonstrated good effort in consensus building and some cases of good practice. However, it was also found that ABTA's cautious and vague language functioned to diffuse responsibility.
- **Dutch Association of Travel Agents and Tour Operators (ANVR)** – actively discouraged practices that were deemed unacceptable, and they demonstrated good clarity, direct language and clear information provision. However, there was lean enforcement on the ground.
- **Global Sustainable Tourism Council (GSTC)** – demonstrated clear auditing but little to no information provision. They adhered to minimum animal welfare in GSTC for all sustainability certification bodies.

Font's work spurred discussions on labelling and its potential in swaying consumers. It was recognised, however, that a comparatively small market of discerning tourists would plausibly read and actively respond to labelling of this kind. Further research was said to be needed.

SESSION 5: CHALLENGES FOR CONSUMPTIVE WILDLIFE TOURISM

The country that forgot how to hunt -recreational and touristic hunting in Japan
Brent Lovelock, University of Otago

Tourism scholar Brent Lovelock presented a case context of consumptive wildlife tourism, in the form of hunting, in modern day Japan. Within this, he identified key challenges to hunting as an activity, some of which were unique to Japan but many generalizable to other declining hunting communities across the world. Moreover, hunting in Japan today was overwhelmingly focused around its role in containing pest species and their damage to agriculture and human interests. The main species to hunt are sika deer (*Cervus nippon*) and wild boars (inoshishi) (*Sus scrofa*), both of which represent a nuisance.

As these populations expand, there is a growing disjunction between Japanese society and 'prey'. Sika deer, such as the sacred deer of Nara, are seen now by most Japanese as more of a tourism attraction rather than a wild animal that is an essential element in active nature-based recreation.

Lovelock identified clear barriers to becoming a hunter and sustaining it as an activity. For one, foreigners are not allowed to hunt in Japan, which may pose a fundamental challenge to incoming hunting tourism. There has also been a loss of traditional hunting knowledge, and most hunters represent an aging segment. Indeed, of the 190 000 hunters in Japan in 2015, almost two thirds are over the age of 60. Following trends of depopulation of the countryside, and potential aversion to nature, it is proving difficult to recruit new hunters.

In addition to this, Lovelock discussed the difficulty of acquiring firearms and hunting licenses, which are expensive and time-consuming processes. That leaves some activities like trapping, which is increasing in relation to shooting. Nevertheless, problems of territoriality remain, and hunting continues to be a sphere that few women enter.

Lovelock notes how spirituality, religion and human-nature relations are important in Japan and how these are manifested in hunting rituals and shrines to wildlife. An underlying spirituality manifested in Japanese society through Buddhism and Shintoism, that historically censored the taking of animal life, also complicates the ethics of hunting. Today, there may be an increasing interest in game meat consumption which could potentially become a driver for the hunting

sector. There may also be 'welcoming of the wild' type movements and sentiments in society that re-embrace hunting.

There are clear animal (and human) welfare implications from the increasing populations of wild animals encroaching upon agricultural and urban habitats, the decline in traditional hunting skills, and the adoption of alternative (trapping) means of hunting.

What is a hunting tourism experience? Boundary work in a commodification process
Erika Andersson Cederholm, Lund University

Erika Andersson Cederholm presented an upcoming research project based at Lund University that will examine the hunting tourism industry in Sweden from a perspective of relations, values and boundary work. The focus of the project will be on rural entrepreneurs and how they develop and perform their enterprises – as formal business and as informal exchanges. Within this, Andersson Cederholm identified a tension in hunting tourism between marketized exchanges and more friend-based reciprocal exchanges between landowners and local hunters. The project will examine in particular how this tension is lived out and balanced by entrepreneurs.

The presentation identified key challenges to hunting tourism in terms of satisfying the customer who pays for the privilege, but also in potentially alienating friends/guests by imposing rules on them for hunts. This raises questions not only of business and interpersonal ethics, but also of animal welfare, insofar as sloppy shots may be taken and the entrepreneur of the hunt may be in a difficult situation in terms of having to police this.

Hunting tourism represents a 'special' interest tourism whose skill base of customers tends to vary, in addition to there being many uncontrollable factors in a hunt that potentially result in poor animal treatment or excess suffering. It was emphasized that a good hunting experience for most customers tends to be one that challenges the hunter, allows them to experience nature, and compete with the animal's natural wiles. Hence, the kill is said to be secondary to many, or an added luxury of the experience.

Andersson Cederholm suggested from her research so far that providers of hunting trips appear to value conducting an honest business, in terms of not promising more than they can deliver. They also adhere to sustainability, if for nothing else than self-preservation of the business: if you shoot too many animals, there won't be any left next season. Finally, they all ostensibly commit in principle to a minimization of suffering of the animals. Nevertheless, these principles may be challenged on the ground, notions of right and wrong may become contested when money is involved, and the impact of wealthy outsiders coming to hunt in local communities may likely be the source of social conflict in some contexts and small towns.

Andersson Cederholm's presentation concluded by presenting some key tropes and traditions in hunting and particularly invited and touristic hunts. She expressed these in terms of the *quantification* and *servicification* discourse: where quantification emphasized the display of quarry in numbers and size in ritualistic wildlife parades. The servicification discourse, meanwhile, emphasized such things as providing a holistic experience of the hunt, including having a bonfire, preparing meals together, thanking the hunting leader and learning from others.

What are the implications on animal welfare of recreational angling?
Albin Gräns, SLU

Albin Gräns asked the provocative question if anyone cares about fish welfare. An estimated 79% of the general public is of the opinion that the welfare of fish should be as emphasized as the other animals we eat. Despite this, welfare standards in fishing are lacking and poorly enforced.

Gräns presented research that suggests that fish are sufficiently intelligent to pass the self-awareness test. This level of consciousness raises questions about not only the extent of our duties to promote fish welfare, but according to others, about the validity of the self-awareness test as a tool for intelligence in itself ("It must be wrong").

It was said that 11.5% of the world population engage in recreational fishing, which is far higher than recreational hunting. In Sweden, over 1 billion euros is spent annually by local fishermen, and the industry attracts some 800,000 tourists every year. Concurrently, fish stocks are declining. Most fish are killed by being left to suffocate, which may take up to hours.

Catch and release fishing is a form of recreational fishing that is thought to be beneficial for the conservation of fish stocks based on that most of the fish released survive. In reality, however, there may be higher mortality rates (up to 89%) as a result of incurred physical injuries (e.g. jaw and eye damage), stress and water deprivation (exposure to air for up to a minute may seriously hurt the fish), or predators that follow the boats and wait for the fish to be released back into the water. Gräns additionally highlighted an underacknowledged source of stress for fish, which is that they are social creatures and suffer stress responses when seeing other fish being killed.

Catch and release differs nationally, as was found out in the discussion. In Germany, all fish must be retained, whereas in Australia and New Zealand, catch and release is possible and increasingly popular.

