

THESIS

THE ETHICAL HUNTER: HOW TO CONSUME ANIMAL LIFE

Submitted by

Adrian A. Flygt

Department of Philosophy

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Fall 2013

Master's Committee:

Advisor: Bernard E. Rollin

Dustin Tucker  
Gerald Callahan

## ABSTRACT

### THE ETHICAL HUNTER: HOW TO CONSUME ANIMAL LIFE

Humans have been hunting and killing animals for survival throughout history. With the advent of agriculture and the stability added to the food supply, transient populations were able to stay in one place. Humans no longer had to rely on the shifting local plant and animal populations for survival. As the agricultural food supply grew so did the infrastructure for spreading the food to those places with less bounty. Hunting then went from a necessity, to a supplement, to an extravagance, the practice of wealthy, globe-trotting gentlemen in search of trophies. In the last forty years, hunting has gone from an all-time high of 19.1 million hunters in 1975, around eight percent of the population, through a steady decline to a current low of around 12.5 million, around five percent of the population of the United States. Despite gun ownership and population increase, involvement in hunting is steadily decreasing. There are many possible reasons for this decline. Daily life for Americans is less rural and more urban, there is less land available for easy access and people are spending less time being active or being outdoors. There are also more single family home and fewer resources for recreation. The role of and use of animals has changed daily life, from a tool to something more. People are growing more interested in how animals are treated. If animal life is valuable in more than an instrumental way, and people care about how animals live and die, killing animals during the hunt must stop immediately.

Hunting is more than just killing animals. Modern man also intentionally ends animal lives during industrial agriculture and may have to end pet animal lives when pets grow too old or are suffering. Both of these modes of consumption are different than the death man inflicts at the end of a successful hunt and different than the death a wild animal would face without the

hunter entering the field. Pet and food animals are killed by someone whose job is killing animals with no emotional attachment, maximum speed and efficiency. Hunters go into the wild to seek out an emotional attachment to the chosen animal or a heightened emotional state before attempting to kill the animal. Animal predators kill without moral agency, such killing is part of the circle of life, completely natural. If done well, the hunter may inflict a less stressful, less painful death than slow starvation or being eaten by a predator, but that does not always happen because of poor judgment or poor execution by the hunter. Further, the animal killed by the hunter is different than the one the predator may choose, the big, beautiful, healthy middle-aged male versus the slow, weak, or catchable fawn or elder member of the herd. The hunter is forced to abide by Fair Chase rules to eliminate some, but not all of his advantages over his prey further distancing the hunt from both domestic animal killing and wild animal predation. Hunting is ultimately intentional, conscious animal killing that may include subjecting an individual animal to exceptional pain and suffering only for human recreation. Such a practice cannot be consistent with current societal values.

Recognizing this challenge, how to justify the only recreational killing and possible animal cruelty that is at least temporarily tolerated in modern times, hunters offer a broad and diverse series of justifications that each fail individually. Hunters attempt to distance themselves from each other arguing first that some hunt purely for food, for survival. Although this may be true for some, the cost of travel, license and equipment will nearly always make hunting the more expensive alternative instead of the only way to feed the family. A hunter concerned only with filling his pot may not value the quality of the animal death in terms of pain and suffering so this justification is not enough to justify the hunt, there must be something else driving the hunter. The sport hunter finds that something else in the form of fun and recreation found in the

hunt. These hunters choose to hunt because they enjoy killing animals or having the chance to kill animals. If hunting is a sport, both sides must be knowingly, intentionally participating with equal chance for victory. This is not the case with hunting. The most egregious use of the sporting or recreational killing is the third type of hunter, the trophy hunter. This person chooses to hunt so they may have the chance to kill a particularly large or dangerous animal to create a souvenir of the hunt. Trophies and record books have spawned the practice of hunting drugged or previously captive wild animals that have no chance for escape, perhaps the most offensive type of hunting, killing only for a trophy without chance for survival. All hunting devolves to intentional recreational consumption of animal life, so hunters attempt to account for value in the process or outcome.

In the utilitarian paradigm, hunters attempt to account for who benefits from a successful hunt, does the good the hunter articulates out way the bad experienced by the dead animal. Although there is argument about if quickly and painlessly killing a healthy animal rather than allowing it to grow old and die is a harm to the animal, I contend it is better for living things to be alive than dead so dying at the time of another being's choosing is harmful. Hunters argue hunting is good because the hunt offers a chance to be out in nature, to connect with a simpler, less regimented time and place. Because the hunter feels these things during the hunt, he is licensed to kill animals. Hunters believe hunting is natural, is a historically valuable practice and should be continued because it is what people have been doing forever. The hunt also connects hunters to each other and to a place where they become well acquainted with the flora and fauna, having intense experiences during the hunt. Hunting requires and improves skills like communication, discipline and endurance, so hunting should be permitted as an outlet for those skills. All of these things are beneficial to the hunter but all of them have other acts of

comparable utility that could create a similar good without the bad of killing or harming an animal.

The hunter then tries to expand the scope of the benefits and the goodness from the hunt to include not just the hunter, but the community of people, the ecosystem, the species chosen, the other species connected to the chosen species and the non-hunting public. Conserving and preserving land from license revenue benefits all consumers of nature and all animals that inhabit or may inhabit the area. If hunters assist in land or population management, they argue that they may kill some individuals so the others may flourish, keeping the population of the chosen species in check. Hunting industry revenue, either in manufacturing goods or supporting hunting travel, helps the economy and employs many people but does not, alone, justify killing wild animals for fun in a way that may cause them exceptional or additional pain. Even with an expand scope of benefits from the hunt; the hunter cannot offset the harm done to the dead animal in potential or actual pain and suffering.

After failing to justify the hunt when measuring only the outcome of the hunt, comparing a dead animal to a list of created benefits, the hunter turns to justifying the hunt because of the process followed. Hunters argue that because of the doctrine of Fair Chase, which seeks to level the playing field between hunters and hunted, the hunters may kill animals. Fair Chase requires hunters to surrender some, but not all of their advantages over the chosen prey animal in the form of hunting regulations that prescribe timing of the season, hunting hours, weapons allowed. Beyond the laws governing the hunt, Fair Chase exists in elective practices of small groups, those who will not shoot ducks until they are flying or choose only to hunt during bow season because it requires more skill or hard work to encounter an animal within the reduced killing range of that weapon. In either formulation, Fair Chase does not go far enough. It is the

foundation for a chance to minimize animal pain, but it still does not include provisions that account for how the hunted animal is killed in terms of pain and suffering.

The solution to these shortcomings will take the form of the Ethical Hunter, the hunter who takes the field to hunt recreationally and begins by following all relevant legal constraints before augmenting them to account for why and how the wild animal is killed with an eye towards reducing pain and suffering. The Ethical Hunter works from Fair Chase trying to make the killing part of hunting as much like slaughter in industrial agriculture without changing the certainty of animal encounter. So there is a chance to fail to see animals, but if animals are seen, they are killed quickly and with minimal pain. The Ethical Hunter begins this control by choosing the best possible weapon, a high-powered centerfire rifle with an optical sight, deployed under the best possible circumstances with the best possible preparation. This requires time and discipline to take shorter range shots at stationary animals when field conditions allow sure shots which only becomes clear after lengthy practice and preparation before going on the hunt. The Ethical Hunter makes his shot in the field as close his practice at the range, shooting from a stable rest with a known range at a stationary target. This target will be a wild animal that the Ethical Hunter will consume completely, being defined by how agricultural uses carcasses.

If the Ethical Hunter can observe all of these additions and avoid motivating the hunt only with a desire to kill, he has created a paradigm that resembles consumption of animal life in industrial agriculture, but that may be even more ethically justified. Assume that living in 2013 requires some loss of animal life, even with a vegetarian lifestyle. The mice killed when harvesting a field of soybeans are no less dead than the elk or the cow killed by the hunter or slaughterhouse worker. Care must be taken to avoid implicit speciesism valuing charismatic megafauna over all other animal species. If an animal life is worth an animal life, ethical hunting

yields more calories per life consumed compared to industrially produced beef. The Ethical Hunter, when hunting locally, traveling minimally processing his own meat requires less resources per pound of animal produced compared to modern industrial agriculture including reduce fuel consumption and carbon dioxide emissions. The wild animal is leading a better life compared to the domesticated animal in the industrial agriculture paradigm because of the wild animal is allowed to live without human constraint or conscious investment. Wild animals travel the countryside eating, sleeping and reproducing independent of man, as wild as possible giving the Ethical Hunter an advantage in telos realization for the animals killed compared to the animals consumed by industrial agriculture. The animals raised in free range farming operations more closely resemble the ethically hunted wild animal, but not completely. If the Ethical Hunter can follow his set protocol accounting for animal pain and suffering, the animal killed at the end of the hunt will have lived a better life and no worse death than the animals consumed by agriculture.

In this formulation, the Ethical Hunter attempts to work through hunting being only about killing to a consumption of animal life that is more consistent with a modern view of animal life. The wild animal killed at the end of the ethical hunt is pure in terms of antibiotics, vaccines and preservatives, an increasingly valued quality of food for many people. The wild animal death is no worse than what animals face in industrial agriculture and may be better in terms of stress of transport and life up to that point which is consistent with the societal concern for quality of animal life. Finally, the hunt connects the hunter to a simpler time of self-sufficiency and to the significance of death, which cannot be the primary motivator but may be a collateral benefit consistent with experiences people are seeking out in modern life. Through this examination, the Ethical Hunter should appear less an antiquated ideal of evil and brutality and more like the most

justified consumption of animal life, a collection of searching, connection, awareness, and minimized environmental impact not justified because of any one of these reasons, but because of how all of them make ethical hunting superior to current alternatives.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
CHAPTER 1 .....	1
CHAPTER 2 .....	25
CHAPTER 3 .....	60
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	91

## **Chapter 1**

Every fall, in small towns and large cities, the days shorten, the leaves begin to change and the weather cools. People trade shorts and t-shirts for pants and jackets, some of this clothing being camouflage or blaze orange. A similar clothing exchange takes place in the spring for waterfowl and small game and then the woods and fields fill with hunters. Hunting has been as standard as the season change for many generations, but gradually interest and opportunities are waning. Growing up in Southern Wisconsin, school, and all things not blaze orange, practically stopped for Opening Day of gun deer season. It was understood that people of legal hunting age would be in the woods and those who could not go would be waiting for those who did. Unfortunately, when I left town for the University of Wisconsin, many things changed. I moved from a rural, small town in the hills to the city on the isthmus. People did not talk about hunting in this academic, urban environment even though other hunters and small town students familiar with hunting attended the University. This shift from valuing hunting above all else, to scarcely talking about such recreation was interesting. When hunting was discussed, it was often dismissed as wanton cruelty that most people despised, some inferior practice of delinquent rednecks, not something civilized people do. At first I attributed this shift to be purely the small town versus the big city; people in rural, farming communities are connected more to the land, animals, the seasons and things like hunting. A closer examination made me wonder if it was more than just the geographic location that was causing the change I was witnessing. Over time, I found myself hunting less and associating with friends who were less and less interested in hunting, regardless of our location. This has led me to wonder what is wrong with hunting and hunters in 2013. As a student of philosophy, the chance to examine and articulate the arguments related to the decline of hunting was one I could not pass up. In what follows, I will explain the problems with hunting beginning with how society has changed its

ethic respecting animal life thereby creating what appears to be the foundation for this decline of hunting. I will examine the influence of the prominent animal ethics thinkers who started the field more than 30 years ago and began the transition of people thinking of animals as tools to people thinking of animals as capable of having lives that can be better or worse. I will then explain why society thinks that humans killing animals in the act of hunting should stop as it is harmful to the animal, in the form of painful death and potentially harmful to humans. I will begin with a brief history of hunting.

Before humans relied on any form of farming or organized agriculture, in the form of animal husbandry or organized crop management, hunter/gatherer cultures used the local animals and plants to provide sustenance, traveling around an area to follow migrating herds or seasonal blooms at the mercy of the season and the local animal population. Without hunting, people could live, and even live well, on the fruits, nuts and berries of the moment but they chose to kill wild animals to supplement their diets and fill in any shortcomings of the season. With the advent of domesticated agriculture some 10,000 years ago, both plants and animals were bred, kept, and changed to be controllable enough to allow people to build civilizations in a given area and remain with a constant, human controlled food source. Hunting remained an occasional supplement to dietary needs, not the sole source of food. In Colonial America, market hunters would travel the countryside, facing little restriction as they supplied wild meat to the hungry colonists as a dietary supplement, sometimes wiping entire wild species off the map like the passenger pigeon which went from populations in the billions to the last one dying in captivity in 1914. During that time, some 200 years ago, market hunters were viewed as skilled workers, much like doctors, blacksmiths and carpenters as they possessed a specialized, necessary ability which supported life in a community. Hunting and hunters were seen in a positive light, an integral part of life in the New World providing food to those who did not own their own farm or

garden or who were unable to, or unsuccessful in, the hunt. There was both instrumental value in hunting, as it provided additional food, along with a sense of connection and community in hunting together with other people for those who ventured into the woods instead of enlisting the services of a market hunter. Hunting was something that communities did not resent or protest, but instead it was something that made life possible.

