Bangladesh Journal of Bioethics

Published by: Bangladesh Bioethics Society
https://bjbio.bioethics.org.bd/index.php/BJBio/about
ISSN: p2226-9231 e 2078-1458
BJBio 2025; 14 (3): 33-41
Submitted:15.03.2025
Accepted: 01.10.2025
Published:01. 11.2025

Original Article

Roadside Zoo: Challenging Anthropocentrism Through Photography

Mary Shannon Johnstone

: https://doi.org/10.62865/mk5rpt82

Abstract: In this article, I use a critical animal studies (CAS) lens to examine what it means to create and view photographs of roadside zoo animals. As a photographer and CAS researcher, I am particularly interested in situations where animal suffering is clearly visible yet ignored or perhaps framed as something else such as entertainment. Since roadside zoos are legally sanctioned, open to the public, and encourage visitors to take pictures, they can be a powerful tool to reframe what it means to look at animal suffering. Roadside zoos are typically privately owned, unaccredited menageries charging an admission fee. They exist in every state in the USA, and they are legal. Through my photography, I hope to picture captive animals as individuals, and create photographs that empathetically call attention to the animal's boredom, frustration, and suffering through confinement. In this article, I discuss my "Roadside Zoo" photography series that I created while working on my dissertation (2025). Specifically, I analyze the ethics of looking at and photographing roadside zoo animals from a CAS perspective. This includes an examination of issues of power, representation, perception, and empathy for both the photographer and the viewer. I conclude with a discussion of an artistic intervention that I made to these photographs and examine how these altered visuals might allow us to better "see" the impact of incarceration on these zoo animals.

Key Words: Anthropocentrism, Critical animal studies, Empathy, Ethics of attention, Gaze, Photography, Politics of sight, Roadside zoos

Introduction: "To gaze is powerful. It is also political," writes photographic historian Roberta McGrath[1(p192)]. What McGrath means by this is that the act of looking—whether it be in the form of attention, surveillance, or gaze—always wields power and reveals a particular position. This is an amoral type of power that can be used to control just as easily as it can be used for attention. This is one of the reasons a critical examination of photography of animals is needed. Another reason has to do with issues

PhD, MFA, BFA. Professor of Art, Meredith College, USA; Associate, New Zealand Centre for Human-Animal Studies, NZ; Fellow, Oxford Centre for Animal Ethics, UK. Email: johnsmar@meredith.edu
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0009-0005-4723-1767

Corresponding Author: Mary Shannon Johnstone, **Email:** johnsmar@meredith.edu

of consent and representation. Since animals have no meaningful way to consent to being photographed, the dynamics of power between photographer and subject are exaggerated with the photographer controlling how the subject is represented, and how the photograph is (at least initially) circulated.

In this article, I discuss these issues through a critical animal studies (CAS) examination of my "Roadside Zoo" photography series that I made as part of my dissertation[2]. CAS is an interdisciplinary field that critiques and challenges power systems that oppress animals[3] [4]. This also includes advocating for total liberation, which means that according to a CAS perspective, any zoo is exploitative and cruel because it is a site of incarceration that also works to normalize animal confinement[4].

My photography series, "Roadside Zoo," began with the hope of "exposing" the suffering of individual animals living in roadside zoos through emphatic photography. Roadside zoos are typically privately owned, unaccredited menageries that typically charge an admission fee and often offer up-close encounters with animals for an additional fee. They exist in almost every Western country, including every state in the USA. Since roadside zoos are legally sanctioned, open to the public, and they encourage visitors to take pictures, they can be a powerful tool to reframe what it means to look at animal suffering through confinement.

While working on this series, I uncovered some of the complexities with picturing animals in roadside zoos, such as how easily an anthropocentric gaze can be inadvertently repeated, or even encouraged, rather than challenged. In this article, I use a CAS lens to offer an examination of how the politics of sight and ethics of attention encourage us to "see" more empathically, and then I take a closer look at how suffering and resistance work together through an artistic intervention that I made to the photographs. (I place the word "see" in quotes because I want to stress that the seeing discussed in this article is not limited to a function of the eye). My hope is that this analysis might be able to be applied more generally to how animals are represented and the insights gained from this critical reflection might be used to help improve our relationships with animals. A quick note about the use of the word "animal." Throughout this article, I use the word "animal" or "animals" to refer to all non-human animals. I understand this terminology implies a binary that separates humans as apart and above from animals[3] [4]. I do not support this thinking, and my use of the word "animal" in this article is strictly for brevity.