SESSION 6: DISCUSSION DAY 1

A concluding plenary talk summarized reflections on the five sessions of the day. This allowed participants also to ask clarifying questions to presenters, and to consider overarching themes across the sessions. One such theme was the risk of moralizing around tourism ethics, especially coming into host communities and imposing norms of propriety. This was discussed, first, in the context of the colonialist legacy of tourism, in which appropriation of indigenous lands was central to the leisure of white settlers. This raised broader questions on differing values and norms and what happens when these clash. Moralizing around animal ethics was secondly discussed in terms of 'playing angel' vs. 'playing god', where the latter may represent targeted initiatives to establish welfare standards and codes to apply universally, whereas the former may just refer to individual acts of making a difference on the ground, as in helping stray individual animals and more.

Compassionate conservation was identified as a theme that grappled with the tension between the consideration of the individual animal and the species, environment, etc. (based on the difference between sentientistic and ecocentric moral values), attempting to reconcile these (Bekoff, 2013). That is, it asked for ways to not have to sacrifice the individual animal (in the scope of this symposium, by turning it into a tourist prop) to protect the well-being of its species or population. A second term was *convivial conservation,* which was said to be a conservation of wildlife that recognises the importance of equity and social justice. This may be especially important for host communities. *Rewilding conservation* was discussed as the third paradigm of conservation, in which humans take a hands-off approach and let nature run its course, when (in particular herbivores) are increasing biodiversity and providing important ecosystem services. Doing so, however, may involve suffering and high mortality for animals that become designated as the 'rewilders', or ecosystem engineers, who are translocated or reintroduced into new areas. Hence, for the individual animal, rewilding can in some circumstances lack compassion. Another line of discussion centered around the potential transition of consumptive wildlife tourism, including hunting and fishing, into non-consumptive or visual tourism. Within this was suggested that photo tourism is on the rise, replacing traditional trophy souvenirs and emphasizing the experience rather than the kill. Moreover, wildlife was suggested to be a multipurpose opportunity, and it is not unthinkable that it may be several things at once (a prey, a culinary dish, a visual spectacle).

SESSION 7: EXPERIENCING ANIMALS IN THE WILD

How does animal-based tourism such as nature trekking and bird- and whale watching affect wildlife welfare?
Lotta Berg, SLU

Lotta Berg provided a comprehensive look at the scope of wildlife-based tourism that takes place in situ, in the wild. She indicated that unlike in zoos, where animals fall under human responsibility and welfare legislation, animals in the wild are less cared for, but potentially equally affected by human hand. This is so, for example, even when they involve some degree of physical distance between the tourist and the animal, as through risk of disturbance, collateral damage of tourists to other species, roads and infrastructures of tourism fragmenting habitat and vegetation changes.

Figure 3: Orca (Orcinus orca) watching, photo by Lotta Berg

While animals in the wild may appear undisturbed, Berg asked the question: are they really? It was said that wildlife are used to different levels of human presence, ranging from purposive or sporadic encounters to things like unintentional acoustic disturbance from motor vehicles. Many wild animals may also be naturally curious, and hence approach tourists seemingly voluntarily. Is this sort of interaction a problem?

A principle mode of engagement between animals and wildlife in tourism is feeding. This may be done for photography opportunities, to incite certain behaviour, to mobilize animals to certain places and more. But feeding raises questions about conditioning, changes in natural behaviour, and disrupted human-wildlife relations. Wildlife may, for example. become accustomed to human presence and hence be easier prey to hunters. The type of feed offered to wildlife also potentially affects their health.

When wildlife is watched or interacted with in the wild, animal breeding, nesting and display behaviour may become disrupted. As to whether or not this is an immoral act, it was asked what the long-term consequences of these incremental changes may be, and to what extent they impact the welfare and fitness of the animal. Migration routes may furthermore be destabilised with human presence and tourism activities. Migration sites are important in allowing animals safe zones to rest and be separated from the tourists, and must hence be protected.

As tourists interact with wildlife in naturalistic and semi-naturalistic settings, the engagement also raises potential problems of zoonotic disease transmission and biosecurity. Should tourists be made to wear masks to prevent transmission of zoonotic diseases? With tourists come also involuntary and accidental reintroductions of other species hidden in luggage or vehicles, such as rats (*Rattus rattus*), which can interrupt native ecology. Moreover, as some tourists bring things into the sites of wildlife, others bring things out: trafficking in wildlife goods is a lucrative market, involving everything from egg theft in national parks to ivory poaching.

In the discussion that ensued, Berg highlighted the potential benefits of wildlife tourism to local communities and biodiversity conservation, if done properly. A critical observation pointed to the empty signifier of 'ecotourism', where they may be nothing ecological about the service apart from its setting, and how this facilitates greenwashing. More discussion followed on wildlife feeding, and how there may be different types of feeding, for different reasons, in different ways, but that boundaries between different feeding strategies may also blur.

SESSION 8: HUMAN-ANIMAL RELATIONS IN AGRITOURISM

Animals in Agritourism
Erica von Essen and Lars Hallgren, SLU

Erica von Essen and Lars Hallgren co-presented emerging trends in agritourism, in which farm animals are the principal attraction. They situated this in terms of reconciling the urban and the rural, and consumers with producers. The aforementioned, it was argued, are separated today in terms of both time and space. Yet agritourism has goals on several levels, including individual ones of self-fullment and family leisure. As part of this, farms, farm animals and farmers are becoming products, entertainers and hosts respectively to cater to a growing group of urban tourists who seek rural authenticity and reconciliation with their lost agrarian heritage.

The case context presented was that of cow-releases, which are popular May activities in Sweden during which cows are liberated from the confines of their winter barns to go out to summer pasture. Their crazy, clumsy and spontaneous antics form powerful affirmations of a thriving countryside and farm animals that 'live well'. The representation of 'happy cows' was problematized in the presentation. It was suggested that the event approximates two forms of 'liberation': a physical one for the cows, in terms of relieving them from constraints and giving them the opportunity to realize themselves as bovines in the grassy field; and a spiritual one for urban visitors, who may experience the temporary alleviation of guilt, anxiety and alienation from the modes of production of their dairy.

Despite this, the presentation emphasized the limits to this liberation and hence to the reconciliation between the urban and rural, and consumers and producers, by way of agritourism events. For one, the whole spectacle was said to be staged and inauthentic, created out of contrast from the monotony of the winter barn and the mechanics of contemporary dairy production.

In the discussion, the role of the farmer in orchestrating this spectacle was problematized, asking to what extent and with what difficulty farmers had to play multiple roles, as e.g. entertainers and hosts, in addition to farmers. It was further pointed out that agritourism events like cow tourism do not often provide spaces for genuine social learning or dialogue between diverse perspectives – rather, differences may be compounded. However, the presence of animal rights activists at these events may trigger more critical discussions about the welfare of cows in

dairy production, and how their labor may be temporarily redeployed from one of industry to entertainer.

The benefits and difficulties of animal contact with the public, as seen at Skokloster 4H
Moa Samuelsson and Martyna Zelek, Skokloster 4H, and Åsa Fahlman, SLU

Agronomy and veterinary students who worked at Skokloster 4H came to present the ethics, welfare and experiences of visitor-animal interactions at one of their farms. They summarized the sorts of animals at the farm and what sorts of standards for interacting with them that applies.