In the last 100 years, however, that acceptance and reliance has changed. While Hemingway and Roosevelt romanticized hunting big game in Africa at start of the 1900's, many others were planting the seeds of early conservation and preservation practices in the United States, Roosevelt being one of them, expanding the National Forests and creating five national parks. (Kerasote, 1993) Hunting had gone from a practical survival necessity to a dietary supplement to a luxury recreation for the wealthy, taking an airplane trip to Africa when many did not own cars to drive across the state. Hunting was accepted as recreation, and even necessity, for the rural poor who could walk out of their backdoor into the woods or a hollow and find wildlife to feed a family when funds did not allow trips to the market. More recently, however, the positive light has continued to dim. In the last 30 years specifically, according to the US Fish and Wildlife Service, hunting participation in the United States has declined from a high of 19.1 million in 1975 to 12.5 million in 2006 even though total population and gun ownership continue to increase. Although 75% of the American public approve of "legal hunting", this number drops to below fifty percent when the hunt occurs only for challenge or to secure a trophy. (Responsive Management, 2003) More importantly, the opposition to hunting has become more vocal and the US culture as a whole has become more interested in protecting animals and others who are not able to protect themselves while also inviting hunting apologists to argue for the value of their past time. (Kowalsky, 2010; Evans, 2005; Pauley, 2003; Wood,

1997; Dizard, 1994; Cartmill, 1993; Causey, 1989) There are several possible reasons for this decline in involvement and waning societal acceptance.

First is a fundamental shift, an evolution, of the average daily life of a person living in the United States. The population has increased from 88 million to over 300 million over this time frame, around one hundred years. The rapid population growth has increased population density, and the prevalence of urban centers while decreasing available land holdings that are open or available to hunters through personal ownership or public access. The population boom has also caused an economic shift from rural, farming communities to white collar employment in these urban centers. (Responsive Management/NSSF, 2008) Now, most Americans live in cities, work indoors and do not have the connection to the land that marked populations in the early 1900's because of the shift to city living.

Related to this shift, there has been an overall decrease in interest in outdoor activities generally and vigorous physical activities particularly. Now television commercials remind children to play outside sixty minutes a day. People go to the gym for physical activity instead of finding it in their jobs and many people do not even make it to the gym, combining sedentary jobs with fast food spreading an obesity epidemic across the United States. Each generation has become on average, more over-weight, less active, married to video games and sitting inside instead of climbing mountains, tracking game and spending time outdoors. Part of this may be connected to the increase in single parent homes where limited resources and time prevent unnecessary hobbies, let alone recreation as time and resource intensive as hunting. In many single mother homes, finding someone to model hunting behavior in a home without a father, as hunting is male dominated, is a challenge that makes playing a sport or staying at home an easier choice. (Responsive Management/NSSF, 2008) In a time of economic recession, making the time/having the resources to hunt in a household relying on one parent and one income, can be a

challenge that may also stop a child from going to the woods to hunt. This, in turn, has become part of a change in the societal mindset. Hunting, because it is not needed for daily survival, has been relegated to a recreational pursuit that does not mesh well with most of societies' current interests.

As the nature of American society has changed, so too has the perception of animals and the role they play in daily life. When asking people on the street what the first animals they can think of off the top of their head, most respond with cats, dogs and fish, animals that are usually part of the family as pets. The concept of working or wild animals is largely lost on the average, urbanized American. Horses, mules and sheep are not common parts of daily life for Americans excluding the few who work with those animals in research or the few who actually see these animals working as farmers or veterinarians. Other than work and pet animals, humans depend on animals for food and animals that are consumed for food register differently in American minds. For many people, food comes from the grocery and these individuals honestly cannot make the mental connection between chickens on the farm and thighs or drumsticks in the Supermarket. The answers to this question of what animal people think of illustrates two important things. First, the people are not as conscious that what they are eating is actually an animal, a thread that will be picked up in the final chapter. Second, the general population of Americans has become so urban that they are rarely, if ever, exposed to non-pet animals outside of zoos, television or books. (Responsive Management/NSSF, 2008) People relate better to pets that are positive contributions to their daily life than animals that will be eaten or the reality that some animals exist outside of the home and the zoo.

This change in the relationship between humans and animals has resulted in a change in people's ideas of how animals should be treated. Now that animals are most commonly pets instead of purely tools for life, as a horse or mule in the frontier West, society has become

concerned with and recognized widespread failures in animal treatment in America. People see their pets having what could be best interpreted as emotions and feelings of pain much like humans, and became concerned with practices that did not respect such feelings. Formal legislation articulating guidelines for animal welfare and appropriate treatment began in the mid 1960's with the passing of the Animal Welfare Act, continuing awareness with the publication of *Animal Liberation* ten years later and has grown steadily since. From cosmetic laboratories to agriculture practices, Americans have largely rebelled against formerly commonplace practices like testing mascara on rabbits or confining sows to tiny stalls for the vast majority of their reproductive lives. Free range meat, organic or natural eggs and cosmetics that are never tested on any animals have created a billion dollar industry that has only grown as awareness of animal welfare issues spreads. (Dimitri and Greene, 2002)

Combining a largely urban population that is less active with less land access and a society that is aware of animal mistreatment and increasingly focused on practices that will respect animal life make it easy to see why hunting has fallen out of favor. But, some are still hunting, or trying to. In some more rural locales, proposals are moving through the state legislature to lower legal hunting ages and even to teach hunting in schools. Even if the hunters can reconcile the incongruity between hunting practices and current societal ideals, there are more problems facing the hunter. To formalize these problems, I will turn to contemporary animal rights theorists.

In the last 35 years, three scholars have paradigmatically articulated different aspects of this shifting societal interest and relation to animals. (Regan, 1983; Rollin, 1981; Singer, 2002) Over this time, discussion of animal pain and suffering has changed from a practical impossibility, because animals are only machines, to a reality, that pain experience spreads logically through the phylogenetic tree with lines of inclusion or exclusion being debated.

Animals have been liberated from much human oppression/exploitation, their suffering considered to be equal to humans when measuring moral judgments at least some times, and more than they once were. Perhaps more related to the discussion of hunting is the conception that animals are subjects of a life, anything that disrupts or cuts short that life, anything that treats that life as a mere means, disrespects that animal life and is therefore immoral. (Regan, 1983) Some argue, perhaps, that we ought to completely eliminate pain and suffering and animal killing, effectively converting the world to vegetarians or vegans. The scholarship of two of the authors mentioned above has undoubtedly accomplished just that on some comparatively insignificant scale. Unfortunately, such a conversion would be nearly impossible for the hunter. If we cannot kill or risk inflicting any extra pain or suffering to animals, any hunting practices must be thrown out. Such practices would be utterly incompatible with the view that animal life is on an equal ethical footing as humans or that individual animals have the right to have their pain and suffering minimized or eliminated.

A third scholar has recognized if most Americans will not give up meat to save their own life and suffering because of the mandates of medical professionals, they are not likely to give up meat purely for moral or ethical reasons. Dr. Bernard Rollin does not advocate stopping the use of animal life completely, but instead has gradually reminded people to listen to their own common sense regarding animals and animal lives, manifesting in a recent, steady change in the societal ethic. (Rollin, 1981) Using animals in a way that recognizes and minimizes the pain and suffering that human use inflicts on them seems more practical in a culture that relies on animals for things from food to companionship to entertainment. This is also essentially the ethic that is at the root of the free range/husbandry based agriculture movement that is spreading quickly through America and other parts of the world. In this account, animals feel pain, animals are alive and animals have interests related to being alive. Any given animal is suited to live a



certain life based on that animals nature individual telos, the “dogness” of a dog say, not just what biologically classifies that individual as a dog, but the life dogs are suited to live without outside (human) intervention or constraints (Taylor, 1986). Human practices that fail to acknowledge or foster this telos realization of an animal, like confining sows in crates or castration without anesthesia, are eliminated to improve the quality of animal life. Humans make choices to avoid the alternate, ethically unjustifiable action that prevents the animal from pursuing species-specific goals. When the animals are killed, the same theme of minimizing pain, suffering and telos frustration is upheld. Such an argument, if broadened and deepened, may ethically license the use of animal life in the hunt. If a defense of hunting is successful, I will argue it must rely on a foundation that is thematically similar to this concept of conscious, thoughtful animal use in a way that eliminates unnecessary pain and suffering while embracing animal telos. This argument, an attempted ethical justification of the hunt, will be elaborated later and is the purpose of this project.

Moving forward, and at the risk of a false analogy, I will consider the discussion of the problems with hunting by contrasting it with two other modern arenas of consuming animal life, the standard animal/animal predation in the wild and those animal deaths at the hands of professionals in both industrial agriculture and Veterinary Medicine. Such death, in either arena, is not actively protested, and at the risk of using loaded words, is often dismissed as “natural” in the case of animal/animal predation as animal death releases energy back into the ecosystem to be used by other individuals. (Evans, 2005) For livestock or pet animals, the professional killing is called “necessary” when an animal has matured enough to be slaughtered and eaten or to end the life of a pet that is old and suffering or no longer wanted. Defining and clarifying the difference between hunting and both animal/animal predation and professional killing will show how hunting is different and how these differences impact societal acceptance of such practices.

I will begin by comparing hunting to the killing found in industrial agriculture and Veterinary medicine.

Across the globe, domestic animals are killed in high volume in most industrialized nations at rates of hundreds of thousands an hour to support growing, meat eating populations. Each year at Thanksgiving, more than 45 million turkeys are killed to load our tables. Another six billion broiler chickens are bred, raised and killed in the United States alone over the entire year. These are the types of chicken that may have never seen the light of day during the course of their genetically streamlined, accelerated life moving from the egg to the dinner table as fast as scientifically possible. This does not include the estimated one billion animals slaughtered worldwide for leather last year. These animals are killed for humans, yet this sort of killing, that is domestic species in agriculture, has until recently, met widespread acceptance and is at least tolerated by the average citizen judging by the number of leather shoes, boots and belts I still see around town.

In *Wild Killing: Contesting the Animal in Hunting*, Garry Marvin makes an important distinction between domestic killing, or what I have called professional killing previously, and wild killing, in hopes of better describing hunting. Marvin begins by defining domestic killing, the killing that encompasses all animals whose lives are closely connected to humans. Farming provides a large group of such animals, cows, chickens, sheep, and goats, that are bred, raised and killed all for human benefit. This group whose lives may end by domestic killing also includes pet animals, like dogs, cats, birds, gerbils and fish, again kept purely for human interests and because of the way they “improve” human life. Marvin notes two important aspects of the relationship of these animals to the human beings whose lives they better and then measures these deaths against the wild killing found in hunting.

Initially, the animal is brought out of nature into civilization, a geographic shift for the animal, before it spends life as an ornament for human life. Over thousands of years, dogs have been domesticated from the free ranging wolf into the exceedingly tame Golden Retriever. Cattle have been genetically selected to be gentler, tolerant of confinement and more suited to constant milking moving from the free range to the milk house with tagged ears. Although some of these animals live wilder or more natural lives than others, the Hereford that is still on the range in Montana compared to the Budgie in New York for instance, all of these animals have been intentionally changed for the sake of human use. During their lives, these animals are geographically and emotionally close to the humans, integrated into the daily life of their caregivers and removed from their original, individual place of birth.

In the second stage of Marvin's description of killing, the animals are again moved when they “need” to be killed. With food animals, the animal must be slaughtered and butchered at a time of human choosing when adequate growth or maturation of the individual animal has occurred. With pets, the timing of death is chosen by the human when either the owners no longer care for the animal or seek to end the apparent suffering of old age or injury. Regardless of classification as food or pet, the animals again go through a pair of important changes. The animal undergoes another geographic shift, from the place the animal has lived with its human or humans, to a place animals are taken expressly for killing. The pets often go to the veterinary clinic while the food animals are taken to the slaughterhouse, which perhaps only differ in title and location? More recently, Veterinarians have started offering in home euthanasia to minimize travel stress and strain on ailing pets and owners.

When the animals reach this final destination, or in the case of some pet animals, when this stage is reached, the animal remains at home with his or her human waiting for the arrival of the killer and the second change occurs. Now, someone who is emotionally unattached to the

animal kills it. Killing animals is considered to be that individuals' job, and such killing is acceptable to the community or at least widely tolerated by those who are not vegan or vegetarian. Either the veterinarian or the appointed executioner at the slaughterhouse kills the animal quickly and mechanically without any intentional emotion or connection to the individual animal. Although the workers try to be mechanical and detached from death, many veterinarians shed a tear when euthanizing animals perhaps showing some emotional connection is unavoidable for some humans. In death, the animal is now emotionally disconnected from the human and geographically displaced both from nature and from where it lived. These conditions contrast sharply with what Marvin calls "wild killing".