Methodology: In this article, I use a humanities approach with close, contextual readings of texts from interdisciplinary fields including photography theory, philosophy, and cultural studies, and then apply a CAS lens to focus on how and where the animal is situated within this work. Then I used this convergence to visually analyze photographs that I made of animals in roadside zoos.

Discussion: *Anthropocentrism definition:* Anthropocentrism is the valuing of human life in opposition to and above all other forms of life[5] [6]. It involves hierarchical thinking and seeing humans as "supreme importance in ethical, political, legal, and existential matters"[5]. It has also been defined as a type of prejudice[7] or a "charge of human chauvinism"[8(p1)] and a lens that interprets the world only through the experiences and values of humans[9]. Put another way, anthropocentrism places humans and their interests at the center of all concerns. Anthropocentrism can be seen in a variety of practices in Western culture, although it is not limited to the West[5]. Some examples of anthropocentrism in Western culture include using animals as food sources, clothing, and entertainment; using animals for laboratory testing; and generally viewing animals as a resource for humans. Anthropocentrism is justified by humans in a number of ways including (but not limited to) viewing animals as instinct-driven machines who don't value their lives as humans do[9] [10]; religious views that dictate human superiority as a mandate from God with humans at the apex[11] [12]; and cultural traditions that are so ingrained and prevalent that regarding human life above all other life is seen as neutral and normal[9] [13]. However, no matter the reasons or justifications, the problem with anthropocentrism is that it creates the conditions for violence, suffering, and injustice for animals. Roadside zoos provide an example of an anthropocentric practice, and demonstrate harm that can come to animals because of it.

Anthropocentrism helps form cultural and/or personal beliefs, ideas, experiences, and perceptions that shape how we think and act[13]. In other words, anthropocentrism is a perspective, or lens through which humans view the world, and see themselves as uniquely privileged within it. Challenging anthropocentrism is part of a CAS perspective[3] [4].

Looking: Power and Control: Within photography, the term "the gaze" most often refers to looking from a particular perspective that is informed by personal experience, cultural influences, and political values[1] [14]. It usually refers to a particular bias, implies looking as a form of privilege and control exercised over another, rather than a benevolent kind of looking. This is because the very act of making a photographic exposure enacts certain choices by the photographer and their perspective. These choices have consequences for how the subject is represented and what the viewer subsequently sees and what meaning is derived from the photograph[15] [16]. It is important to note that photographic meaning is created by both the photographer's and the viewer's gaze.

Mary Shannon Johnstone. *Hyena*, 2023.
Reproduced with permission from the artist.

As an example, consider the photograph *Hyena*. This photograph was taken in daylight in a roadside zoo in Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin. This means that the spotted hyena lives in a small, mid-western town in the USA—a climate foreign to her biology, which is suited to sub-Saharan Africa. There are a few problems immediately apparent. First, spotted hyenas are mostly nocturnal animals[17], so being awake and active in the daylight can be a biological stress. Second, hyenas are social creatures who live in clans[17], so a hyena living alone can be another type of stress. Before I took this photograph, I watched her for about 20 minutes, occasionally photographing through the window. At first, she ignored me. However, when I squatted down to her eye-level at the corner of the window, she would open her mouth and make eye contact with me each time she walked by, as she is doing in this photograph—where her mouth is open and she is looking into the camera with a slight grimace as noted by the wrinkles above her nose.

Some might look at this photograph and see the hyena making a funny face. They might find her expression comical, or try to give the photograph a witty tagline, or perhaps create a meme about being caught off guard. In her book, *Animal*, Erica Fudge writes about the "smiling" chimpanzee, Ham, who was used by NASA to test flightlessness. Fudge discusses what viewing Ham's expression as a "smile" might mean[18]. Smile is in quotations because, as similar as chimpanzees are to humans, primatologists have asserted that when a chimpanzee pulls back both lips it is not an expression of joy; it is often an expression of stress, aggression, or fear[18] [19]. This expression is colloquially discussed as a 'fear grimace', but primatologists refer to it as 'silent bared teeth' (SBT)[19] [20]. Before I discuss Fudge's analysis, I would like to give some biographical context for Ham.