For chickens, for example, there is casual contact during daytime and the chickens can get away from human contact at their own choice any time. Rabbits, similarly, have both outside and inside access, meaning they can escape human contact. There are risks, however, including screaming or excited children who can agitate the animals and people who do not wash their hands. The presenters emphasized the importance of clear signage, rest days and rotation for individual animals, channelling the children visitors' enthusiasm in a productive way, staying vigilante with hygiene routines and having clear communication with the parents of children visiting.

The presentation noted a number of tangible benefits in relation to 4H farms. Direct contact with animals could help children overcome fear; minimize the gap between city and country; encourage learning by doing; educating about agriculture and sustainability and teaching about cultural heritage in terms of preserving and interacting with native Swedish livestock breeds. As for the animals, most species were said to welcome the interaction as a source of enrichment, especially when it is on their own terms.

Nevertheless, it was also emphasized that high visitor pressure may pose an inherent challenge, that much staff is typically required and that assessments between the 'right' number of animals need to be carefully made. Plenty of animals mean that it is more difficult to control interactions, but on the other hand, fewer animals means it is more difficult for animals to get rest. In the end, the presentation pointed to occasional tensions between animal welfare and visitor satisfaction, but also added a third mode: education. Balancing these three sides, moreover, was integral to successful and sustainable 4H activities.

SESSION 9: CAPTIVE WILD ANIMALS IN HUMAN ENVIRONMENTS

Animal welfare in Zoos and the role of zoos and human-animal interactions
Anita Burkevica, Parken Zoo, Eskilstuna

Anita Burkevica presented in her capacity as zoo director and veterinarian at Parken Zoo, a wildlife park in Eskilstuna in Sweden. Her presentation summarized the challenges of keeping wild animals for human leisure, but also pointed to opportunities for meaningful encounters, learning and sustainability. At a fundamental level, zoos were said to be key actors in the conservation of biodiversity and exotic animals, making them available to people at shorter distances and more accessible places.

Burkevica presented a short history of zoos leading up to their current enterprises and involvement in international species conservation programmes, scientific projects and animal welfare projects. The main aim of zoos, she noted, should be to increase public interest and understanding of the nature and its diversity. The European Association of Zoos and Aquaria (EAZA) checks zoos as to their compliance with standards for animal welfare, involving screening members and cooperating with states.

The mandate and role of zoos today mean having to balance multiple roles, which may sometimes contradict one another: entertainment, education, research, conservation and more. They need to justify their existence beyond a purely recreational rationale today, needing to show clear contributions to species conservation projects in the wild as well as within zoos.

Key principles that apply for animal welfare in zoos include the five freedoms. As a veterinarian, Burkevica emphasized the importance of providing opportunity for animals to perform their natural behavior, and the provision of health care for sick or injured animals. Within this, teams of experts comprised by zookeepers, zoologists and veterinarians attempt to recreate the most naturalistic possible setting for the animal to thrive in. That means procuring special plants to meet their diets, and stimulating enactments of 'natural' behavior, such as tigers *(Panthera tigris)* wanting to chase and manipulate their prey.

Shared enclosures in some ways approximate the wild better, insofar as it comprises several species of animals who may interact. Nevertheless, one must proceed cautiously here, not integrating species that are not compatible, etc., or risking disease transmission or other antagonistic interspecies encounters. The relocation of zoo animals regularly takes place, as they shift homes and require

Figure 4: inside Parken Zoo, Eskilstuna, photo by Anita Burkevica

Figure 5: Tigers in Parken Zoo, Eskilstuna, photo by Anita Burkevica

transport between or within zoos after transfer recommendations or management decisions. Stress from handling can be minimized through training and preparation and sometimes it requires immobilization. Photos of activities with animals may be taken, but animals should not be handled only for being photographed.

Burkevica concluded by reflecting on visitors' experience of the zoos and the animals. In order for it to feel more natural for both animals and visitors, enclosures are now glass-fenced rather than meshed, and walkthrough rather than caged enclosures are common. There are designated petting zoo areas with suitable domestic animals and staff, and limited forms of interaction with more exotic, wild species that take place on the terms of the animals. The animals need to be able to distance themselves and hide from the visitors.

SESSION 10: ANIMAL ROLES AND VALUES

How roles and values ascribed to animals relate to animal welfare in animal-based tourism
Henrik Lerner, Ersta Sköndal Bräcke University College

Henrik Lerner's talk focused on the roles in which animals exist, and are made to enter into, in relation to us. The roles they inhabit come with potentially different duties owed to them. Lerner discussed animal welfare principles as stemming inherently from values (normative) and from how we see animals in these roles. Within this, it was recognised that species or even the same animal can inhabit multiple roles at any one time, notably dogs (pet, working dog) and that various contexts and modes of engagement with the animal can bring about these roles differently. Indeed, Lerner indicated that Swedish legislation in many cases is actually based on roles of animals rather than species. A new animal welfare act in Sweden now designates animals having intrinsic value when they are in human care.

The presentation discussed value theory, and how animals have been seen to be of either instrumental or intrinsic value. Both animal ethics and environmental ethics, in different ways, attribute intrinsic value to animals. The moral landscape is complicated, however, by the fact that this value may be located on the level of individual animals, species, ecosystems or even the earth. Lerner recalled the work and nomenclature of Holmes Rolston III to illustrate this.

In the end, the sorts of value, and by extension the sorts of rights and duties that animals are owed, may be a function of their particular role in a tourism setting. For example, it was noted that it is disrespectful to use the US eagle for touristic purposes, changing its role from wildlife to mascot entertainer.

Conceptualising nonhuman animals as 'workers' within the tourism industry: Theoretical, practical and ethical implications
Katherine Dashper, Leeds Becket University

In a presentation that positioned animals as laborers within a tourism industry, Katherine Dashper summarized the ways in which animals work, or have their work extracted for human leisure in the global economy. In this way her presentation raised broader questions about how we can conceptualize work and the premises under which this is carried out. She referred to Actor Network Theory as a helpful tool involving a relational ontology, in order to see the parts that animals play in relation to human actors and goals.

Dashper first presented a typology of animal tourism, ranging from wildlife tourism to captive and domestic tourism animals. The latter, she stressed, can include everything from traveling with your pets (as co-tourists or as helpers) to animal working in the tourism industry as e.g. modes of transport. Different types of work done by animals, often seasonal and contingent, may involve service or performing of emotional labor.

Most of these animals, she said, are subject to the same vulnerabilities in working conditions as human service industry workers. Unlike the latter, however, animals do not enter into anything resembling contracts of pay and fair terms of condition. This makes them especially vulnerable to exploitation within the tourism industry, which is already exploitative in nature of its labour force. Dashper traced this to the demand from capitalism, tourism organisations and society at large, that pressure people to interact with animals in roles of entertainers, photo props and more. Here, the animals are expected to behave in certain ways.

It was suggested that although animals do not enter into formal wage-pay contracts, they do receive equivalents in terms of being provided with food, shelter and medical care. However, the quality of this varies and is not regularly provided for all tourism animals in a way that satisfies animal welfare standards. They also appear to be "subject to human whims". The question this gave rise to is the extent to which tourists have responsibilities to nonhuman workers. Going horse trekking, for example, should tourists be mindful of their weight, their level of experience and more? Should they have a role in ensuring animals get 'rest days'?