In his account of wild killing, Marvin defines another classification of animals which does not include domestic food animals or pets. Instead, the animals considered here could be collected loosely under the title "game species". That is, elk, deer, moose, wild sheep, antelope, assorted fowl, and such pest species like the prairie dog in the West, all those animals that can be legally hunted or killed without prosecution. Wild killing embodies the opposite of domestic killing in two important respects.

First, the human, not the animal, undergoes a geographical relocation. Rather than bringing the animal into the human world as in domestic killing, the human gathers his weapons and ventures in to nature to pursue the animal. The human, and not the animal, is out of his normal place of life and has moved into a different arena. Second, rather than the killer emotionally distancing himself from the animal, the human intentionally takes on the roll of the killer and undertakes a heightened emotional state, trying to become like the animal, sneaking through the woods, hiding in the brush and disguising himself to facilitate proximity and ease of kill. Some hunters profess a spiritual connection to their prey, an emotional unity from the process of the hunt. Rather than the human giving the killing duties to someone else, the point of

wild killing is for the human to kill the animal primarily for personal enjoyment and because of personal choices. In contrast, domestic killing relies on someone emotionally separate to do the killing in an emotionally neutral, mechanical way at a location specifically for killing.

Following Marvin's classifications, hunting is separated from domestic killing because of the intentional emotional connection instead of emotional distance and geographic shift of the human instead of the animal. The intention to kill found in hunting, and emotional involvement of moral agents who are actively choosing to kill in the hunt, paints a less than attractive picture of the hunter. How can society trust and live with some of the only intentional killers who are not incarcerated? Hunting though is not exactly like the professional killing found in the domestic arena, so we must next consider the other standard of animal killing, that of animal/animal predation, to see if hunting can find a solid ally in that process. If not, we will find hunting ethically unjustified because of how it differs completely from other forms of animal life consumption.

When a hawk nabs a rabbit, the casual observer sees the death as a simple part of the circle of life. The hawk needs to eat, without rabbits or similar prey, the hawks would starve to death. Without hawks, rabbit populations would run amuck, over consume browse and lead to rabbit starvation. (Quammen, 2003) When a human hunter kills and eats some animal, assuming the hunter has observed all the relevant legal constraints, the killing draws disapproving glares when discussed in mixed company. If all living things must die, how does death at the hands, or more appropriately fangs, of a predator relevantly differ from the death inflicted by the hands of a hunter? Clarifying this distinction will show what exactly hunting is and where to begin an ethically sound defense of hunting. Imagine two mule deer running through an alpine meadow, far away from civilization and free of human interaction. The first is killed naturally, wildly, by a hungry wolf or dies in old age because of starvation. The second is

killed by a hunter with a bullet from a high-powered rifle. How or why is hunting protested while wolves walk comparatively free?

The first difference between the hunter and the predator is the presence of morality or ethics when humans are involved in the killing things. People believe the hunter could have done otherwise, shopped at the grocery store for meat, while the animal predator is doing exactly what he is suited to do naturally as an important part of the process of nature. (List, 2004) The wolf chooses only between the first deer or hopes of another deer that. If the wolf does not try to chase a deer, or worse yet chooses to chase and fails, the wolf is risking his life, with either futile energy expenditure or an exhausted, empty stomach. Without a deer carcass, or some other prey animal, the wolf will not eat and will not live. The predator/prey relationship is often defined biologically, certain animals have evolutionary advantages making them better at killing certain prey at certain times while some prey, like hares, change color depending on season to avoid predators in their area. While the predators are ending the lives of other animals, the predators are not disrespecting the prey animal because the predator is risking his life and the dead animal is used completely by the predator for survival. (Shepard, 1996) The dead animal is not killed for fun, but for survival in a way that is consistent with the nature of things. There is no verifiable rationality or moral agency in animals, while there is some moral agency assigned to humans. Although the act of predation may appear violent or vicious, the predator should be seen only as doing what needs to be done for survival, done without alternatives and done without moral judgment by observers of the action.(Regan, 1983. Singer, 2002)

Hunters, on the other hand, can and do choose other food sources. If the hunter misses shots, or does not find an animal worth shooting at in terms of size, sex or legality, the hunter has wasted time and perhaps money. Most hunters will return home to find a stocked refrigerator or options that do not involve personally killing animals during a hunt. The hunter is choosing how

and when an animal is killed in the face of the option of eating something else that does not directly cause a loss of animal life like a bagel, cheese or domestically raised and killed beef or chicken. Over the course of the hunt, hunters can and do inflict a death that is less natural and respectful of the prey than starvation or animal predator consumption or at least different. This may happen when animals are wounded and then die slowly and painfully either being found by the hunter or consumed by carrion animals or continue living with limited mobility or constant pain before dying. In some cases, the hunters choose to take only the trophy part of the chosen prey animal, removing antlers or horns for taxidermy as a memento of the hunt leaving part or all of the rest of the animal in the field to return to the earth. Although other animals may benefit from the carcass left in the field after it is stripped of horns or other parts, and it is perhaps more "natural" for the animal to be eaten by other carrion animals, such incomplete human consumption is not respectful to the killed animal. In cases like this, the animal is being treated as a mere means, and are inconsistent with the animal/animal predation complete use of the carcass. Any time the hunter does not remove and consume the animal, he is not doing what a natural predator would do and cannot justify his role as being like animal predators.

The second difference between the animal predators and hunters is the death itself, which has the potential to be better for the prey when done by a hunter instead of a predator in two ways. First, effective kill range. An animal predator has to directly touch the prey for the prey to be killed. This means the prey sees the predator, and over time will create some sense of proximity versus threat and decide if upon seeing or smelling a predator 500 yards away the proper response is stay still or run. A wolf approaching at 200 yards is worth paying attention to, but perhaps not worth running away from. If the wolf is closing to 100 yards, traveling in a pack and increasing speed of approach, the prey will have heightened awareness and will be

considering flight. This triggers stress responses in the prey which, when the threshold is exceeded, will lead the animal to run away.

On the other hand, a hunter with a scoped rifle in an elevated tree stand may never actually be noticed by the prey before the bullet is fired. Such a hunter has an effective kill range of at least 200 yards, sometimes much more, depending on cover and visibility limitations. The stress and fight or flight response may never be triggered as the prey may not be aware of the threat. In this way, the animal is exposed to less stress before death, assuming the bullet hits its mark and a clean kill is made immediately compared to being eaten alive or starving. In this way, the prey animal is exposed to less pain and stress when killed by a skilled hunter compared to death at the fangs of an animal predator. In the wild, animals die in two ways, either by being killed by a predator or by starving to death because of old age, physical malady or limited resources. Any of these deaths are as close to the epitome of torturous and painful as I can consider without more elaborate thought. In the case of starvation, the magnitude of pain may be less than being eaten alive, but the duration of suffering may be longer, days and weeks instead of minutes. A skilled hunter will kill an animal in 22 seconds with a bullet from shot fired to last breath compared to approximately 30 seconds with a properly placed arrow causing the animal to catastrophically lose blood pressure and bleed out. (Swan, 1994) If we consider these shots being fired under the best possible circumstances, the animal killed in the hunt would not face any other stress in his death as the hunter would be completely hidden and undetected before the killing shot was fired. Regardless of exact cause of wild death, the prey animals face more pain and suffering in wild death than at the hands of skilled hunters. Rolston argues for hunting to follow the ethic recognizing this inequality of pain and stress between animal predation and human hunting, "the strong ethical rule is this: do not cause inordinate suffering, beyond those orders of nature from which the animal were taken". (Rolston, 1988) A skilled, practiced and



patient hunter follows this rule with his kills, the problem is not all hunters are proficient at all times and not all hunts end with a well-placed bullet or arrow causing a quick death.

When bullets miss the mark or the hunter is detected, the advantages hunting holds over wild death are quickly erased. Instead of less pain and stress, the prey animal may face even more pain than being eaten alive or starving. The deer or elk that was eaten alive for minutes or hours, or who starves for days before being dead, may be wounded, wandering for days or weeks before ultimately starving or being eaten alive. Some of these animals will recover, being tortured by their wound before healing enough to escape predation and survive to live a relatively normal life as it seems at least one arrowed deer or goose does in the newspaper every season. Other animals will not be dealt an immediately fatal blow, leaving them lame and unable to move or eat, an easy target for predation giving them the extra stress of being wounded in the hunt before being eaten alive by an animal predator. Such a death may be even more painful and stressful both because of total duration and because of cause. If the animal never senses the hunters' presence, they will know only intense pain of unknown cause and completely unfamiliar nature. When the hunt is not perfect, as described above, the hunter eliminates the advantage hunting may have over wild killing.

A third difference between animal predator killing and hunting is the type of animal killed. Animal predation is often modeled as selective. Those individuals who are not fit enough to escape predators or who are not able to battle for finite resources, do not survive because they are weaker. This is supposed to strengthen the species gene pool by culling the old, slow and weak meaning those animals who remain are fighting tougher opponents for finite resources and becoming stronger in the process. Ideally, this makes reproductive competition tighter resulting in the genes from the individuals most suited to survival being passed on. Over time, a species evolves in response to these stressors, like wolves or change in available forage, making the

species more adapted to the common challenges in a given environment. Some studies have shown that although this selection is often the case, predators choosing those individuals that are easiest to kill, it is not always true and animal predators may attack and kill otherwise healthy animals. (Vitali, 1990) Human hunting on the other hand, is at best, opportune, and at worst, selective in a way that is actually destructive to the prey species. (Geist, 2000) Rather than taking out the oldest, slowest, weakest or youngest, hunting, by rule or individual discretion, targets the strong, usually middle-aged male, of a species. This is because of increased body mass making the individual desirable as being “trophy size” or exploiting their sexual dimorphic traits like horns and antlers. The males of some species with desirable traits have to be roughly middle-aged, depending on the species, and in good health to grow trophy quality antlers or large, strong bodies. Such targets would be in their reproductive prime, in a position to positively contribute to the next generation of the species genetically so their death takes an individual and a collection of DNA from the future. When the targets are not selected for strength and size, the targets are taken because of opportunity. That is to say the hunter picks them because the animal was walking past a given hunter during legal hunting hours. This too is contrary to traditional evolutionary selection, in part, because although the individual may be slow, old or weak by chance, it may also be strong, young and fertile or may be potentially bigger, stronger and better in a few more seasons. Animals that end up in the wrong place at the wrong time may sometimes have traits making them consistent with animal predation, other times consistent with being desirable for size and strength and opposed to the selection criteria of animal predators. Perhaps the biologist responds that this too is a sort of selection as those not in that given place at that given time will survive, but it is hard to see chance as actively benefiting a species in the long term.

A final difference between human hunting and animal predation is the problem of fair chase. This has two facets that strike a final blow at how hunters and wild predators are relevantly different while articulating an important problem in formulating a defense of hunting, exactly what is fair when the lives of beings worthy of moral concern are at stake. When the animal predators pursue the prey, both animals are assumed to be on equal footing. Both are animals, both are in the wilderness, both have lived in the wilderness for their respective life times. There is a chance the predator will fail and although not always an equal chance, there is some chance the prey will escape. An eagle is not punished for exceptional flying abilities, the wolf for speed or cunning. They are just two animals fighting for life with a given fish or a given elk fawn. In this way, wild predator/prey relations are the benchmark of fair chase so that on a given day between two individual animals, a casual observer would not know with certainty which one would survive. Although some have argued "predation itself, the intrinsic evil in nature's design... is the hardest of all things to fathom" because of apparent violence and destruction of the process, the animals involved appear to have a chance to live or die with no predetermined winner. (Scully, 2002)

For hunting, this is not the case. Hunters begin the hunt ahead of their prey. Hunters have synthetic fabrics to fight off weather, high-powered weapons designed to send projectiles farther and faster, and ATV's, horses or trucks to get them farther into the wilderness combating any limitation of the plain, empty-handed human. They also have the luxury of language and rationality to communicate with other hunters and non-hunters to create strategies based on the species being hunted, the time of year and the location of the hunt. Add in optical scopes, laser rangefinders and years of species behavior documented by previous hunters or digital recordings on trail cameras of daily migration habits and the playing field is hardly level. Hunters have so much technology at their disposal that much, but not all, of the chance for failure can be

removed. This is why fair chase rules have been formally added to hunting practices erasing some of the advantage human hunters have over their prey. Hunters are required to give up some, but not all, of these advantages in hopes of leveling the playing field between the prey and the hunter. In this way, the human hunter has to follow rules and limit himself, making himself more like the animals he is hunting. This very facts reinforces how human hunting is unlike animal/animal predation.