Ham's name is an acronym for Holloman Aero Med, which is a medical facility located on Holloman Air Force Base in New Mexico, USA[18] [21]. Ham was born in Cameroon in West Africa in 1957 where he likely saw his mother being slaughtered in order to secure his capture[21]. Ham was then sent to NASA to be trained for their space program—training that involved electric shocks and extended confinement to a chair[18] [21] [22]. In January 1961, before Ham was even four years-old, he was launched into space at approximately 5800 miles per hour and then spent 6.5 minutes without gravity[22]. Upon returning to Earth, Ham's space vessel landed about 100 miles off course, and began sinking in the ocean[18] [22]. Luckily NASA's recovery team were able to successfully retrieve Ham after a few hours, and when crewmen pulled him from his capsule Ham was "smiling"[18] [22]. When they returned to base, news crews wanted to reenact the scene, but no treats, rewards, or even four men could make Ham re-enter the capsule or return to his chair[21] [22]. It seems

Ham's "smile" was not a gesture of pleasure or joy.

In making this comparison between Ham and this hyena, I am not suggesting that the chimpanzee and hyena are similar species (although both fear grimace); however, I am underscoring Fudge's larger point about what it means to interpret an animal gesture through

U.S. Senate. Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences (07/24/1958–02/11/1977). *Ham reaches out from his couch to take an apple from a crewman of the USS Donner. This was the first food for the chimpanzee following a 430 mile ride in a Mercury capsule launched by a Redstone rocket from Cape Canaveral Jan. 31, 1961.* Image available as "unrestricted use" and "unrestricted access" and was retrieved from the U.S. National Archives and Records Administration, https://catalog.archives.gov/id/703809. (Accessed February 20, 2025).

an anthropocentric gaze. In other words, Fudge asks, 'what does it mean that we *want* to see Ham smiling?'[18(p26–27)], or in the case of this photograph, that we might want to read this hyena's expression as comical? Fudge writes that "the smile might tell us something else; something that might undermine the way we are using this animal"[18(p33)]. Reading Ham's, or this hyena's, expression as humorous tells us about our own gaze, shows us what we want to see, and eclipses the animal in the process[18]. It is an example of a harm that can come from photographic representation. Reading Ham's expression as a smile tells us that we want to see ourselves as good, benevolent, and generous team players who share this planet (and beyond) peacefully with animals[18]. This same argument can be applied to this hyena—to read her expression as smiling or comical means that her captivity is a positive thing. She is confined for her safety, our safety, and for the conservation of the planet. Like viewing Ham's expression as a smile, to see the hyena as funny means that she is also happy with her captivity.

But, if we consider the inverse of this—to read this hyena's expression as stress, aggression, or resistance—it might mean that we, as humans, are to blame for her discomfort. It might mean that the pleasure we derive from going to the zoo, seeing animals confined, and taking pictures of them is anything but benevolent or kind. More succinctly put, how we look and what we see are intertwined, and to view this photograph of the hyena as smiling or humorous is to uphold an anthropocentric gaze.

I recognize my presence provoked this hyena's expression. I mention this because even with the best intentions of trying to expose suffering, or engage the viewer with empathy, the photographer's gaze can cause discomfort and immediate stress to individual animals. This is a concern I have with the "Roadside Zoo" documentary series. Looking at and photographing wild animals is an act that is not free of consequence which is one of the reasons a critical examination of photographing animals is necessary.

Looking: Attention and Empathy: Looking is not always discussed in negative terms. For example, ethical attention, or the focusing of one's senses and consciousness on another is an essential part of looking at suffering for philosophers such as Iris Murdoch and Simone Weil[23 24 25]. Both Murdoch and Weil assert a need for letting go of one's "ego"[23(p66)] (bias) and attuning to the world around us in order to respond to those in need[23 24 25]. Although neither Murdoch nor Weil wrote about photography, there is a connection to the hope and motivation for some documentary photographers. The hope that with a particular kind of looking, camera angle, moving composition, one's moral perception might be altered[26].