Dashper concluded on a note of intersectional oppression in tourism, in terms of the necessity to recognise the continent status of all workers in tourism – human and nonhuman. These cannot be separated. Within this should be ways to develop more humane jobs for all species. In the discussion that followed, animal labour was considered in terms of its problematic connotations of slavery: they do not have a choice to work, but we tell them what to do and when to do it. This is less pronounced in some contexts, when animals can choose more freely, or are made to engage in behaviors that are natural or enriching for them. In these situations, work can be a way out of boredom and depression for animals.

WORKSHOP THEMES

The second half of day two included a workshop, where the participants chose one of the following areas within animal-based tourism, consequently forming five discussion groups: I. The impact of broader societal structures on animal-based tourism, II. The role of digital technology in animal tourism, III. Compassionate animal-based tourism, IV. Cultural relativism and V. Future scoping.

The group members were given a free approach to their respective area, i.e. no specific questions to be answered. Following the separate group discussions, the participants gathered and presented the result of the group discussions, with a continued discussion and conclusion among all present participants. Action points were produced.

I.   The impact of broader societal structures on animal-based tourism

In this working group, a macro perspective was applied in order to consider the broader modern movements and trends in which animal-based tourism is situated. This perspective, it was argued, is essential if we are to understand societal drivers for wanting to interact with animals, and predicting future directions for animal-based tourism. It is not enough that we put pressure on tourists or tour operators on the ground, if the structures around them remain unchanged.

The group discussed the role of climate change in precipitating potential new flows of tourists, such as opening up routes in the Arctic following the melting of ice caps. It also considered the recent backlash to travel in the form of 'flight shame', and how this might help break some forms of animal tourism that involve long distance travel. Instead, it was suggested, animal tourism may be given impetus to become local, where the proximate and the everyday in the animal context may be exoticized and commodified in for example 'staycations' and shorter day trips. This may partly account for the popularity of local agritourism, where nearby farms are visited.

In line with this shift on the part of tourists' preferences, it was also noted that as we enter a post-industrial society, there may be less emphasis on the accumulation of wealth and more on experiences and how they contribute to a person's identity. Given this, one might ask whether travel might actually increase, but travel-associated accumulation (like souvenirs) may decrease. As tourism becomes a ritual context for showing identity-based goods, the group discussed the rise of animal tourism experiences that may be especially valuable to establishing a person's identity and status. Within this, last chance tourism, danger tourism, and even slum tourism in relation to interacting with animals may feasibly be on the rise among some tourists. In a society less burdened by ownership and wealth, however, the group expressed a concern that the ephemeral character of experiences and rentals of animal interactions may invite a general lack of responsibility.

World events also condition the context for travel, where to travel, and which places to avoid. As such it was suggested how world events, man-made as well as natural disasters, may temporarily redirect tourists – either away from zones of dangers or coming into them as part of voluntourism. Here, animals can be 'push' and 'pull' factors, where for example mosquito infested seasons in one's home country can be an attractive impetus for traveling elsewhere. Recent biosecurity discourses on invasive species, the spread of zoonotic diseases and so called pest animals crossing borders also invite discussions on the role of borders and animals and how it may affect tourists' mobility. Do current policy directives on combatting invasive species reflect a generalized xenophobia today that has been partly displaced to the animal context?

Part of the discussion centered on the concept of authenticity and asked to what extent contemporary and future travelers craved this on holiday. It was suggested that ideals of authenticity have always existed and provided a driver for traveling, but that each generation may fill authenticity with different criteria. For instance, relations and togetherness, rather than observing spectacle, may increasingly infuse our ideal of authenticity as these are becoming scarce commodities. Within this was also discussed whether different parts of the world crave different forms of authenticity.

Gender was a topic that was theorized to condition the context of animal-based tourism. The group suggested that animal tourism may be an arena in which ideas of gender can be played out and negotiated, given that touristic settings are a liminal space partly freed from everyday constraints. Moreover, that animal interactions can inform one's gender identity seems apparent with an entertainment industry that commodifies macho, primeval, atavistic encounters with wild animals, where nature is a kind of antidote to the feminizing influence of modern city life. The popularity of survival shows featuring Alaska rangers, Bear Grylls and survival and self-sufficiency guides appears to testify to a masculine domain of taming the wild. Oppositely, contexts involving care and nursing relations with animals on holiday, including bottle-feeding baby animals or volunteering at shelters, may be both a female domain and a context in which alternative notions of masculinity can be played out, ironically performing repressed gender roles.

Finally, the topic included speculation on the rise of an animal tourism industry in which the animals were the tourists whose needs are to be catered to. In the growing popularity of bringing pets on holiday (as emotional support animals, for instance), and holidaying with dogs and horses (in bed 'n' box hotels), one trend of seeing our pets as honorary family members may in the future reorient animals from objects to subjects.

Action points

Legislation and policy:	*Develop, review and ensure implementation of animal welfare legislation and "best practice" guidelines in animal-based tourism, nationally and internationally.
Guidelines for tourists:	* Go local and explore animal friendly and ethically justifiable animal tourisms at home before flying across the world. * Be a responsible tourist – inform yourself, contact travel retailers and tour operators, demand animal friendly and ethically justifiable approaches to animals in tourism.
Calls for further research:	* Society´s view of animals' roles in animal-based tourism –How do the perceptions, values and attitudes of tourists correspond to those of tourism operators and welfare organizations. * Possibilities to stimulate local, animal welfare-friendly and ethically justifiable animal-based tourism. * How gender is performed, contested and negotiated in animal-encounters in animal-based tourism.

II.   The role of digital technology in animal-based tourism

Technology can powerfully mediate distance and interactions with animals. In this thematic session, a group discussed the various ways in which technology affects human-animal relations in the context of tourism.

Social media was an intuitive context and platform for both advertising and generating expectations on animal encounters, and for potentially disseminating critical reviews and allowing spaces for moral reflection. Here, the influence of 'intermediaries' between tourists and the industries, including Expedia and Tripadvisor, play a potentially critical role. Influencers on Instagram showing close contrived encounters with wild animals was argued to be a potentially harmful driver to contemporary animal tourism, but there are mitigating aspects of technology that were seen to potentially promote more sustainable animal interactions.

One example was *virtual animal-based tourism*, and the extent to which this may replace or complement 'real' encounters, thus taking some pressure and stress off the animals in their habitats. On a fundamental level, technology allows us to experience animals more closely already: binoculars improve views, trail and surveillance cameras, sometimes even mounted in the nests and dens of animals, allow intimacy without getting physically close to animals. The use of drones capturing footage, which can now come extremely close to many wild animals

without or at least cause less disruption to their behavior, may hence allow for remote viewing close-ups.