These fair chase rules are satisfied in several ways. First, formally by regulations that set hunting hours, seasons and locations. Some upland birds cannot be legally hunted before a certain hour because all of the birds will be along the gravel roadsides picking pebbles so a hunter could just walk a road way and shoot the birds on the ground, hardly a sporting hunt. Some deer cannot be hunted with a rifle during the rut to avoid disrupting the deer's reproductive cycle. Second, hunters choose to make the hunt fairer, by surrendering some advantage by using less advanced weapons that require more practice and skill to successfully fire accurately. Choosing a handgun instead of a rifle, a compound or recurve bow instead of a firearm of any kind or blackpowder instead of centerfire weapons are all options for hunters depending on state of residence, species and season. Each of these choices increases the skill required by the hunter by decreasing the killing range of the weapon. This is supposed to make the hunt more fair for the prey by introducing a greater likelihood for failure of the hunter and decreasing his killing abilities.

It is not entirely surprising that predators do not have legal predating hours, fair chase rules or a choice of weaponry. Instead, it is the fact that humans have these rules and the argument that hunting ought to be fair that we should pay attention to. Perhaps the very existence of the Fair Chase doctrine shows hunters realize the immorality of the hunt and are forced to take steps to pacify some of their concern for morality without completely giving up

the hunt. (Luke, 1997) The hunters are still going to the field to kill, but they are now doing so under the guise of fairness by following the doctrine of Fair Chase. It is not a sure thing that animals will die when hunters are seeking them in the hunt, but it is perhaps safely less sure because of the concept of fair chase. Hunters want to kill, but most hunters do not want returning home with blood on their hands to be absolutely guaranteed because that would make them merely slaughterhouse workers wearing blaze orange or camouflage. Hunting with guaranteed success, the paradigm case is canned hunts and will be covered in depth later, is not what most hunters are heading to the woods for. Instead, hunters want the chance to kill a wild animal, the more effort required, the better the hunt and the more satisfied the hunter. With this, we must move forward with a more formal definition of what hunting is for Americans in 2013.

Up to this point, we have considered a shifting social ethic as an extension of an evolution of American culture away from the outdoors to a time of quick, indoor convenience. We have considered the recent recognition of animal pain, something like animal consciousness and the scholarship that has articulated the new societal conception of such considerations. I have compared animal death in hunting to animal death in the wild, seeing the hunters make a conscious choice to head to the field to kill in ways that give up some, but not all, of the human advantages. This makes the hunt just the right amount of uncomfortable and uncertain which leaves us with the idea that hunting is somewhat constrained killing done selectively and electively by those who could kill and eat other animals more cheaply and easily. The chance for failure, introduced by formal fair chase rules, or selective hunting practices, combined with a dynamic environment means not all bullets or arrows are placed perfectly and not all animals are killed cleanly if they are killed at all.

This examination makes hunting look like so much intentional, recreational killing and often coincidental animal cruelty. While hunters claim an almost religious connection to the

animal hunted, to hunting as a craft and to the land where the hunting takes place, this statement seems to clash with the fact that a successful hunt means that animal that the hunter was so intimately connected to is now dead, and dead because the hunter wanted it to be in that place at that time. Additionally, the hunting land, formerly lauded for peace, sanctity and location for spiritual renewal, has been shattered by gunshots or painted with the red blood of death. This clash is better embodied in the title of “blood sport”, often bestowed proudly on hunting by hunters and non-hunters alike. As the only arena outside of animal slaughter in agriculture and euthanasia in Veterinary Medicine, where killing beings worthy of moral concern is licensed, hunters must balance the instrumental value of the enjoyment of the hunt for the hunter with the loss of life for the animal. These are hard pans to balance. With a discussion of balance, we invoke a measure of utility but this is only part of the justification for hunting. As I will show below, hunting is more than replacing each component piece of the hunt with an act of identical utility. There is also some measure of both duty and virtue, which will be defined and elaborated in the next chapter. I believe this discussion is beginning of a foundation for such a balance and ethical justification of hunting.

To show what hunting is, we have seen above what it is not. The skirmishes with anti-hunters about why one should or should not hunt begin with a question about replacing components of the hunt with activities of apparently comparable utility in hopes of eliminating the loss of life at the end of the hunt. Dr. Bernard E. Rollin offers a more tangible thought experiment to his students at Colorado State University that is worth mentioning. As a land grant agriculture school, the CSU campus offers a collection of hunting experience rivaled only by a Ducks Unlimited regional meeting or the University of Montana. Rollin begins, asking simply, “Why do you hunt?” The students reply with some preference for spending time outdoors with friends or family. Rollin responds, “Why not hike?” Surely hiking is a productive

outdoor pursuit fostering some sort of camaraderie in a similar way to hunting. The students reply that hiking is not hunting; there is more to hunting than that. They want to be outdoors with a focus on seeing animals. Rollin responds, "Why not take some binoculars, so seeing the animals is easier?" The students reply that binoculars will not help them see the animals the way they want to, there is more to hunting than seeing animals. They want to have some sort of souvenir from the hunt. Rollin responds, "Why not take a camera instead of binoculars so you can take a picture and prove you saw the animals?" The students reply that the picture alone is inadequate; there is more to hunting than the memento of the successful hunt. They want to prove their skills at both seeing and approaching the animal. Rollin responds, "Why not put crosshairs on the camera to prove proximity, proficiency of aim as well as creating a memento from the hunt?" At this point, the story takes a turn that disturbs some. The students respond that this would still not be hunting, there is more than being in nature with friends, seeing animals, getting close to the animals and having some sort of proof of the successful "hunt". Some of the students emphasize it is the kill, or the desire and intention to kill, that makes the hunt. Releasing the shutter of the camera with crosshairs fails to mimic hunting in a single, relevant respect, there is no animal death. Despite a steady stream of replacement activities, the hunters meet this query, semester after semester, with a desire to kill a wild animal as the defining characteristic of the hunt.

This thought experiment verifies many simple assumptions about hunting that are not entirely surprising. Hunting is the premeditated killing of some animal which is sometimes the only measure of a successful hunt. Ann Causey asserts "the one element that stands out as truly essential to the authentic hunting experience is the kill" otherwise one only attempted to hunt. (Causey, 1989) When the hunter comes home without his quarry, we still say the individual who went out into nature with a weapon and a purpose was hunting but such a hunt was incomplete.

Perhaps he failed in this particular hunt, but he did not fail to be a hunter. Such a trip is not classified as armed hiking when the hunter does not kill an animal. Based on the previous thought experiment and this addition, we see hunting contains either the successful kill, or an intention to kill some wild animal. The hunter does not just kill some animal, he kills a wild animal, not some tame or domesticated one. (King, 1991) It is only when the hunters do not bring home an animal that the above replacement activities are considered satisfying, that they somehow justify the investment of time and energy, inserting value in the searching for an animal. (Ortega y Gasset, 1972) Many hunters return home empty-handed but revel in the beauty of the sunrise, the prevalence of non-game species or the depth of conversation shared with companions. My last elk hunt yielded no dead elk but one of my favorite weeks with my father to this point in my life. Careful examination of the process shows that hunting is more than killing, more than the intention or desire to kill animals. It is the desire to kill combined with an enjoyment of such killing and doing so for fun that makes a human a hunter and an animal a predator. This realization is, and should be, disturbing and presents the biggest problem for hunting in 2013. How can hunters convince the public to move past the idea that hunting killing for fun, with conscious choice, as a past time when hunting is viewed by some as "the perfect type of that pure evil for which metaphysicians have sometimes sought" instead of an innocent hobby that should be allowed? (Krutch, 1957) The answer to this question is what will give hunting a firm and lasting ethical foundation as part of modern life and future cultural practice in America. Many responses are offered formally and subtly by the hunting community but a close inspection finds most of these explanations to be rooted in half-truths and outright lies that collapse under even cursory examinations. I will argue, that parts of some of these explanations, when combined with the practices and ideals of a small portion of the current hunting community, as well as some new ideas, can and do deserve public acceptance because of



their ethical foundation. This leaves us to move forward with how hunters try to solve the problems of hunting in modern America, both in public perception and reality, and why most of these solutions fail.

## **Chapter 2**

After articulating the moral and ethical problems with hunting which may be causing declining involvement, I would like to consider the standard reactions to and justifications of the hunt that aim to resolve, or attempt to offset, these previously outlined problems. Hunters begin by accounting for the motivation for the hunt before arguing about the benefits the hunt. These responses will be divided into two main groups, utilitarian and deontological. Further separations exist in those groups and will be explained and elaborated as they arrive.

A key preliminary thought must be kept in mind-- hunters and hunting are evolving, regressing and dynamically responding to each species and each season, each year, every year. As such, any given hunter can progress through different stages offering any, or all of the following justifications either choosing fractional bits of what I have articulated or offering a given response in its entirety. At the end of this section, I will have shown that all of these justifications individually fall short of providing an adequate moral justification of hunting given the social constructs within which hunters are forced to operate. More clearly, animal death, particularly that which is potentially or exceptionally painful, is not consistent with the societal consensus ethic for animals of Americans in 2013 as it treats animals as mere means, not ends in themselves.

In the end, just as a complete critique of hunting will consider more than just the dead animal, a successful defense of hunting will not rely only on a utilitarian justification, seeing the dead animal as only a dead animal. A successful defense of hunting will also require more than deontology, more than considering the way the animal was killed but also the why, when and how. Hunting takes animal lives, which I contend is a harm to the animal as things can be better or worse for the animal with respect to its life regardless of the animal having any concept of life, better or worse. I will again assume for living things, living is better than not living so

dying is bad and should be considered harmful. Then dying, or being killed, in a painful, unexpected or unnecessary way is worse than dying quickly or at the end of a long, happy life. So, losing life at the end of the hunt is bad for the individual animal, the worst possible end of life, and must be justified as something more than killing for human amusement. Hunting takes something valuable, life, away from the animals in an unjustified way. (Regan, 1983; Taylor, 1996) In order to justify the hunt, we must consider how animal life is taken, why the animal life is taken and what is done with the animal after the hunt, which will require reference to spoken and unspoken values of modern society. In what follows, I will show what can be justified in an era of internet, obesity, and smartphones along with what is terminally inconsistent with such values, we must examine how hunters try and fail to justify the hunt in 2013.

To begin, consider three divisions that hunters make to distinguish themselves from each other. Most often, these lines are drawn to separate “us” from “them”, each camp arguing that their own justification is both significantly different from the others and that their justification is, more importantly, better. These justifications focus on the use of the end result of a successful hunt, what is done with the animal once it is dead, how it is used and who benefits from that use. The other important consideration is the professed motivation for the hunt, why the hunter chooses to hunt viewed through his particular social/cultural context. This motivation and articulated justification will be important instrumentally for constructing an acceptable justification for the hunt, which is willful, mindful killing. In each of the three camps that follow, the reason for pursuing game, along with the use of the game when it is killed are different. They also offer three different acceptable means to kill the animal. For the purpose of this examination, the lines between groups will be drawn sharply. In practice, these lines and groups contained by them may overlap on certain issues or vary year to year, species to species,

hunter to hunter even within a hunting party as two hunters in the same woods hunting the same species may have completely different motivations minute by minute or season by season.

(Kellert, 1976)

First is the subsistence hunter. These hunters take to the field in search of animals to literally put meat on the table or to fill the cooking pot.(List, 2004) Hunting is justified as a purely utilitarian pursuit, a successful hunt means the person or family will eat. A failed hunt means either no meat, or they will have to get meat from some other source. These hunters claim to be on the most stable moral and ethical foundation as they are using as much of the animal as possible for survival while claiming no enjoyment of the hunt beyond a full freezer. They kill because they must and gain nothing but meat from the hunt. Often this type of hunter is likened to the Native Americans who claimed both a spiritual connection to the animals killed along with a complete use of the animal carcass which is argued to reflect the ultimate respect for the animal's life. (Shepard 1973, Littlebird 2001). This use of the animal is an important paradigm to apply to the rest of these justifications. Complete, thoughtful use of the dead animal is the final standard of a justified hunt, an ethically justified hunt uses as much of the animal as possible, avoiding/eliminating waste. Later, this will be used to argue against many justifications of the hunt as they involving partial use of the animal carcass, or use of the animal only as a target.

The first shortfall of this justification is that if the hunter is concerned with filling a pot, or literally putting meat on the table, his only concern is a dead animal by any means necessary. It would not matter exactly how that animal was killed, quickly and painlessly, painfully or whether within the limits of the law or not, only that it is dead and the hunter will eat. Many a deer, elk, rabbit or pronghorn has lost its life outside of legal season under the guise of pure

hunger and being in the wrong place at the wrong time. This hunt has the potential to expose the animal to more stress and suffering during the hunt because the hunter may be required, out of desperation/immediate need, to take non-fatal shots in hopes of slowing the animal for capture or a fatal shot later. The only concern for this hunter is the end, the dead animal. Any necessary means can and will be used to secure dead animal including poaching, after hours hunting, baiting and other practices inconsistent with the rules of fair chase and formal law. Such killing is neither fair to the animal, as it may be unnecessarily painful, nor is it fair to other hunters, as it may rely on the unfair advantage of hunting outside of the rules that most observe in terms of season, proximity to structures or other legalities of the hunt. Although the subsistence hunter may start with the purest of intentions, the need to eat meat, the process of killing the animal does not have any safeguards to insure quick, minimally painful animal killing, only a dead animal by whatever means are necessary.