Contemporary philosopher and ecofeminist Lori Gruen also writes about moral perception. In her 2015 book *Entangled Empathy*, Gruen connects the idea of attuning to another, learning something about their individual situation, and using a blend of affect and cognition to attend to "another's needs, interests, desires, vulnerabilities, hopes, and sensitivities"[27(p.3,66)]. Gruen calls this "entangled empathy" and discusses it as a

process that might allow us to improve our relationships with others who are very different from us and understand our responsibilities toward them[27]. This hope of connecting with another and caring in a deeper way is also an aspiration for some documentary photographers[26].

In *The Ethics of Attention* (2022), Silvia Caprioglio Panizza connects the idea of attunement and moral perception to viewing photographs of animal cruelty. For instance, she talks about the activist group *Anonymous for the Voiceless,* who show graphic images of animal violence in public spaces[24]. Using Murdoch and Weil's notion of attention, Panizza makes the point that simply showing animal oppression doesn't always lead to attention and sometimes fails to motivate action[24]. This is one of the criticisms some photography scholars also have about viewing photographs of violence and suffering[28 29]. They reason, without action, viewing the pain of others can anesthetize the viewer or make the subject a spectacle[28 29].

This issue is something Timothy Pachirat also discusses in his 2011 book *Every Twelve Seconds* where he writes about how the violence of industrialized slaughter is negotiated through "zones of confinement" that allow the gruesome work of killing animals for food to take place on a mass scale, something he calls the "politics of sight"[30(p15,236)]. But Pachirat also acknowledges that without changing what we value and how we think about animals, a glass slaughterhouse could just as easily turn into an enterprise that charges a fee to witness this killing[30]. Pachirat's point is that looking and visibility mean very little without an accompanying change in perspective and values. I believe Murdoch and Weil would agree. I am not alone. At the end of their 2022 book *Animal Crisis*, ecofeminists Alice Crary and Lori Gruen draw a parallel between Murdoch's work and Pachirat's politics of sight saying that Pachirat's research provides a complement to Murdoch's *The Sovereignty of Good*[31]. What I find compelling and relevant is that looking and paying attention involves more than just making animal suffering visible. It involves a change of perspective.

Photography: Challenging or Repeating Anthropocentrism? But how can photography alter both perception *and* perspective? Within the "Roadside Zoo" photographs, I used a strategy discussed by two separate photo historians, Shawn Michelle Smith and Laura Wexler. Both advocate for a photographic approach that includes acknowledgement of what exists beyond the edges of the photograph to consider what informs the photograph within culture and politics, both globally and locally[32 33].

Mary Shannon Johnstone. *White Tiger*, 2022. Reproduced with permission from the artist.

As an example, I would like to offer a close reading of the photograph "White Tiger" from my Roadside Zoo series. This photograph depicts three brightly colored wall, murals with three intersecting window frames and three different pieces of signage. There are depictions of three animals—an illustration of a spotted hyena that appears on wall signage, a flying eagle is painted on the wall in the center, and in the middle window frame, a white tiger looks out through a frosty window. At first glance, it is not clear if this is a real tiger. There is nothing natural about this scene. The colors are loud, the shapes of the paintings are geometric rather than organic, and the animals in the mural are out of context. There is partially melted snow on the ground with footprints and a white tiger stands in front of a window frame in the middle of the image. The angle of view is diagonal to the three walls, but since the tops of the wall are not visible, the space is foreshortened and the environment appears flattened, loud, and graphic. The resulting composition creates a frame which frames the three window frames within the image. The unnaturalness of this scene calls attention to the tiger who is caught in a world where he clearly does not belong. There are two elements in this photograph that point to the meaning residing outside of the photograph—the snowy environment, and the traces of human presence.