Other topics discussed included how edu-tainment about animals is increasingly mediated through digital platforms. Within the context of hunting, for example, one now no longer learns to hunt from family mentors to the same extent as in the past, relying instead on influencers and guides on social media and YouTube - for good and bad. While this can open exposure to all sorts of questionable animal interactions online, it may also be seen as a democratizing force, allowing anyone to 'enter' the sphere. Relatedly it was discussed that cell phone technology can bring power down to the individual level. Taken to its extreme, it could also be brought down to the animal level where animal-mounted go-pro cameras show animal activities and agency. The group briefly considered the use of technology from the animal side, in terms of using apps and programs to communicate their needs to us, or games on e.g. iPads for stimulation in enclosures. Recently, for example, VR (Virtual Reality) goggles for cows were devised to stimulate green pastures.

Legislation and policy:	*Outreach and education about animal welfare and ethical challenges, resulting in guidelines for web-based platforms and influencers. *Certification and labelling on internet-based platforms (websites, social media) informing about and promoting animal-based tourism activities. * Promote development and implementation of virtual animal-based tourism (see 3Rs in III). *Develop and implement legislation/guidelines about using animals first when technology cannot replace use of real animals.
Guidelines for tourists:	* Require that web-based platforms and influencers consider the animals´situation and ethics surrounding animal use, demand that they take a standpoint (a condition for your attention, you following them, etc.). * Require tour operators to consider and implement technical development replacing, reducing and refining animal use.
Calls for further research:	* The impact of web-based platforms, including influencers, on animal-based tourism and how they can promote animal friendly and ethically justifiable tourism.

III. Compassionate animal-based tourism

This group discussed compassion for the animals in animal-based tourism, based on the concept of *Compassionate conservation*, which promote the consideration of animal welfare in conservation, benefitting individuals, species and conservation outcomes (http://compassionateconservation.net/). Compassionate conservation is debated, mainly because of the inherent conflict between the cost for (welfare of) the individual animal and the greater good for a population or species (i.e. is it possible or not to apply compassion in successful conservation activities). Animal-based tourism can be beneficial for different species, and threatened domestic breeds, through increased attention, knowledge and closeness to individual animals. In fact, animal-based tourism may contribute to positive attitudes towards individual animals as well (e.g. voluntourism, agriturism).

However, the group identified several threats not only to individual animal welfare but also on a species level as a consequence of animal-based tourism (see literature review and presentations in this report) and proposed two approaches to avoid or mitigate the negative consequences.

First, the 3Rs (*Replacement* of animals with alternative methods, *Reduction* of the number of used animals and *Refinement* of the methods, including housing and care, to mitigate suffering and promote animal welfare), initially developed to improve animal welfare for animals used in research, can be applied in other areas as well, including animal-based tourism.

The initial questions should be: is there a need to use animals? Is the interest for the tourism (and thus society) bigger than cost of the individual animal? From a compassionate perspective, are there any activities where the use of animals can never be accepted? Animals can be replaced with virtual reality or completely replaced by tourist activities without any animal theme. If animals are involved, how many animals need to be involved in a given activity? Zoos, amusement parks, elephant and horse riding camps and farms may exhibit less species or less individual animals within a species, less species or individuals have to be affected by safari or trophy hunting activities, etc. Refining the treatment of animals used in tourism will ensure a good welfare and compassion for these animals. Housing (captive animals), exposure, care and handling that enable natural behavior, health and positive feelings will not only benefit the individual animal, but also groups, populations and species, especially if these are small or otherwise vulnerable.

Compassionate animal-based tourism rely on animal protection, i.e. what we do, or ought to do, to provide a good animal welfare through legislation, but also education, policy making and, importantly, information that reaches out to tourists, industry and decision makers.

The second approach emphasizes the need of information to tourists. Certification and labelling of products and services is a well-known strategy to inform consumers, and the group believed that is one strategy to help tourists to make animal welfare-friendly and compassionate choices when traveling. To achieve

credibility in society, this needs to be based on objective, scientific knowledge and collaboration between NGOs, academia, industry and local people involved in, or otherwise affected by, tourism. Another way to reach out to tourists is to provide information about animal-based tourism at airports, ferry terminals, train and bus stations, car rentals, etc. To ensure effective communication, PR strategists and experts in advertising should be involved. The benefits for animals, humans and environment from a responsible tourism need to be communicated.

Legislation and policy:	* Develop, review and ensure implementation of animal welfare legislation and "best practice" guidelines (based on research on animal health, physiology, behaviour, emotions, and natural living) among travel retailers, tour operators, and animal users. * Forbid non-acceptable animal activities in tourism. * Develop, review and implement legislation and guidelines about information, certification and labelling.
Guidelines for tourists:	* Be a responsible tourist – inform yourself, contact travel retailers and tour operators, demand animal friendly and ethically justifiable approaches (compassion – do no harm) to animals in tourism. *Push for certification, labelling and information before and during traveling. * Require tour operators to include a 3R approach, replacing, reducing and refining animal use.
Calls for further research:	* Attitudes and compliance of certification, labelling of and information about animal-based tourism – potential differences between activities, species and demography. * Health, physiology, behavior, emotions, and natural living with regard to different species and if and how they are suitable in animal-based tourism. * Knowledge, attitudes, identification and implementation of compassion and the 3Rs in animal-based industry.

IV. <u>Cultural relativism</u>

Local customs and universal animal welfare standards may sometimes clash. Indeed, part of the appeal to animal tourism in destinations may reside in their 'when in Rome' character: allowing a zone of permissiveness and enjoying local traditions. In many cases, the animal tourism industry is a significant income and source of livelihood for local communities, meaning that when external pressures are put on them to restrict animal uses, we may face ethical dilemmas between human and animal welfare and sustainability.

The group produced a large sketch for their presentation. The topics included in this discussion were the role of regulatory bodies in setting standards. Within this was discussed the roles of hard vs. soft mechanisms, and asking to what extent Destination Marketing Organizations (DMOs) and NGOs may be able to operationalize locally universal codes of conduct. This 'aspirational' universal code, can therefore by somewhat flexible to allow for local context. Similarly, this aspirational code needs to be dynamic also across time, allowing for constant evolution as conditions and priorities change.

In addition to regulation, the group discussed the potential for market forces to indirectly regulate against poor ethical standards in animal tourism, given that tourists may become increasingly discerning about the principles adopted by their tourism operators. This demand side pressure on the tourism industry may be slow-going if one is to rely principally on marketing and social media, but it is likewise an important process.

Where market demand is too slow in bringing about change, the group asked a series of critical questions on who exactly will regulate, and whom this will affect (travelers, countries, operators, etc.). Without attentive regulatory schemes worked out in connection with local communities with e.g. NGOs and DMOs, such regulation is likely to do more harm than good. A recurring dilemma was prioritizing between human and animal welfare. It was said that at present, there needs to be a stronger recognition of the interrelation of human and animal sustainability in the context of animal tourism, insofar as one should ideally benefit the other. Addressing the Sustainable Development Goals was suggested as a potential way forward in acknowledging the intersectionality of human and non-human oppressive conditions in tourism. Indeed, pitting these against one another is likely to undermine not only the welfare of both, but human-animal relations, where protected animals may become the subject of resentment among locals. The priority then should be to create a sustainable surrounding for the communities around e.g. safaris.