The main problem with subsistence hunting is that in 2013, in America, if it is done legally, it does not actually happen with adequate frequency to be a viable justification for the majority of hunters. Even if a hunter chooses to stay in state, or better yet, he hunts literally out of his back door, with the least possible investment in travel time and resources, processes all of his own meat, owns a single firearm and practices minimally, the price per pound of meat purchased in the grocery store will always be cheaper. Paying for carcass processing puts per pound cost for sausage, steaks and other cuts between one and three dollars, measured from whole carcass weight, not final product weight. This point is exaggerated when the hunter leaves his home state because of increase license costs, increased travel expenses and increased meat transportation costs. If an average whitetail deer weighs 200 pounds when alive, it will yield less than 100 pounds of edible, finished meat. Estimating license cost, \$40, ammunition, \$25, rifle,

\$300, and acquisition of the most basic meat processing equipment, hunting is not a cost effective meat source for most hunters.

For those hunters who have inexpensive weapons, land access close to home and equipment or expertise for carcass processing, this becomes more financially viable and has the chance of being ethically justified through examination of the process and the outcome of the hunt, but it does not guarantee a sound ethical foundation because the certainty of a minimally painful animal death is not part of the calculus of this type of hunting. Unfortunately, the urbanization of America combined with decreased personal land holdings and changing access to public lands for hunting, subsistence hunting with the least possible resource investment/cost is functionally impossible for most. So, these reportedly subsistence hunters are actually, when considering all relevant costs associated with the hunt, hunting for some reason besides survival. There will always be less expensive food sources closer to home that are not the product of a hunt. Hunters continue to choose the hunt, in light of cheaper sources of meat, because there is some other valuable currency exchanged in the course of the hunt. There is some reason, beyond subsistence, that makes them hunt. Although this justification of hunting for survival worked on the Frontier, where true subsistence hunting existed, it no longer stands on such a firm foundation. Subsistence hunting is both impossible and unnecessary in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, in the lower 48 states of America, so it alone cannot be a sufficient moral justification for hunting.

The answer that accounts for part of the "something else" that brings people to the hunt beyond subsistence can be found in a second type of hunter, the sport hunter. This classification of hunters chooses to hunt, or argues he is hunting, purely for fun and sport. Instead of focusing on the use of the animal for sustenance, these hunters instead find value in the experience of the hunt, the process of preparing for the hunt, the actual hunt and then the reflection on the hunting

time. If the opportunity presents itself, these hunters kill an animal, they may consume part of the animal, as meat, as a pelt, as a set of antlers, or all of the particular animal. They may alternately share or donate part of the animal to those in need, as some states allow donation to local food pantries, or to those friends and family who enjoy wild game meat but do not themselves hunt or did not hunt successfully that season. Although these hunters acknowledge the good found in a successful animal harvest, this good is not what drives their desire to hunt. These hunters hunt because they enjoy hunting, not because they need meat. In 2013, this group represents the largest number of hunters. The hunters in this group best illustrate the hunt as the ultimate blood sport as they are participating, primarily, for the fun of killing an animal while also finding value in the process of the hunt. Despite being the largest group in number, only 27% of other hunters approve of this sort of hunting. (MNDNR, 1992)

This group of hunters, hunting for fun or sport, may progress through five stages, outlined in a supplement to Montana's Hunter Education program which may provide insights to the justification of the hunt. First is the shooting stage where the new hunter is chiefly interested in shooting at animals to test his skill. Success of the day is quantified by the amount of shooting done. A hunter in this stage is in the field looking to shoot at or kill something, intended prey or otherwise. Second is the limiting out stage. As it does not always take long to improve shooting ability, this stage is marked by taking as many animals as the law allows, perhaps more. Success is measured by how many animals are brought home. Third is the selective stage. Now that a hunter shoots well and limits out, he has changed his focus to a specific species, location, or season. Success at this stage is measured by the mastery of a challenge, killing a deer with a specific size or shape antler or successfully hunting secretive or uncommon animals. Fourth is the method stage. This stage finds the hunter working on a specific way of hunting the animal,

honing personal skills by hunting with a pistol or bow to increase the skill and challenge involved because of the limitations of the weapon. Success in this stage is measured by regular, successful mastery of a certain method of hunting like bow-hunting during the whitetail rut or hunting bears with blackpowder rifles. Fifth and finally, is the philosopher stage. In this stage, the hunter does not focus on any single benefit or good part of the hunt. He is not focused on prey species, weapon or season. Instead, the hunter enjoys the time outdoors, the nostalgia or familiar return to the same woods or the joy of sharing with a new hunter. Killing is no longer an important part of the hunt for the Philosopher hunter. A successful hunt is one that involves going to the woods and experiencing co-existent goods. It is important to consider this final stage of the sport hunter, hunting because of all the “other” things that the hunter enjoys. Instead of shooting and killing, the Philosopher hunter hunts because he realizes the value in all the other parts of the hunt. This stage is not one found only in older, more experienced hunters and it not necessarily a stage where a hunter will stop. More will be said about the realization and value of the “other” reasons to hunt later. The sport hunter may enjoy all the other parts of the hunt besides killing the animal, but the sport hunter is ultimately going afield with the purpose of killing purely for the sake of killing which cannot be ethically justified.

These sport hunters operate under the assumption that hunting can and should, even must, be fun for the hunter. Society frowns on recreational killing in general, and that done purely for fun, specifically. In fact, sociology has shown cruelty to birds and small animals during a person’s teen and preteen years is a common habit of child molesters, murderers and the criminally insane and may increase the likelihood that an individual will intentionally harm humans and other animals later. (Regan, 1983) As such, allowing sport hunting, which may involve inflicting wanton animal suffering purely for fun, is not consistent with current societal



values and cannot be ethically justified even if the hunter experiences some benefit beyond the dead animal. Sport hunters, in trying to call the hunt a sport, or sporting, fail to grasp the concept of sport. In the sports arena, to be playing a game or participating in a sport, or sporting match, both sides are participating knowingly, intentionally, and with some rules so that both teams have a chance to win, "sport implies two players on an equal playing field". (Fox, 2002) Many scandals have come about from fixed sporting events because the spectators were looking for both sides to have an equal chance, the outcome being in limbo. The animal being hunted in this "blood sport" does not appear to be knowingly participating in this sport, many are not aware there is a human predator in their area until they have been shot and are in process of dying if they are ever aware at all. Further, the rules are not entirely clear to the animals, (perhaps the rules never could be articulated to the animal) and potentially may never be. Most hunters do not tell the deer to run away before pulling the trigger. Finally, excluding the practices of fair chase, which are actively implemented by the hunter, there is very little chance for the animal to win if winning means killing the opponent. This may be the only way to make the game equal in terms of outcome, killing the other is a win, being killed is a loss and no death is somehow a tie. It looks sometimes like hunting is more along the lines of the hunter looking at the animal and saying, "I get to shoot you and you get to be dead," that is the extent of the sport or equality at play. (Williams, 1995) In this way, hunting is not reasonably considered a sport or a game in the way that people hunting for fun would like the public to believe. This paradigm changes slightly when hunting predators, a grizzly bear is more equipped to kill a hunter than a whitetail. Some years grizzly bears, black bears and mountain lions do "win" but these cases are not common and represent only a small percentage of hunts in the US annually which are then regarded as a tragic loss of human life. Still the nature of the hunt requires two different species, man and beast in

this case. (Ortega y Gasset, 1972) If the individuals involved are too similar, this relationship comes closer to cannibalism than hunting, but the advantage one has over the other must not be too great.

The third and final group is the trophy hunter who represents a hybrid of the sport and the subsistence hunter in certain aspects. These hunters choose a quarry because it will provide the hunter with some sort of significant or desirable souvenir of the hunt in the form of a mounted replica of the individual animal killed which captures and records the exceptional nature of the animal. Species are chosen either because of ferocity, like bears or mountain lions, or because of grand manifestations of sexual dimorphism, the large antlers found on deer, elk, moose as well as some sheep and mountain goats. Other trophy species are chosen because of their exotic or limited range, requiring significant travel time and money to reach, like goats, sheep or deer native only to isolated parts of the world. The trophy from the end of the hunt represents dominance of man over beast, the ultimate success, killing a majestic wild animal that embodies virility and power. The trophy also creates a historical artifact of the hunt, representing time, resources or investment by the hunter but is the only reason for the hunt. These trophy hunters may consume some of the animal, beyond the taxidermied mount, but the focus is the skin or antlers for preservation in the form of wall mounted trophies as an artifact to be collected reflected on by the hunter. (Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks) In fact, some trophy hunters kill to provide full body mounts to museums or scientists killing only to create a specimen for display. The animal, as the focus of the hunt, is something to be collected, a notch in the hunter's belt or step on the way to some award or filling the void in a collection. Safari Club International awards both the completion of several species of sheep and goat "grand slams", killing four different species of goat or sheep over a hunters career, and the fastest completion of

such feats. This reward often involves giving hunters financial resources to globe trot in pursuit of their prey. These hunters may complete in a single season what eludes other hunters in an entire career due to time, money and travel constraints or the scarcity of huntable individuals of a species.

On one hand, the trophy hunters often pursue a single animal, "the trophy hunter is a self-disciplined perfectionist, seeking a single animal, the ancient patriarch" instead of needing to kill or consider killing many animals to provide adequate food. (Gates, 1971) This gives the trophy hunter an advantage as fewer animals are killed in the trophy hunt as a "trophy" represents the best possible individual out of a pool of individuals. These trophy hunters are looking for older, more mature individuals of a species who have the desired physical characteristics, which is what makes the dead animal desirable as a trophy instead of merely a carcass. The chosen animal is then killed and preserved for eternity as a reminder of the success of the hunt that day through taxidermy. The trophy hunter, and the observant non-hunter, is left pondering what is more respectful than a permanent statue commemorating the life of an individual. That is certainly more long lasting than the food that crosses the table and nourishes the subsistence hunters. Further, the old, regal animal has a hopefully noble death, being killed because of its great size and apparent strength instead of growing too old and feeble to escape predation or feed itself. The problem is this sort of consumption of animal life, when measured against the benchmark of complete, thoughtful use of the idealized subsistence hunter, is neither. Killing an animal only because it is beautiful and majestic then preserving the beauty and majesty is not consistent with the societal opinion that while hunting for food is acceptable, hunting only for trophies is not. (Duda, et al. 1998) In this way, pure trophy hunting is not compatible with societal values in 2013 and cannot be morally or ethically justified by appeal to current societal

norms because it kills the biggest and best animals for fun using them only, or primarily, as historical trinkets. But I will have to return later to critique this point to avoid reaching a moral conclusion by appeal to a vote. Still, at this point, I will simply observe that it is inherent in our current society to reject killing for non-subsistence, pure personal satisfaction in the form of recreation or trophy alone.

Trophy hunting has the potential to draw the greatest acceptance by other hunters in the form of admiration when a particularly dangerous or beautiful specimen is killed. Assuming the hunter has followed all the relevant rules, and carried out the hunt with focus, dedication and significant physical strife, successfully killing a large bear, well-antlered elk or deer is the zenith of hunting accomplishment. Hunting trophies of these species is often more physically demanding than hunting close to home or only for meat. These hunts usually require trips deeper into the wilderness and rely more on skill to kill a sometimes dangerous animal than just luck of being in a place with prey animals during legal shooting hours. The trophy hunt may also involve securing a guide to offset an individual hunter's lack of skill or familiarity with the area or to provide protection or extra riflemen in the form of Professional Hunters who assist on hunts in Africa. If such services are secured, the hunting is not guaranteed to be successful, but some of the uncertainty is removed by purchasing local experience to increase the likelihood a hunter will encounter a shootable animal. If these hunters cared only about being in the woods and enjoying the scenery, hiring guides who advertise animal size, limited property access and success rates would not be helpful.