First, a white tiger surrounded by snow and frost denotes a layer of meaning that may not be immediately obvious. While there are five different species of tigers, including Siberian tigers who live in wintery areas of Asia, all white tigers belong to the subspecies of the Bengal Tiger, *Panthera tigris tigris*[32]. They live in southeast India and therefore the snowy landscape, like the hyena, is completely foreign to their biology. Perhaps more importantly, white tigers are extinct in the wild with the last known wild white tiger shot in India in 1958[34]. In the USA, all white tigers are descendants of a single tiger named Mohan who was brought to the USA in 1951[34]. Due to severe inbreeding, white tigers often suffer from a variety of problems that compromise their heath[34]. These health problems are so severe that in 2011, the leading zoo accrediting body, Association of Zoos and Aquariums (AZA), announced they would no longer breed or transfer in any white tigers[36]. Since tigers only live 10–15 years, a white tiger on exhibit in a zoo is a sign of an unaccredited facility who supports spectacle and profit over an animal's well-being. Therefore, any kind of looking at white tigers is political, and a portrait of a white tiger is never neutral.

Second, the inclusion of human footprints and trash bin point to a relationship between the tiger and humans. The chaotic footprints in the snow suggest that, unlike the tiger, the humans are free to roam as they please, while a strategically placed garbage bin is adjacent and eye-level to the white tiger. The tiger is a discarded commodity.

When I created this image, I hoped my photographic choices would encourage the viewer to think about how precious their own freedom is, and what it might be like for a tiger (who would roam 6–12 miles at a time in the wild) to be caged. In other words, I hoped this photograph communicated empathy. However, a concern I have with this photograph, and the entire "Roadside Zoo" documentary series, is that the photographs may look too much like everyone else's who visit roadside zoos. I worry that the anthropocentric gaze is too strong, and the images could be just as easily used by the zoo to advertise what they have to offer, rather than serve as a critique on animal captivity. While captions help to contextualize the photographs, the words and images can easily be separated when shared online through social media. (Image captions for the photographs in this article have been omitted due to word count limitations. However, full captions are available within my dissertation[2].) Since context and perspective shape meaning together, without context, my documentary style could easily repeat anthropocentrism instead of challenging it.

In considering a new approach, I decided to intervene with my documentary-style "Roadside Zoo" photographs. I inverted the photographs in Photoshop to produce a negative effect where the animal's body glows. With the stripping away the color and turning the photograph into a negative (reversal), the animal appears in a way that is foreign, or perhaps jarring, to most normally sighted people. This intervention creates an unexpected view of something most of us have been dulled to—the imprisonment of zoo animals. I call this series "Roadside Zoo: Captive Glow."

With this artistic intervention in "Roadside Zoo: Captive Glow" I believe the animals can be better seen both aesthetically and conceptually. This is because there is an opportunity to see something beyond suffering—resistance. CAS scholar Dinesh Wadiwel argues that examining animal resistance is important if we are to understand how power impacts an animal's life[36]. Wadiwel cautions that focusing solely on animal suffering creates a dialogue about animals' capacities and worth (welfare), shifting the focus from what humans do to animals (violence) to a conversation on whether humans are justified in their actions or not[36]. Deborah Hart makes a similar point in her 2024 article while discussing the orca attacks on the Iberian coast[37]. She writes, "The question should not be, 'what are the intentions of these animals when they resist, and what is their goal?' But rather, 'what is the institution of their repression?'"[37] Hardt is asking us to look at the conditions of power that cause retaliation. I am inspired by both authors. As I converted and cropped the photographs, I began to see something I hadn't before—I saw what Wadiwel refers to as the creative ways in which the animals resist[35].

As an example, I would like to discuss "Taping Baby Alligator Mouth Shut", a photograph taken in 2024 at a roadside zoo in South

Carolina, USA. The photograph depicts a baby alligator who has been snatched out of a pool of about 100 juvenile alligators as part of the zoo's daily show. I watched the alligator flail in the water and resist being selected. He was then pinned down, and his mouth was sealed with electrical tape and then passed around to about 75 people to be held. I walked around during the show, drawing attention to myself while photographing, but no one stopped me or asked what I was doing. I don't believe the visitors or the workers thought anything was wrong with the treatment of this alligator. No laws were being broken. On the contrary, perhaps taping the alligator's mouth shut was even seen by some zoo-goers as responsible. From an anthropocentric perspective, the zoo was ensuring human safety while promoting curiosity and education about alligators. Of course, none of this backstory is visible in the photograph, nor is it necessary to understand what is visible. My hope in depicting this scene in this way is that it might reveal both a change in perception and perspective. Let me explain through a close reading.