Directives to policy:	*Develop, review and ensure implementation of animal welfare legislation and "best practice" guidelines in animal-based tourism among travel retailers, tour operators, and animal users, emphasizing the benefits from a sustainability and human perspective as well. * Develop, review and implement legislation and guidelines about information, certification and labelling, also including benefits from a sustainability and human standpoint.
Guidelines for tourists:	* Be a responsible tourist – inform yourself, contact travel retailers and tour operators, demand animal friendly and ethically justifiable approaches (compassion – do no harm) to animals, humans and environment in tourism (One Welfare). *Push for certification, labelling and information before and during travelling, based on One Welfare.
Calls for further research:	* Attitudes and compliance of certification, labelling and information about animal-based tourism – potential cultural differences. * The roles and responsibilities of humans in animal-based tourism. * Impact on UN Sustainability goals from animal-based tourism – and its interconnection. *Animal-based tourism from a One Welfare perspective.

V.   Future scoping

In a cross-cutting working group, the future of the animal-based tourism industry was discussed. Although this was a recurring topic also in the other groups and in the sessions generally, this group synthesized some key directions for animal tourism going forward.

Connecting to group #1 on broader structures, the role of transitioning to a low-carbon, flight-shame society was discussed in terms of its impact on traveling to experience animals. In this group, it was speculated that the city may become a new locale for animal encounters – an immediate and proximate context in which an increasing number and diversity of animals are beginning to co-habit. This opens up new human-animal relationships, often uneasily, connecting to concerns about conditioning wildlife to feeding, trespassing areas, sanitation and disease risk. At the same time, the city has the potential to become a major attraction for animal tourism, in for example 'tours of the city', animal walks and natural meeting places with animals that are *liminal* rather than wild, thus partly accustomed to human interactions. This may plausibly be less stressful than for wildlife.

So-called feral ecologies were discussed as ways forward. Less and less nature is endemic and self-contained, but affected and moved along with people. Invasive and so-called pest species, moreover, are on the rise everywhere in the world and may be an untapped resource for animal tourism.

Legislation and policy:	* Develop, review and ensure implementation of legislation and guidelines considering animal welfare-friendly and ethically justifiable animal-based tourism, including sustainability.
Guidelines for tourists:	*Inform yourselves. * Be part of the discussion and debate about animal-based tourism *Push for legislation, guidelines, information and responsibility among different stakeholders.
Calls for further research:	*Future directions for animal-based tourism in a changing climate. * Animal-based tourism in urban areas. * Animal-based tourism with focus on feral species.

Concluding remarks

The challenges facing animal-based tourism are many and evolving as tourists place new demands on environments, species and animals. There appear to be three fundamental tensions for the industry: (1) balancing education or conservation and entertainment ('edu-tainment') in animal experiences; (2) imparting changes on the individual consumer level or structural changes to the industry and outfitters (including asking, do animals have to be used at all?); and (3) satisfying animal welfare and conservation goals simultaneously given the sentientistic/biocentric/ecocentric moralities.

In addition to this, we have observed that animal-based tourism may be a victim of its own success on a fundamental level: it hinges its appeal on a separation of nature and culture and exotic animals apart from everyday life. Yet with selling experiences that aim to break down the separation, in contrived ways, and bringing wild animals closer into human interactions, its principal appeal may be gradually eroded.

Further research as indicated by our workshop sessions at this symposium should clarify the effectiveness of labelling and certification in animal tourism; explore the urban as a new frontier for animal tourism; investigate the impact of climate change on changes in destination and species packages; study implementations of the 3Rs (*Replacement*, *Reduction* and *Refinement* of activities using animals) especially in relation to compassionate conservation and consequently, in animal-based tourism; analyse the internet culture of social media, online advertising and reviews with regard to promoting or discouraging certain forms of animal interactions; and generally try to apprehend emerging trends and what these will mean for animal welfare.

For the tourism industry and researchers examining it, there is a need also to consult other contexts and fields in which animals are used by humans and where comparatively greater strides have been made in regard to recognising animals' cognitive ability and the ways in which human use impact them.

Non-Governmental Organizations provide a number of concrete guidelines that can be followed to mitigate welfare risks or avoid activities where the welfare is considered severely compromised in the tourism industry. For example, World Animal Protection highlights activities they recommend tourist to avoid, but also informs about some animal tourism activities that the organization suggests promote animal welfare and conservation:

https://www.worldanimalprotection.org/sites/default/files/int_files/pdfs/checking_out_of_cruelty.pdf (accessed 2019-11-19)

Within the scope of animal welfare and tourism, Four Paws Australia also includes recommendations about purchase of souvenirs and caution about local dishes containing meat of uncertain origin or of exotic animals:

https://www.four-paws.org.au/our-stories/publications-guides/animal-welfare-tourism (accessed 2019-11-19)

It is important not to become paralyzed by perceived response efficacy, e.g., the belief that one's individual behaviour does not make a different in the solution of a problem (Kinnear et al., 1974).

References:

Bekoff, M.E. 2013. *Ignoring nature no more: The case for compassionate conservation*. Chicago, IL, London. The University of Chicago Press, 456 pp.

Bertella, G. 2014. The Co-creation of Animal-based Tourism Experience. *Tourism Recreation Research* no. 39 (1):115-125

Bertella, G. 2018. An eco-feminist perspective on the co-existence of different views of seals in leisure activities. *Annals of Leisure Research* no. 21 (3):284-301

Bulbeck, C. 2005. *Facing the wild : ecotourism, conservation, and animal encounters*. London, [England]: Earthscan.

Burns, G.L. 2015. Animals as Tourism Objects: Ethically Refocusing Relationship between Tourists and Wildlife. In *Animals and Tourism: Understanding Diverse Relationships* edited by K. Markwell, 44-59. Bristol.

Burns, G.L., Macbeth, J., and Moore, S. 2011. Should dingoes die? Principles for engaging ecocentric ethics in wildlife tourism management. *Journal of Ecotourism* no. 10 (3):179-196

Campos, A.C., Mendes, J., Valle, P.O.d., and Scott, N. 2017. Co-creating animal-based tourist experiences: Attention, involvement and memorability. *Tourism Management* no. 63:100-114

Carr, N. 2009. Animals in the tourism and leisure experience. *Current Issues in Tourism* no. 12 (5-6):409-411

Cartmill, M. 1993. *A View to a Death in the Morning: Hunting and Nature Through History*. Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press.

Chhabra, D., Healy, R., and Sills, E. 2003. Staged authenticity and heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* no. 30 (3):702-719

Cloke, P., and Perkins, H.C. 2005. Cetacean Performance and Tourism in Kaikoura, New Zealand. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* no. 23 (6):903-924

Coghlan, A., and Buckley, R. 2012. Nature-Based Tourism. In *The Routledge Handbook of Tourism and the Environment*, edited by A. Holden and D.A. Fennell, 334-344. London & New York Routledge.

Cohen, E. 2007. 'Authenticity' in Tourism Studies: Aprés la Lutte. *Tourism Recreation Research* no. 32 (2):75-82

Cohen, E. 2012. Tiger Tourism: From Shooting to Petting. *Tourism Recreation Research* no. 37 (3):193-204

Cohen, E. 2018. Animal ethics, dietary regimes and the consumption of animals in tourism. In *Tourism Experiences and Animal Consumption: Contested Values, Morality and Ethics*, edited by C. Kline, 1-27. London: Routledge.