The problem remains that although the focus of trophy hunting is different than subsistence and sport hunts, not just killing an animal, but killing a particularly large, beautiful or fierce one, it is still killing for human entertainment, satisfaction and "prestigious evidence" in

the form of a trophy. (Gunn, 2001) Trophy hunting involves the loss of animal life for the sole purpose of human recreation along with something like a masculine/macho measuring stick. It then ignores the majority of the dead animal using only part of the animal in creating a trophy, which is judged unjustifiable by both the hunting and non-hunting public. In some cases, a buffalo or elephant may provide the hunter with a trophy and the local village with food, which makes the hunt look more like a sport hunter, or even a subsistence hunter sharing. This practice will not offset the unjustifiable trophy part of the hunt as the sharing is a coexistent good, not the focus of the killing. If humans are the only animals capable of killing for fun and are justified in so doing only because we have the ability, such a justification alone is incomplete when we attempt to cultivate an ethic of respecting animal life, or acknowledging some human responsibility to minimize human infliction of pain and suffering. If we commit ourselves to an only anthropocentric worldview, discussing ethics and morality related to animal treatment loses any weight it may carry. When human goodness and satisfaction are our only concerns, hurting animals becomes at least irrelevant and at most impossible. In this way, trophy hunting is a more morally offensive than sport hunting, which is just killing for fun. Trophy hunting is nearly thoughtless consumption of animal life outside of the use of some of the dead animal as a souvenir only because of the good it does for one person and exclusive of the bad it may do to the animal involved.

Trophy hunting, the search for and killing of trophy caliber animals, has spawned two even more revolting offshoots. Both have become regionally epidemic and destructive to hunting and to animal life when the hunt transitioned from a way to survive to a leisure pursuit by the wealthy. Trophy hunting worsened when hunters were no longer happy killing for fun and began to seek out more entertainment and competition by killing for record books where

they could quantify how they beat others' hunts. Here I mean to outline and dismiss these two practices as the most reprehensible offshoots of the indefensible practice of trophy hunting. Hunting, per se, involves species living without confinement with some chance for escape and survival. Unfortunately, these hunts are currently common place and lucrative which means eliminating them will involve awareness and an increased responsibility for the hunters.

First are the formal record books that track the largest trophies of each species around the globe. Founded at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, the Boone and Crockett Club was one of the first to record and publish record trophy animal kills but this did not start until more than 50 year after the Club was founded. (Kerasote, 1993) Forty years later, believing the Boone and Crockett record books used a scoring style that favored symmetry, Safari Club International has formulated a different, less severe scoring method opening the record books for more than 700 species worldwide. Although these record books started with the best of intentions, a collected log of the biggest and most perfect specimens of a given species, many modern hunters have lost track of the original intention, collecting and recording specimens for the National Collection of Heads and Horns. Instead of winning the admiration of your neighbor with a prize buck hanging in the garage for skinning and meat processing, these record books prompted global races for trophy collections. Frequent, record kills bring fame and money which in turn drives the hunters in search of more trophies. Being a prominent record book hunter brings sponsorships and awards from hundreds of dollars to tens of thousands, not to mention global acclaim in the trophy hunting sphere which can in turn support more frequent and farther afield hunts for trophies. First there was the “Grand Slam” killing an individual from all four species of Turkey or sheep, then the Double Grand Slam. Soon enough, the Slams required visits to multiple continents. This exploitative animal consumption turned the life of an individual animal into a

checkmark on a grocery list. The individual animals became useful to the hunter inasmuch as the animal was the biggest or best to have been killed at that time. The animal has transitioned from the point of the hunt to a resume entry illustrating the skill, luck or prestige of the hunter who killed it, not the exceptional survival-ability of a particular individual animal as an excellent specimen of a desirable species. Instead of the local impact of showing off a large specimen, the record books allow the results of a hunt to be formally broadcast around the world.

Second, the competition for records has sparked hunters pursuing these trophies and trophy species by whatever means necessary which has sent some trophy hunters on what has been called the "canned hunt". In these hunts, animals are raised on game farms where they are kept in essentially a large zoo enclosure, until a hunter has the time and money to kill them. In the most objectionable operations, the chosen animal is drugged and released into a small enclosure for what amounts to modestly camouflaged slaughter. Other operations grant hunters limited access to the non-native species in a fenced-in ranch where the kill may not be guaranteed, but the animals are fed and watered in such a way that they have been pseudo-domesticated. This makes killing these trophies very much like shooting fish in a barrel as the ranch owners know where and when the animals will be in certain places because of the limited space and the regimented food and water schedule. This has turned many species into line entries on a to-do list, one that is importantly different from the common practice for serious bird watchers. While the bird watchers seek and hope to view exotic and rare species as part of checking off boxes on a life list, the trophy seeking trophy hunter makes a list and selectively kills animals until the list is complete many times over creating taxidermied artifacts of the experience. This important difference between the birder and the trophy hunter makes the quest for a complete list of slaughtered species/individual trophies ethically revolting and completely

ethically unjustifiable. Although a hunter may be chasing a trophy, or the biggest, best example of the species he has chosen, trophy pursuit alone cannot justify the hunt as it is the most selfishly and incompletely consumptive of the animal life. Theodore Roosevelt, decorated hunter and conservation pioneer, took a solid position on trophy hunting before canned hunts became the issue they are today, "any destruction for the sake of making a record, is to be severely reprobated...the rich...who are content to buy what they have not the skill to get by their own exertions-these are...the real enemies of game." (Roosevelt, 1926)

Now that the major conventional motivations of the hunter have been outlined, understood, and dismissed, I will dissect these arguments through a critical, philosophical lens, hoping that exposing the failures of these motivations/justifications will allow a clear discussion of how hunting can and even must- persist in modern times. To this point, I have been examining how the hunters justify or dismiss the hunt to each other, with in the hunting community. Next I will go outside of the hunting community to examine how hunting fails to build an ethical foundation in 2013 by examining how the hunter attempts to justify the hunt to non-hunters, and perhaps to himself.

Looking at the previous failed justifications, we see hunters have tried to distance themselves from each other, showing that some hunters find the practices of others objectionable, even within the hunting paradigm. How can the sport hunter who wants to eat what he shoots claim the trophy hunter is despicable when he would surely shoot and eat a large buck and have it taxidermied given the chance? (List, 2004; Loftin, 1984) Here I intend to broaden the examination to include all hunts resulting in a dead animal, or those that have the intention of creating one. Such justifications, in sum, will employ a utilitarian calculus to justify the animal death. Hunters claim that the benefit gained in a successful hunt, either by the



individual hunter, the community or the species/ecosystem outweighs the bad inflicted by the death of an individual animal. In each case, I will argue what benefit is being experienced and why it is relevantly good. I do not mean to dispute the value of some of the justifications given; surely some of these practices are valuable because of the benefit to everyone, not just the benefits seen by the hunter. With this in mind, I am not prepared to argue that the good found in parts of the hunt have more goodness or benefit than a painful animal death, either actually or possibly. The following justifications are offered to the non-hunting public as a defense of any hunting at all. These justifications do not seek to separate different groups of hunters, only to account for the importance of hunting itself, the value of hunting because of what the process and result of hunting do for hunters and for other human and non-human individuals. This is an important shift as hunters try to rationalize the value of animal death to those who see value in the animal's life, a value hunters report holding also. Inspecting the utilitarian considerations and justifications requires the calculus be done through the transparent lens of the modern, American hunter, a potentially perilous vantage point, but the one under consideration. At first glance, some of the lines drawn here will closely mirror those made initially. I believe it is important to parse out specific claims here with more complete breadth and depth in hopes of leaving no specific justification unconsidered and undisputed. Analyzing the arguments with a logically critical eye will show that these justifications rely on standard arguments from philosophy, and consequently fall victim to many of the same criticisms.

To begin, I will consider all the benefits the hunter personally and directly gains from being a hunter or completing a successful hunt. Earlier we considered five stages of the sport hunter, each of which had tangible benefit to the hunter involved. Sometimes the lines between whom and what is actually benefited by the hunt blur to the point of disappearance. I hope the

separations started here are at worst helpful for organization, and at best complete and foundationally directional for this discourse.

First, hunting is justified because it provides both a motive and an outlet for physical fitness of the hunter involved. The pursuit of species like elk, big horn sheep and mountain goats frequently requires trips to high elevation and physically demanding conditions. Because of the prestige and limited habitat ranges of these species, hunters are also often drawn to the mountains from many states away. This means many low-altitude, middle-aged and overweight white collar desk jockeys shed their wool suits for Gore-Tex and camouflage each Fall. For some, many months or years of practice and training manifests itself in a successful hunt and a remarkable story. For others, the shock of altitude, thin air, harsh conditions and transporting meat off the mountainside leads to heart attacks, injury and death. Closer to home, those who are not frequently active outside of the hunting season are often found dead by friends, family and hunting companions after dragging out an animal carcass or climbing one more ridge proved too challenging. So, hunting is at least potentially good for the hunter providing physical obstacles to test his body when day to day life may not provide such opportunities. If a hunter has become inactive, he may lose the ability to enter the woods and pursue his favorite species which can encourage time walking in the offseason or more aggressive training regiments.

There is no doubt that physical fitness is valuable, particularly at a time with skyrocketing obesity rates and television commercials reminding kids to play outside, but hunting or the chance to hunt alone will not guarantee fitness. In order to be licensed to hunt out of a person's state of residency, a hunter needs at worse only to draw a tag in the lottery, or in some states buy an over the counter license, have a valid Hunter's Safety Card and pay the associated fees. Physical fitness is not measured or even questioned directly. As a result, some

hunters resort to patrolling National Park boundaries near roads to avoid the challenge of horseback or boot powered transportation through the steep mountains and high elevations where animals like elk prefer to live. The hunters do this legally, but with the skeptical eye of those who have prepared for a more rigorous back country hunt or the locals who burn time and energy covering the countryside scouting out where to hunt. Local guides hope and expect their hunters to prepare physically for high dollar hunts out of state, but I have not experienced any administering physical fitness tests upon arrival to camp. Many stores sell blaze orange coats and vests in 5XL that would allow an average person to have a party inside. Believing that hunters filling such clothes are Olympic Athlete sized and physically fit strikes me as mistaken. Regardless, the possibility for improved physical fitness of one hunter is not a guaranteed benefit of hunting and it is not more valuable than the potentially painful death of one animal. Further, all of the fitness benefits can be gained by the hunter without actually killing the animal or even going to the woods, so hunting is not justified only because it may present an outlet for physical fitness.

Hunters argue that the hunt connects them to nature, to a simpler time, to a chance to escape the regimented daily grind of modern life to a life where there is only a person, his life and a chance for causing death. Hunters hunt because it is natural for man to kill animals, it has been happening for five million years. (Causey, 1989) Related to this is the reality that the woods and fields where people hunt are not densely patrolled by wardens, leaving only the hunter himself and other hunters around him to be sure rules are followed and what happens when they are not. This is clearly a feeling of power that is different from a smirk when jaywalking in the middle of town, a simplicity created by life, death and nature in the moment. Only the hunter can decide if it is bright enough to see at first light in the morning, if the bird that

just flushed was an illegal hen instead of a rooster, and if that hen is shot, what should be done with it knowing that killing females of some species is illegal. Further, the hunter is dealing in death, the possessor and distributor of tremendous power over animals. Other than murder or animal slaughter, this is one of the only times when man has the chance to kill an individual of his choosing, in a manner of his choosing at a time of his choosing with only the killer as a witness.

There is surely value in simplicity, in a life more closely connected to the cycles of the season, governed by something other than the forty hour work week or mortgage payments (Magnuson, 1991). This can be seen in the increased breadth and depth of farmer's markets, people keeping chickens in the city and skepticism of widely used agricultural practices like feed for beef cattle or anti-biotic use in pigs. Hunters use hunting as an escape from such normal routines to relax and reflect on what they claim matters, only to return to a work world quite far removed from the life and death simplicity of the primal woods. The hunt and the outcome of the hunt are argued to be simple, and importantly so for the hunter, compared to "regular life" and off the shelf food. The hunter attempts to argue that this connection, this simplicity, found by hunting in the woods away from civilization is good and that it is a greater benefit for a hunter to feel this connection to the ecosystem, the ecology of death, than for an animal to stay alive. (Rolston, 1988) The self-legislation, connection and simplicity found in the field is important and valuable, again showing a feeling of powerless labor in the day to day world that is relieved in the hunt but it is not enough to justify recreationally and painfully taking animal life.

Dissection of this response must be done in layers. First, justifying hunting because it is "natural" for humans to do has been shown to be, at the very least, contentious. In environmental ethics the line between nature, and it's apparent opposite, culture, is not a

substantive distinction. Hundreds of years ago it was natural, or at least common, to rape, pillage and run about as berserkers. People lived in caves and wore animal skins as clothing. In 2013, those practices are neither common, nor accepted by American society. Oddly, hunting now appears to align with these outdated practices as being out of favor with a new, modern social consensus. Accepting hunting only because it is "natural" leads our discussion close to the normative fallacy, that is, what is currently allowed ought to be allowed because we are doing it right now. Others argue that not only is hunting not natural, but neither is eating meat. So although cultural habituation makes these practices common, it does not justify them ethically. (Moriarty and Woods, 1997) In this way, arguing that one can justify hunting because it is what humans are meant to do will not allow animal death for the sake of human connection to some ingrained desires. Humans have given up berserking, running around naked and peeing in bushes, perhaps hunting ought to die a similar fate. An action being natural is not enough to justify recreational animal killing. Culturally it has been natural, or locally common, to hunt, but that is not enough to justify the hunt ethically as it does not use a process that involves consideration of how the animal life is ended and used.