Mary Shannon Johnstone. *Taping Baby Alligator Mouth Shut*, 2024. Reproduced with permission from the artist.

The photograph depicts a small alligator's head being held in a left human hand, while the right human hand descends from the top of the frame with a roll of tape. The vertical cropping makes the right hand appear more controlling and menacing, perhaps referencing a marionette. The roll of tape has already been wound around the alligator's mouth twice, and the right hand appears to be continuing with the roll still attached to the alligator's mouth.

The photograph is stripped of color and is "reversed" like a photographic negative. This means that what is normally black (like the tape or the shadow of the human) is white, and what would be white (like the sun shining on the wooden deck) is black. The "negative" reversal offers an altered version of this scene, which is outside of most humans' vision—one that resembles an x-ray, adding to a cold, clinical, or perhaps menacing quality. The removal of color, reversal of white and dark, the heavy tonality, and tight cropping all allude to discomfort and work to subvert the anthropocentrism in witnessing this scene. In this way, inverting the photo might also act as a subversion to the anthropocentric gaze[38].

One might argue that the alligator seems passive—he seems to be still and looking forward, with no movement or flailing visible. However, I would argue that neither the hands pinning the alligator's head, nor the taping of the mouth would be necessary if the alligator were consenting to the situation. In this way, the inversion of the photograph is not only aesthetic, but conceptual. Restraint is visible, implying resistance.

Mary Shannon Johnstone. *Pongo Waits*, 2024. Reproduced with permission from the artist.

The same is true in this portrait of Pongo, a 28-year-old orangutan who has lived his entire life in captivity and every day since 2009 inside this concrete cell in Florida, USA. The black marks surrounding his face are the shadows of the leaves by nearby trees he will never climb. In the wild orangutans spend most of their time in the trees. The only reason for the bars his hands cling to is because he would otherwise escape. Therefore, the bars are an indication of his resistance. The same is true for Michael,

a chimpanzee lives at a roadside zoo in West Virginia, USA. During my 2023 visit, zoo staff told me he was an "introvert". I can only imagine the stress involved with being an introvert on display everyday of one's life.

Mary Shannon Johnstone. *Michael*, 2023.
Reproduced with permission from the artist.

With this artistic intervention, I hope to highlight both suffering and resistance. This is a departure from the illustrative, documentary style photographs I began this project with. With the documentary-style "Roadside Zoo" photographs, the individual animal's response and resistance to their captivity was sometimes ambiguous. The photographs relied on the viewer caring enough to "read" what they were looking at, and hopefully offer an empathetic different perspective. In the "Roadside Zoo: Captive Glow" series, I hope to offer images that look so strange and unfamiliar that it startles or confuses the viewer. Maybe the viewer doesn't understand what they are looking at right away, but through this altered perception, I hope the viewer's perspective is also changed.

Mary Shannon Johnstone. *Tiger World Cub*, 2023.
Reproduced with permission of the artist.

Conclusion: Looking and photographing are complicated acts, made on shifting ground that involves power, control, attention, and empathy. These issues become more complicated when picturing animals who have no method of meaningful consent over being photographed, or how they appear in the resulting photograph. In this article, I discussed some of the ethical considerations around challenging an anthropocentric gaze when photographing animals in roadside zoos. By engaging in an artistic intervention that inverts the photograph to appear as a negative, I hope to offer an alternative way of "seeing"—one that alters both perception and perspective and highlights captivity and resistance. As a final word, for anyone photographing animals, a critical reflection is imperative since even benevolent intentions can be eclipsed, even unintentionally, by an anthropocentric gaze.