Danby, P., Dashper, K., and Finkel, R. 2019. Multispecies leisure: human-animal interactions in leisure landscapes. *Leisure Studies* no. 38 (3):291-302

Daugstad, K., and Kirchengast, C. 2013. AUTHENTICITY AND THE PSEUDO-BACKSTAGE OF AGRI-TOURISM. *Annals of Tourism Research* no. 43:170-191

Desmond, J. 1999. *Staging Tourism: Bodies on Display from Waikiki to Sea World*: University of Chicago Press.

Dobson, J. 2012. 'Ethical issues in trophy hunting', . In *Controversies in Tourism*, edited by O.P.M. Moufakkir and P.M. Burns, 86-98. Wallingford: CABI.

Everett, S. 2008. Beyond the visual gaze?: The pursuit of an embodied experience through food tourism. *Tourist Studies* no. 8 (3):337-358

Fennell, D.A. 2013. Tourism and animal welfare. *Tourism Recreation Research* no 38 (3): 325-340

Fennell, D.A. 2014. Exploring the boundaries of a new moral order for tourism's global code of ethics: an opinion piece on the position of animals in the tourism industry. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* no. 22 (7):983-996

Franklin, A. 1999. *Animals & Modern Cultures – A sociology of human-animal relations in modernity* SAGE.

Franklin, A. 2003. *Tourism: An Introduction.* London: Sage.

Franklin, A. 2012. Viewing Nature Politically. In *The Routledge Handbook of Tourism and the Environment*, edited by A. Holden and D.A. Fennell, 75-83. Lodon & New York: Routledge.

Green, B.C., and Jones, I. 2005. Serious Leisure, Social Identity and Sport Tourism. *Sport in Society* no. 8 (2):164-181

Higham, J., and Neves, K. 2015. Whales, tourism and manifold capitalist fixes : new relationships with the driving force of capitalism. In *Animals and tourism : understanding diverse relationships*, edited by K. Markwell. Bristol: Channel View.

Jacobson, S., K., and Lopez,A.F. 1994. Biological impacts of ecotourism: Tourists and nesting turtles in Tortuguero National Park, Costa Rica. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* no. 22(3): 414–419

Juvan, E., and Dolnicar, S. 2014. The attitude–behaviour gap in sustainable tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* no. 48:76-95

Keul, A. 2018. Consuming the King of the Swamp: Materiality and Morality in South Louisiana Alligator Tourism. In *Tourism Experiences and Animal Consumption: Contested Values, Morality and Ethics*, edited by C. Kline, 179-192. London: Routledge.

Kinnear, T.C., Taylor, J.R., and Ahmed, S.A. 1974. Ecologically Concerned Consumers: Who Are They? *Journal of Marketing* no. 38 (2):20-24

Kline, C. 2018. Abstracting animals through tourism. In *Tourism Experiences and Animal Consumption: Contested Values, Morality and Ethics*, edited by C. Kline, 209-217. London: Routledge.

Lovelock, B. 2015a. Consumptive and nonconsumptive tourism practices: The case of wildlife tourism. In *The Routledge Handbook of Tourism and Sustainability*, edited by M.C. Hall, S. Gossling and D. Scott, 165-174. New York: Routledge.

Lovelock, B. 2015b. Troubled Shooting – the ethics of helicopter-assisted guided trophy hunting by tourists for tahr. In *Animals and Tourism: Understanding Diverse Relationships*, edited by K. Markwell. Bristol: Channel View.

Lovelock, B., and Lovelock, K.M. 2013. *The Ethics of Tourism: Critical and Applied Perspectives*. London & New York: Routledge.

Lovelock, B.A. 2008. An introduction to consumptive wildlife tourism. In *Tourism and the consumption of wildlife: Hunting, shooting and sport fishing*, edited by B.A. Lovelock, 3-30. London: Routledge.

MacDonald, K.I. 2005. Global hunting grounds: power, scale and ecology in the negotiation of conservation. *Cultural Geographies* no. 12 (3):259-291

Markwell, K. 2015. Birds, beasts and tourists: human-animal relationships in tourism. . In *Animals and Tourism: Understanding Diverse Relationships*, edited by K. Markwell, 1-26. Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Markwell, K. 2018. Introduction: exploring leisure-nature relationships. *Annals of Leisure Research* no. 21 (3):259-264

Mason, P., and Mowforth, M. 1996. Codes of conduct in tourism. no. 2 (2):151-167

Mavhunga, C.C. 2011. Mobility and the Making of Animal Meaning

The Kinetics of "Vermin" and "Wildlife" in Southern Africa. In *Making Animal Meaning*, edited by L. Kalof and G.M. Montgomery, 17-44. Michigan State University Press.

Meissner, A.M., Christiansen, F., Martinez, E., Pawley, M.D.M., Orams, M.B., Stockin, K.A. and Cloeckaert, A. Behavioural effects of tourism on oceanic common dolphins, *Delphinus sp.*, in New Zealand: The effects of Markov analysis variations and current tour operator compliance with regulations. *PLoS ONE* no.10 (1): e0116962

Mkono, M., and Holder, A. 2019. The future of animals in tourism recreation: Social media as spaces of collective moral reflexivity. *Tourism Management Perspectives* no. 29:1-8

Moorhouse, T.P, Dahlsjö, C.A.L, Baker S.E., D'Cruze, NC, and Macdonald, D.W. 2015. The customer isn't always right - Conservation and animal welfare implications of the increasing demand for wildlife tourism. PLoS ONE no. 10 (10): e0138939

Moorhouse, T., D'Cruze, N.C., and 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* no. 25 (4):505-516

Moorhouse, T.P., D'Cruze, N.C., and Macdonald, D.W. 2019. Are Chinese nationals' attitudes to wildlife tourist attractions different from those of other nationalities? *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* no. 27 (1):12-33

Ojuva, J. (ed). 2018. Animal welfare in turism services - Examples and practical tips for the well-being of animals used for tourism in Lapland. Publications of Lapland UAS. Publication series D. Other Publications 7/2018.

Rodger, K., Moore, S.A., and Newsome, D. 2007. Wildlife Tours in Australia: Characteristics, the Place of Science and Sustainable Futures. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* no. 15 (2):160-179

Rojek, C. 2000. *Leisure and Culture*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rose, J., and Carr, A. 2018. Political ecologies of leisure: a critical approach to nature-society relations in leisure studies. *Annals of Leisure Research* no. 21 (3):265-283

Sayre, R., and Henderson, K. 2018. The Cow Goes Moo: Farm Animal and Tourist Interactions on Long Island's North Fork. In *Animals, Food and Tourism*, edited by C. Kline, 82-95. Oxon: Routledge.

Schmidt-Burbach, J., Ronfot, D., Srisangiam, R. and Sestak, K. 2015. Asian Elephant Elephas Maximus), Pig-Tailed Macaque (Macaca Nemestrina) and Tiger (Panthera Tigris) populations at tourism venues in Thailand and aspects of their welfare. PLoS ONE 10.9: e0139092

Schmidt-Burbach, J. 2017. Taken for a ride. The conditions for elephants used in tourism in Asia. World Animal Protection. https://www.worldanimalprotection.org.au/sites/default/files/media/au_files/taken_for_a_ride_report.pdf (accessed 2019-11-24).