Hunters argue that the hunt serves a valuable social and historic role connecting them to other people in their community and to another time when the skills involved in the hunt were vitally important for survival and success in life. Hunting is then ethically justified because of this connection. They claim hunting allows a craft to be preserved that will be important for current and future generations because hunting is an old practice that requires tremendous skill, and is on the verge of extinction. Causey argues that continuing the hunt connects man to his roots, to the most basic skills that allowed human beings to progress to their current state and is a historically ingrained practice for humans. (Causey, 1989) She values woodsmanship,

marksmanship, camaraderie and a connection with animal death as vital components of human life, skills that need to be passed on to the next generation for the good of all people. If hunting stops, there will be a historical disconnect, a missing piece of the cloth of history. As such, humans need to continue hunting to assure this specific skill does not die out, and along with it, an important outlet for such traits as confidence, independence, self-sufficiency, and others that are vital to complete a successful hunt and useful in life.

Again, there are several tiers to this dissection. First, the social value of the hunt, the connection to community, is unmistakable and valuable. Opening weekend of the rifle deer season was almost a National holiday in rural southern Wisconsin. Similar scenes unfold around elk, mule deer and antelope across the West and East, pheasants and ducks elsewhere in the Midwest. Registration stations are hotbeds for comparing animals, catching up with old friends and making plans for either the rest of the season, or the rest of the fall away from hunting camp. Many hunters use the season to make a pilgrimage home to hunt with old friends and family members on what may be the only chance they have to connect with each other during the year. It was late in my college career that I stopped venturing home for deer hunting with my father and brother because of a mixture of bad judgment, tests, and papers polluting my thoughts and ultimately taking me away from the hunt.

Unfortunately, not all social realms of the hunt are positive. A frequent airtime favorite during the Wisconsin fall sings, "It's the second week of deer camp and all the boys are here, we drink play cards and shoot the bull but we never shoot no deer." Another notes, "I got the great big knife, cause the hunting is my life, it's my chance to drink beer and get away from the wife." The value of fraternizing with likeminded others under the guise of hunting does not, in itself, license the hunt. All of the social benefits listed above, or more simply the connection with other

people that a hunter enjoys because of the hunt, can be found playing cards, unarmed, at home, or a bar without killing animals. Service clubs, bowling leagues and coffee circles can accomplish the same social connection along with improving soft skills like communicating, being organized and working hard, all without bloodshed, so there must be something more in the hunt that the hunter requires. Second, the historical or nostalgic connection to skills that are gradually getting weeded out of society may just be a reflection of current values or an evolution of humans. Nostalgia and community alone are not an adequate justification for killing animals in a potentially painful way when animals are said to be worthy of some moral consideration.

After considering the benefits gained by the individual hunter, I will next examine the apparent benefits for the community gained by allowing the hunt. This will involve considering not only the good of a successful hunt, but the good of allowing hunters the chance for a successful hunt. This more broad reaching benefit, found as benefits to a group instead of an individual, may be more complimentary to the utilitarian measure of good because it includes so many more individuals in its calculus.

A pair of buzzwords in the hunting community currently is conservation and preservation, whether of individuals, species or land. The cover of every Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation *Bugle* proclaims "hunting is conservation." Each year, Ducks Unlimited, Whitetails Unlimited, Pheasants Forever, the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation and many smaller, local entities run and supported by hunters, preserve and rehabilitate thousands of acres of prime habitat through monetary donations and volunteer work which prevent the land from being developed or modify it to better suit the chosen species. Between the direct donations of groups specifically driven by habitat rehabilitation or conservation, hunting specific taxes and licensing fees, hunters generated 1.6 billion dollars for conservation in 2011. (Southwick Associates,

2012) This conserved land benefits the species of interest for the organization, but it also helps many other species directly and indirectly. When a mulcher is taken through a thicket to shred pinion to ease access to forage for local elk herds, other animals eat the newly available forage and may benefit from the re-growth that follows a disruption of the ground level plant cover. Beyond groups actively pursuing habitat preservation, licensing fees also contribute to land acquisition, though not on as large a scale as the actions of these groups. Hunters argue that because they are supporting habitat growth and development for the chosen species, carefully monitoring populations to support reintroduction and population stability, that the loss of a set number of individuals from that species during the hunt is justified. Further, because the species they are helping preserve and secure habitat for benefit non-hunters as well, the hunters are doing a great service to the community as a whole, assuring their selected species, and whatever closely related species are required to keep their chosen species afloat flourish.

The United States is a nation of approximately 2 billion acres. In the last 100 years, hunting groups and hunting related fees have been responsible for the preservation or rehabilitation of, at best, several million acres not under the immediate management and supervision of a governmental agency. (Kerasote, 1993) Hunters are attempting to argue here that they are entitled to turn America into a large scale zoo/game farm, managing it to produce the desired yield of the species hunters prefer with enough of the "other" species to support the chosen species. When the chosen population is managed around a sustainable level, the lack of higher non-human predators requires hunters to kill some of the chosen species. (Geist, 2000) Hunters argue hunting raises money which preserves habitat to support population growth which requires hunting to control animal populations which lack non-human predators to keep them in check with the augmented/modified habitat. Keeping selected animals alive, and keeping the



population of those animals at a set level to facilitate hunting is self-serving for the hunters' interests. The hunters then argue others, those who are not hunting the chosen species, experience the good of their efforts too. Thousands of people can witness one, single goose, but only one person can kill that goose, which may then feed several other people. So, preserving habitat in the interest of maintaining species health cannot justify the hunt because of the way hunters consume the animals, a hunter is the final consumer of the individual animal he has killed, it will not survive to be enjoyed by others. Regardless, preserving some of the species, or land for the species does not license the death of selected individuals. Hunters cannot justify killing some animals only on the grounds that they have preserved others because the individual animal is the subject of a life, losing such life is harmful to the individual and not justified by the other lives saved.

Conservation or preservation has taken a different form in the way hunters are saving animals and attempting to justify the hunt. Species like wolf, black bear and elk have been hunted or predated to the brink of extinction and are being reintroduced successfully in states across the West and Midwest with populations now large enough in some areas to hold limited hunting seasons. In Texas, hunting the Scimitar-Horned Oryx was helping to keep the global population of the animal from disappearing. When ranches could manage populations that were large enough to harvest individuals from, hunters would seek out a chance to hunt the exotic trophy. In 2005, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service placed the Oryx on the Endangered Species list not because populations in the US but because of declining populations in the Oryx' native Africa. This added lengthy permitting process for the possession, harvest and transport of the previously desirable Oryx trophy. The extra challenge involved with the process of managing a herd caused many ranches to stop holding Oryx in Texas, less than 10% of the

ranches still have Oryx. Poor or uncontrolled hunting dropped the Scimitar-Horned Oryx population in the wild and stopped American ranchers from easily supporting a population through hunting. In this way, well regulated hunting and population management tried and failed to preserve a wild animal population. (Young, 2013)

Hunters also argue that hunting is good because it brings revenue to local business, supports a multi-billion dollar industry for hunting clothing, guns, ammo or items related to the hunt and employs tens of thousands as makers of goods, guides, meat processors and lodging. In 2011, roughly 13.7 million hunters spent 38.3 billion dollars on licenses, equipment and trips in the United States. (Southwick Associates, 2012) Nationally hunting license sales account for more than 350 million dollars annually providing the primary source of income for many local wildlife/resource management programs. Hunting and fishing combine to account for five billion dollars annually in Wisconsin encompassing all dollars spent from travel to food and other supplies. Colorado has launched a campaign called "Hug a Hunter" outlining the money spent by hunters in the local community, what it is used for and how such expenditures benefit all consumers of the outdoors. Clearly there is good, there is value, in keeping people employed, contributing so cities are economically functional and encouraging hunters to travel and spend money, particularly in the economic climate of 2013. In many geographic areas, hunters visit more frequently, stay longer and are in larger groups than competing outdoor consumers like birders, hikers and others. This means the hunters are spend more money and in turn bring more goodness in the form of revenue to the location of the hunt. That being said, some other recreational pursuit could bring monetary benefit to cities and support a large industry, it does not have to be hunting. Money alone does not justify potential or actual animal death at the end of a hunt.

The final branch of the utilitarian justification is the good hunting does for the chosen species. Hunters argue that hunting is important, justified and good for a given species because it controls populations and contributes to ecosystemic health. Hunters argue the hunt is justified because humans are the ultimate predators and the animals killed during the hunting season effectively regulate populations by supplementing natural death from starvation and other animal predation. Hunters are "needed" to keep the populations in balance, specifically the populations of those game animals that are preferred for filling the freezer. In this way, hunters are doing the rest of the world a favor by regulating these populations, standing in as the often displaced high order predators. (Terbough, et al. 2001) Hunters are a simple solution to these animals' problems, if the species is not facing adequate losses to non-human predators, then the hunter will try to kill enough to bring the species down to a given level. (Quammen, 2003) Frequently, non-hunters consider it an animal problem when deer, moose or bear populations reach the nuisance point. (McShea, Underwood, Rappole, 1997) Deer versus car accidents, common in high deer population density areas, cost thousands of dollars and are responsible countless human injuries. The National Safety Council recorded 530,000 animal vs. vehicle accidents in 2003 resulting in human damage totaling 100 deaths and 10,000 injuries. Encounters with moose and elk are less frequent but more destructive for vehicle, human and animal. Farmers are not happy when corn yields are lowered by local deer herds and no one seems pleased by the sheer number of Canadian Geese that honk and poop across sidewalks and golf courses. When the public perception suggests that the frequency of these accidents is the fault of the species, we have made a tremendous misjudgment. The hunter argues, without the hunt, these populations will continue to explode, increasing property damage and destruction, so we must hunt.

It is not unreasonable to see hunters filling this role of management predator. We must understand that this situation was artificially created by humans imposing management strategies for the chosen species or developing cities in places that were once wild so animal encounters are more frequent and less appreciated. Further, human hunters can regulate which type of animal is killed through hunting laws in a way animal predators cannot. As landholdings are gradually broken into smaller and smaller pieces with more and more human interference, all animals are brought into closer contact with humans. In the case of predators like wolves, foxes, mountain lions and bears, the contact is often violent, occasionally fatal to humans or pets, and not welcome. Over time, some of the wild animals have been selectively eliminated, that is, hunted to extinction, like the wolf, under the guise of management to suit human ends. Other species are only selectively killed when significant time and resources are consumed, as is common with bears in and around National Parks. Calling this abundance of animal life and frequent human interaction an animal problem rather than realizing the role humans have played in creating it, and may be able to partially reverse it, ought to excuse the hunters from any negative judgment when killing these overly abundant animals. The hunter may be called to fill this predatory role, when all other “natural” means have been displaced. Reflecting on earlier justifications, the populations are managed, or allowed to run without interference because of other human decisions. When the time comes to bring the species back into check, to reduce the number of individuals, hunters can easily fill the role of predator as license numbers and hunting areas can be highly regulated to achieve the desired effect. Although it may be necessary, in the hunters’ eyes, to kill individual animals for population management, the ecosystems where these animals live have a relief valve that can accomplish much of the same outcome, although not as fast as a speeding bullet. When predators are not numerous enough to moderate a given population, the

prey flourish and ultimately over consume the food species they rely on. (Quammen, 2003) This creates a food shortage which will drive down the prey numbers but may take several seasons to stabilize. So, the human hunters are an answer to a question nature is capable of resolving with time. Killing animals because humans view the population as too large, which may be because human actions have removed the non-human predators allowing it to grow too large, will not justify the hunt, no matter how good the killing is for the people involved.

Lumping all of the utilitarian justifications together will show the common failure of attempts at applying a utilitarian calculus. Not unexpectedly, these justifications fail because there is no sure way to measure exactly how big the benefit is when weighing it against a competing badness, potential or actual painful loss of individual animal life. I contend that the badness of the loss of sentient life is, or ought to be, clearly worse when attempting to apply such calculus that weighs human benefits against individual animal death. Recall the earlier considerations given to the history of animal ethics and what I believe to be significant evidence that animals have a life that can be better or worse for them. Animals are suited to live some sort of life and constraining the realization of such life is bad. Disagreeing with the contention human life improvement does not always trump the loss of animal life relies on a sort of anthropocentric speciesism, placing human life, and the enhancement of such life, ahead of all other individuals, particularly non-human animals. Understanding that which we are most like is only commonsense. That does not make such understanding and species bias a foundation for taking other life, or at least it will not in this investigation.