References

1. McGrath R. Reviewing the Gaze. In: Bull S. A Companion to Photography. 1st ed. Oxford, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd; 2020. p. 189–207. ISBN: 978-1-405-19584-3.
2. Johnstone, S. The Latent Animal Image: Exposing Suffering and Developing Change. PhD Dissertation. New Zealand Centre for Human-Animal Studies, University of Canterbury, New Zealand, 2025. https://ir.canterbury.ac.nz/items/b37a15d1-527b-4e13-8d31-a231fdb1d828 (Accessed 10 Oct. 2025).
3. Taylor, N. & Twine, R. Introduction: Locating the "Critical" in Critical Animal Studies. In T*he Rise of Critical Animal Studies,* N. Taylor & R. Twine (Eds.); 2014. p. 1–16. Routledge. ISBN: 9781138125919.
4. Best, S., Nocella, A., Kahn, R., & Gigliotti, C. Introducing Critical Animal Studies. Animal Liberation Philosophy and Policy Journal. 2007. *5*(1): 4–5. https://www.criticalanimalstudies.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/JCAS-Vol-5-Issue-1-2007.pdf (Accessed 10 Sep. 2025).
5. Calarco M. Animal Studies: The Key Concepts. New York, USA: Routledge; 2021.ISBN: 978-1845206673.
6. Weitzenfeld A, Joy M. An overview of anthropocentrism, humanism, and speciesism in critical animal theory. Counterpoints. 2014;448:3–27. http://www.jstor.org/stable/42982375 (Accessed 15 Jul. 2025).
7. Milligan T. Speciesism as a Variety of Anthropocentrism. In: Bodice, S. Anthropocentrism: Humans, Animals, Environments. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill; 2011. p. 223–243. ISBN: 978-9004187948.
8. Boddice R. Introduction: The End of Anthropocentrism. In: Bodice, S. Anthropocentrism: Humans, Animals, Environments. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill; 2011. p. 1–18. ISBN: 978-9004187948.
9. Meijer E. When Animals Speak: Toward an Interspecies Democracy. New York, USA: New York University Press; 2019. ISBN: 9781479863136.
10. Wadiwel D. The War Against Animals. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill; 2015. ISBN: 978-90-04-30041-5.
11. Mackintosh A. Foucault's Menagerie: Cock Fighting, Bear Baiting, and the Genealogy of Human-Animal Power. In: Chrulew M, Wadiwel D. Foucault and Animals. Vol. 18. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill; 2017. p. 161–89. ISBN: 978-90-04-33224-9.
12. Merskin D. Species Traitor? Foundations and Tensions in Human/Animal Scholarship and Advocacy. In: Khazaal N, Almiron, N. Like an Animal: Critical Animal Studies Approaches to Borders,