Shackley, M. 1996. *Wildlife tourism*. London: International Thompson Business Press.

Shani, A. 2009. *Tourists' attitudes toward the use of animals in tourist attractions: An empirical investigation*, Department of Educational Research, Technology, and Leadership, University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida.

Shani, A., and Pizam, A. 2008. Towards an ethical framework for animal-based attractions. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* no. 20 (6):679-693

Simon, A. 2019. The competitive consumption and fetishism of wildlife trophies. *Journal of Consumer Culture* no. 19 (2):151-168

Stone, P.R., and Sharpley, R. 2013. Deviance, Dark Tourism and 'Dark Leisure': Towards a (re)configuration of morality and the taboo in secular society. In *Contemporary Perspectives in Leisure: Meanings, Motives and Lifelong Learning*, edited by S. Elkington and S. Gammon. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Swan, J. 1995. *In Defense of Hunting*. New York: Harper Collins.

Tenbrunsel, A.E., and Messick, D.M. 2004. Ethical Fading: The Role of Self-Deception in Unethical Behavior. *Social Justice Research* no. 17 (2):223-236

Todd, C.S. 2012. The Importance of the Aesthetic. In *The Routledge Handbook of Tourism and the Environment*, edited by A. Holden and D.A. Fennell, 65-74. London & New York: Routledge.

Treaty of Lisbon amending the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community, signed at Lisbon, 13 December 2007.

Tribe, J., and Mkono, M. 2017. Not such smart tourism? The concept of e-lienation. *Annals of Tourism Research* no. 66:105-115

Wang, N. 2000. *Tourism and Modernity*. Amsterdam: Pergamon.

Weibel-Orlando, J. 2009. A Room of (His) Own: Italian and Italian-American Male-Bonding Spaces and Homosociality. *The Journal of Men's Studies* no. 16 (2):159-176

Winders, D., J. 2017. Captive wildlife at a crossroads – Sanctuaries, accreditation, and humane-washing, Animal Studies Journal no 6(2): 161-178

World Animal Protection. 2015. Checking out of cruelty. How to end wildlife tourism's holiday horrors. World Animal Protection: https://www.worldanimalprotection.org/sites/default/files/media/int_files/pdfs/checking_out_of_cruelty.pdf (accessed 2019-11-19).

Appendix 1 : Schedule for Instagranimal

SCHEDULE DAY 1

ARRIVAL AND WELCOME

08:30
-
09:00

Arrival

09:00
-
09:30

Welcome and introduction

Erica von Essen and Johan Lindsjö,
Organizers, Swedish University of Agricultural
Sciences

SESSION 1: BASIC DEFINITIONS & FRAMEWORK

09:30
-
09:50

Formulating Ethical Arguments

Olle Torpman, Swedish University of
Agricultural Sciences

09:55
-
10:15

How do we define and measure animal
welfare?

Linda Keeling, Swedish University of
Agricultural Sciences

10:15 - 10:30 COFFEE BREAK

SESSION 2: TOURISTS AND THEIR RESPONSIBILITY

10:30
-
10:50

The 7 Sins of Wildlife Tourism

Lara Tickle, Swedish University of Agricultural
Sciences

10:55
-
11.15

Into the mind of the trophy hunter: A
social media analysis

Muchazondida Mkono, University of
Queensland

11:20
-
11:40

Tourist, volunteer or both? Benefits
and challenges for animal health and
welfare

Johan Lindsjö, Swedish University of
Agricultural Sciences

11:40 - 12:40 LUNCH

SESSION 3: ANIMAL TOURISM AND SUSTAINABILITY

12:40 - 13.00	Animals, Tourism, and the Sustainable Development Goals
	Carol Kline, North Carolina State University
13.05 - 13:25	Ethical Dilemmas in Elephant Management for Tourism: A case from Hwange National Park, Zimbabwe
	Michael Jones, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

SESSION 4: TOURISM AGENTS AND THEIR RESPONSIBILITY

13:30 - 13:55	Animals in Tourism: Our Five Principles
	Roger Pettersson, World Animal Protection
14:00 - 14:25	Are travel associations doing enough to protect wild animals in tourism?
	Xavier Font, University of Surrey

14:30 - 14:55 COFFEE

SESSION 5: CHALLENGES FOR CONSUMPTIVE WILDLIFE TOURISM

14:55 - 15:15	The country that forgot how to hunt - recreational and touristic hunting in Japan
	Brent Lovelock, University of Otago
15:20 - 15:40	What is a hunting tourism experience? Boundary work in a commodification process
	Erika Andersson Cederholm, Lund University

| 15:45 - 16:05 | What are the implications on animal welfare of recreational angling?

Albin Gräns, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences |

SESSION 6: DISCUSSION

| 16:05 - 17:00 | Reflections on day 1

Erica von Essen and Johan Lindsjö, Organizers, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences |

EVENING

| 18:00 - 19:00 | A short walking tour of Uppsala

Erica von Essen and Johan Lindsjö, Organizers, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences |

SCHEDULE DAY 2

SESSION 7: EXPERIENCING ANIMALS IN THE WILD

09:00 - 09:20	How does animal-based tourism such as nature trekking and bird- and whale watching affect wildlife welfare?
	Lotta Berg, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
09:25 - 09:45	Feral Tourism: The Elephant in the Room
	Adrian Franklin, University of Tasmania

SESSION 8: HUMAN-ANIMAL RELATIONS IN AGRI-TOURISM

09:50 - 10:10	Releasing Cows and Reconciling Tourists: The Roles Played by Animals in Agritourism
	Erica von Essen and Lars Hallgren, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
10:15 - 10:35	The benefits and difficulties of animal contact with the public, as seen at Skokloster 4H
	Moa Samuelsson and Martyna Zelek, 4H Skokloster

10:35 - 10:50 COFFEE

SESSION 9: CAPTIVE WILD ANIMALS IN HUMAN ENVIRONMENTS

10:50 - 11:10	Animal welfare in Zoos and the role of zoos
	Anita Burkevica, Parken Zoo, Eskilstuna

SESSION 10: ANIMAL ROLES AND VALUES

11:15 - 11:35	How roles and values ascribed to animals relate to animal welfare in animal-based tourism
	Henrik Lerner, Ersta Sköndal Bräcke University College

11:40 - 12:00	Conceptualising nonhuman animals as 'workers' within the tourism industry: Theoretical, practical and ethical implications
	Katherine Dashper, Leeds Becket University

12.00 - 13:00 LUNCH

THEMATIC GENERATION EXERCISE IN PLENARY

13:00 - 13:25	Common themes
13:30 - 15:00	Group work

15:00 - 15:15 COFFEE

THEMATIC GENERATION EXERCISE IN PLENARY, CONTINUATION

15:15 - 16:15	Group presentations and plenary discussions
16:20 - 17:00	Book Session: "From Beasts of Burden to K9 Security: The Working Animals of the Tourism Industry"
	Carol Kline, North Carolina State University
17:00 - 18:00	Publication and output of symposium