Displacement, and Othering. Vol. 5. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill; 2021. p. 125–57. ISBN: 978-90-04-43908-5.
13. Joy M. Why We Love Dogs, Eat Pigs, and Wear Cows: An Introduction to Carnism. San Francisco, USA: Conari Press; 2010. ISBN: 978-1573245050.
14. Lutz C, Collins J. The Photograph as an Intersection of Gazes: The Example of National Geographic. In: Wells L. The Photography Cultures Reader: Representation, Agency, and Identity. New York, USA: Routledge; 2019. p. 53–72. ISBN: 9780415749206.
15. Malcolm J. Diana & Nikon: Essays on the Aesthetic of Photography. Expanded Edition. New York, USA: Aperture; 1997. ISBN: 978-0879233877.
16. Solomon-Godeau, A. Photography At The Dock: Essays on Photographic History, Institutions, and Practices. Minneapolis, USA: University of Minnesota Press; 1991. ISBN: 978-0816619139.
17. San Diego Zoo Wildlife Alliance Library. Spotted Hyena (Crocuta Crocuta) Fact Sheet: Behavior & Ecology [Internet]. SDZ; 2024. https://ielc.libguides.com/sdzg/factsheets/spottedhyena/behavior-ecology (Accessed 8 Jun. 2025).
18. Fudge E. Animal. London, UK: Reaktion Books; 2002. ISBN: 9781861891341.
19. Waller B, Dunbar R. Differential Behavioural Effects of Silent Bared Teeth Display and Relaxed Open Mouth Display in Chimpanzees (*Pan Troglodytes*). Ethology. 2005;2(111):129–42. DOI: 10.1111/j.1439-0310.2004.01045.x.
20. Kim Y, Vlaeyen J, Heesen R, Clay Z, Kret M. The Association Between the Bared-Teeth Display and Social Dominance in Captive Chimpanzees (*Pan Troglodytes*). *Affective Science*, 2002;3:749–60. DOI: 10.1007/s42761-022-00138-1.
21. Sorenson J. Ape. London, UK: Reaktion Books; 2009. ISBN: 978-1861894229
22. Save the Chimps. Ham, the First Chimpanzee in Space [Internet]. STC; 31 Jan. 2021: https://savethechimps.org/ham-space-chimp/ (Accessed 8 Dec. 2024).
23. Murdoch I. The Sovereignty of Good. 2nd edition. New York, USA: Routledge Classics; 2001. ISBN: 978-0415253994. (First published in 1970.)
24. Panizza S. The Ethics of Attention: Engaging the Real with Iris Murdoch and Simone Weil. New York, USA: Routledge Studies in Ethics and Moral Theory; 2022. ISBN: 9780367759568.
25. Weil S. Human Personality. In: Miles S. *Simone Weil: An Anthology*. London, UK: Penguin Group; 2005. p. 69–98. ISBN: 978-0802137296. (First published in 1986.)
26. Borge M. Documentary Photography Reconsidered: History, Theory, and Practice. Great Britain: Bloomsbury Visual Arts; 2019. ISBN: 978-1472586698.
27. Gruen L. Entangled Empathy: An Alternate Ethic for Our Relationships With Animals. Brooklyn, USA: Lantern Books; 2015. ISBN: 978-1590564875.
28. Sontag S. Regarding the Pain of Others. New York, USA: Picador; 2003. ISBN: 978-0312422196.
29. Rosler M. In, Around, And Afterthoughts (On Documentary Photography). In: Wells L. The Photography Reader: History and Theory. 2nd ed. New York, USA: Routledge; 2019. p. 335–57. ISBN: 978-0415749183.
30. Pachirat T. Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight. New Haven, USA: Yale University Press; 2011. ISBN: 978-0300192483.
31. Crary A, Gruen L. Animal Crisis: A New Critical Theory. Cambridge, UK: Polity; 2022. ISBN: 978-1-509-54968-9.
32. Wexler L. The Democratic Lens: Photography and Restitution: The Civil Potential of the Image' by Laura Wexler [Lecture]. 20 Nov. 2022. LaFonda Ballroom, Santa Fe, USA.
33. Smith S. At the Edge of Sight: Photography and the Unseen. Durham, USA: Duke University Press; 2013. ISBN: 978-0-8223-5502-1.
34. Xu X, Dong GX, Hu XS, Miao L, Zhang XL, Zhang DL, Yang HD, Zhang TY, Zou ZT, Zhang TT, Zhuang Y, Bhak J, Cho YS, Dai WT, Jiang TJ, Xie C, Li R, Luo SJ. The Genetic Basis of White Tigers. Current Biology. 2013;20(11):1031–35. DOI: 10.1016/j.cub.2013.04.054.
35. Association of Zoos and Aquariums. White Paper: Welfare and Conservation Implications of Intentional Breeding for the Expression of Rare Recessive Alleles. [Internet] AZA, 1 Jun. 2011. https://assets.speakcdn.com/assets/2332/aza_white_paper_inbreeding_for_rare_alleles_18_jan_2012.pdf (Accessed 23 Jul. 2025).
36. Wadiwel D. Do Fish Resist? Cultural Studies Review. 2016;22(1):196–242. DOI: 10.5130/csr.v22i1.4363.
37. Hardt D. Dangerous Play: Orcas, Mêtis, and the Global Lockdown. Humanimalia. 2024;15(1). DOI: 10.52537/humanimalia.19193.
38. Thank you to Dr. Yolandi Coetser for this insight. Personal communication. [Zoom] 18 Dec. 2024.

Author Contribution: This article is derived from the author's PhD dissertation. "The Latent Animal Image: Exposing Suffering and Developing Change" (2025) with the New Zealand Centre for Human-Animal Studies at the University of Canterbury, Christchurch, NZ.

Conflict of interests: None.

Funding: While this article was not directly funded, the content of this article comes from PhD research that was supported with a University of Canterbury Doctoral Scholarship (2022−2025).

Data availability: All data within the article. No data retention for another writing.