The second important rationalization of, or justification for, hunting does not consider the possible or actual outcome of a successful hunt, but instead relies on the process of the hunt, potentially leading up to animal death. This argument comes into play when the modern hunter

is forced to concede there is no pure legal subsistence hunting with adequate frequency to justify all hunting. In this case, hunting devolves into either pure, recreational sport or trophy hunting. Hunters argue that if a given protocol or highly focused set of rules is followed and the animal is hunted respectfully, within the limits of the formal hunting laws, then the hunt is justified and acceptable. Hunters can consume animal life if they follow a certain process before the animal's death. This takes the form of the doctrine of Fair Chase, mentioned briefly earlier. Along with the record books, Boone and Crocket was the first to articulate this concept:

“...the ethical, sportsmanlike, and lawful pursuit and taking of any free-ranging wild, native North American big game animal in a manner that does not give the hunter an improper advantage over such animals.”

Here we see the hunters trying to defend how the animal is hunted and killed, encouraging those who hunt to take animal life in a way that is not measured by efficiency, but rather the rightness or wrongness of the killing when measured against the ideal quoted above. The manifestation of Fair Chase in hunting takes two forms, specific, discrete concern for animal life resulting in a process that respects facets of that life and the case by case application of fair chase by the individual hunter. (Posewitz, 1994) I will explain and examine each below, showing how hunters attempt to use Fair Chase to show why hunting is not merely killing and ought to be allowed in modern times.

First, Fair Chase in the form of regulation, formalized rules for hunting, that purportedly licenses animal killing at the end of the hunt by telling the hunter exactly what he must do in the form of laws. Knowing that some wild game bird species consume gravel at day break to assist digestion, pheasant hunting on public lands in South Dakota cannot begin until noon, after the birds have dispersed from the gravel roads and are not literally sitting ducks, so to speak. The rifle season for deer and elk is timed to start after the rut is over while the bow season often

coincides with the rut as the comparatively low hunter volume and quiet hunt will not disrupt the mating season. A spring bear hunt in Colorado was not allowed based on public outcry that the possibility of killing mother bears that had just given birth would lead to the death of the cubs as well, being deprived of a source of protection and food at an early, vulnerable time. Hunting big game at night with lights to essentially stun the animals, stopping them for a quick and easy kill is also illegal. Similarly, hunting over bait for deer and occasionally bear is outlawed in different regions because it exploits the animal's basic needs, food, leading them more easily within reach of the hunters as the hunter chooses what bait is put out, where and when, concentrating an easy food source. In this Fair Chase doctrine, we see a claimed respect for the individual animal, and animal life, giving the animal some chance to escape, hoping to avoid making hunting a guaranteed kill. Hunters are looking for a chance to encounter an animal to kill because sure killing is slaughter.

Hunters argue because of Fair Chase, the animals are given a chance to escape the hunter so the hunt is not a guaranteed animal kill. This chance is more theoretical than actual when 10 hunters and dogs descend on a rabbit patch or corn field. Current technology further exploits the advantage hunters have and are not addressed by the Fair Chase doctrine, with the advent of optical sights, high-powered rifles, synthetic materials to keep hunters warm and dry, it seems the hunter takes every other advantage available, except those explicitly forbidden by the law. Some of these conscious choices will be expanded later in terms of weapon choice and hunting method. The constraints on the hunt offered by Fair Chase limit the way the animal is hunted, but not the way the animal is ultimately killed. Although the legal scope of Fair Chase claims to add a chance for escape and a limit exploitation of human advantage over the chosen animal, it does not level the playing field completely. To be clear, hunting does not need to be literally kill

or be killed, as it may be when hunting large or dangerous game in order to be fair. For species where the hunter does not have to register the carcasses, all that matters in the end, is if the animal is dead and rides home in the cooler. For other species, like deer and elk, assuming the hunter follows protocol and stops at a registration station, the wardens check to see if the animal is of the appropriate size and sex, all other concerns beyond whether or not there is a dead animal to tag escape recording on the registration notebook. Because of this, the legal scope of Fair Chase alone does not adequately account for an ethically justified way to take animal life through hunting. Fair Chase prescribes a process that may not always, or even often, result in killing animals with minimal pain and suffering.

Second, Fair Chase exists in the form of an individual hunting ethic, that is, the doctrine of a group that hopes to positively guide conduct as a way to eliminate painful or disrespectful loss of animal life. In this way, it goes beyond the law telling the hunter what he should do, but what he may choose not to. In different groups, this takes different forms. For some pheasants are not shot on the ground, out of respect for the bird, respect for the hunt and safety for other hunters and dogs. For others, small, spike horned bucks were allowed to pass the stands without shooting in hopes of more growth for next season and the chance to shoot them later. When other hunters outside of a group did not adhere to such practices, a hunter is left to shake his head because the killing and ethic in the other groups sometimes trumped the specific ethic of another given group. For other hunting groups, large and small, the personal choice can cover many other aspects of the hunt. Those wishing to surrender some of the technical advantages of man may choose the bow over a high powered rifle, requiring the hunter to get much closer to the animal for a killing shot. Others choose to hike in to mountain camps instead of riding ATVs or trucks into comfortable hunting lodges. Still others choose the blackpowder weapons to



ideologically return to the early days of rifle hunting. With these choices comes an increase in required skill, chance for failure and, reportedly, greater pleasure when the hunt is successful. So the extension of Fair Chase, beyond the letter of the law, can take many formulations and impact animal death differently. Here the process has the chance for respectful consumption of animal life, but that relies more on the individual hunter or group of hunters and is not a universal answer for providing a process that will ethically license the hunt. One can hunt within the letter of the law but not within an ethically sound paradigm.

Boone and Crocket take this doctrine further and outline six other tenets of Hunting Ethics beyond the initial formulation of Fair Chase:

1. Obey all applicable laws and regulations.
2. Respect the customs of the locale where the hunting occurs.
3. Exercise a personal code of behavior that reflects favorably on your abilities and sensibilities as a hunter.
4. Attain and maintain the skills necessary to make the kill as certain and quick as possible.
5. Behave in a way that will bring no dishonor to either the hunter, the hunted, or the environment.
6. Recognize that these tenets are intended to enhance the hunter's experience of the relationship between predator and prey, which is one of the most fundamental relationships of humans and their environment.

Beyond the mention of law as formal application of Fair Chase earlier, all the other considerations do not have as firm guide, other than what the individual hunter decides to do personally within the bounds of his group of hunters. For some, it is custom to use the whole animal, entrails and all. In this group, any hunt that does not end with consumption of the entire animal as either food or other goods is disrespectful to the animal, to the hunters and to the hunt. As such, suggesting a universal ethic with elective compliance will foster an environment of ethical animal killing is mistaken. The process of the hunt, within the letter of the law, cannot assure minimally painful animal death. Adding compliance to a higher standard that is not

universal or even completely concrete will not strengthen the argument. For those who choose to abide by the six tenets covered above, there is a higher likelihood the animal will be killed in an ethically justified manner. For those who choose to use more primitive weapons or hunt with fewer “luxuries”, the increased skill combined with a decreased weapon reliability may have exactly the opposite effect. Instead of a quick, clean kill, the animals may be wounded, experiencing torturous pain before recovering to a life with a damaged body or losing their lives without being consumed by the hunter. Still others may choose a standard, code or behavior that appeals to and satisfies them personally but does not stand to the scrutiny of people outside of that group. Fair Chase alone, even with the listed augmentation, in this formulation is not adequate to create an ethically justified paradigm for taking animal life. An ethic that is employed electively will not encompass those who are hunting within the limits of the law, within the limits of personal standards, but outside the limits of the ethically justified hunter.

Looking again at the six tenets listed, we must examine the basis and intention of them, how do these tenets of Fair Chase attempt to provide a foundation for a hunter’s duties? The first is simply following the articulated, written laws, hunting within the regulations given. This ought not be surprising, follow the rules to avoid punishment. It is impressive that some hunters have to be told to follow the rules and obey the laws of the sport both the formal, written ones and the unspoken localized customs. The second, calling for respect of local traditions, may actually not work in the animals' favor. In some areas, hunting with dogs, shooting birds on the ground taking exceptionally long distance shots may be common and accepted local practices, may be legal within the scope of the hunting law, but may not lead to humane kills. This sort of localized relativity is not enough to guide a substantive, all encompassing ethic worth using, one that stands up to philosophical scrutiny because of the ethic's incomplete application

In review, I have outlined the three types of hunters, the subsistence hunter, the sport hunter and the trophy hunter. Each of these three groups attempts to justify the hunt respectively for survival, fun or recreation and souvenir collection. Examining these three groups carefully shows that in America, in 2013, there are not enough pure subsistence hunters like there were on the frontier or before the advent of agriculture and animal husbandry to consider this justification ethically sound for all hunters. In the vast majority of modern hunting scenarios, there will always be cheaper and easier sources of food than hunting, so subsistence hunters are functionally sport hunters who eat everything they kill but who claim food as their primary motivation. Closer scrutiny also reveals the trophy hunter is a sport hunter taken to the extreme, a sport hunter who hunts only for the fun of harvesting a large specimen. The trophy hunter is a caricature of the sport hunter, exemplifying the most objectionable characteristics of hunting, machismo, killing by any means, and only using the hide or horns of the animal killed for trophies. This leaves our investigation with the sport hunter, who claims to have many reasons to justify the hunt, many coexistent goods from the hunting experience. Considering these justifications, I have shown relevant utilitarian and deontological frameworks along with a sort of nostalgia or sentimentalism linking hunting back to old times when life was more pure and simple. Utilitarian views force us to answer who is measuring the utility and who things are better and worse for, the painfully killed animal appears worse off than the happy hunter. The deontological justifications are a good start to creating and enforcing ethical standards but are not complete. Widespread, universal acceptance of them has still not occurred after some 100 years of exposure to the doctrine of Fair Chase. Finally, the sentimentalism does not justify hunting by itself because there are many old societal practices that have long since fallen to the wayside because they are no longer practical or reasonable within the limits of society, a charge hunting

appears to be guilty of in its current iteration. This leaves hunters without any single, firm foundation to place a justification for killing animals for fun, and occasionally food. Although hunting, both the act of entering the field with the intention of killing along with actually successfully hunting an animal clearly does have collateral benefits to the hunters, to the public and to the ecosystem or species, these benefits alone are not enough to justify the painful loss of an individual animal's life. Killing for some benefit and killing with a certain procedure in mind do not get past the reality that hunting is killing, killing beings worthy of moral consideration, and doing so for fun. If we are to allow hunting in 2013, we must justify recreational killing, killing for fun, which will call on parts of many of the justifications given above with some important supplements to account for the shortcomings shown previously.

### **Chapter 3**

In the first chapter, I outlined the moral problems with hunting, specifically how, in America, participation in and acceptance of, hunting is on the decline. This decline appears to be in response to shifting of societal values and cultural norms. Judgment of what the benefits of hunting might be, as well as what duties might be involved, in the form of responsibilities to humanity, to the animals hunted and other hunters, is changing. Animal life has something beyond purely instrumental value in the eyes of more and more people. Since we are, as a society, no longer subsistence hunters, it's only natural for us to identify with the hunted as vulnerable, potentially cruelly exploited, and consider taking action to prevent such exploitation. This can be seen in the proliferation of advocacy for minorities and victims across the board. In either case, a moral view of animals and hunting constructed in this way is anthropomorphic and limits the scope of our decision to hunt as only a measure of the instrumental value, to us as humans, of killing animals. We have accepted, or are starting to realize on a larger scale, that animals have lives that can be better or worse, and that for living things losing life painfully or purely for the recreation or amusement of others is the worst possible death for animals. Such a death, I have argued to this point, can never be morally or ethically justified. This leaves hunters to justify killing animals for fun or sport, current paradigm for modern hunters, participants in a recreational, elective blood sport. Specifically, how can modern man hunt, or justify, his wild animal killing. This moral view has a fairly narrow and completely anthropomorphic scope.

In the second chapter, I examined the responses from the hunting public, and outlined how the conventional defenses of hunting fail, considering in detail three hunting paradigms, subsistence, sport, and trophy, before using conventional utilitarian and deontological arguments to examine how our moral sentiments might be justified but are not for hunting. Ultimately, if

animals are held to have some moral worth, we cannot kill them only for the good the kill does for others, whether that be individual animals, species, hunters or other non-hunting people. If animals are not held to have some moral worth, some non-instrumental value, then humans or any hunters may kill them however and whenever they choose leaving discussions of hunting ethics empty. Hunters then moved past the outcome of the hunt to the process. If a hunter follows a given set of rules born from alleged concerns for fairness for the animal and for responsibility to the animal and other hunters in the form of explicit, posted laws, there is still a significant chance for painful animal death. The chance of this unnecessarily painful death occurring will not be excused merely because the hunter followed a specified procedure without considering the outcome as well. Doing so would fail to consider the hunt through a consequentialist lense and there is more to the hunt than the process or the outcome considered separately. Using these conventional moral theories, considering utility, process and obligation, broadens the still anthropomorphic view of animal killing but does not clearly justify it. This leaves the hunter wishing to thoughtfully and ethically consume animal life unable to philosophically justify his trip to the woods without further questions and justifications.

Essentially, whether hunters are considering their intentions, procedure or consequences, they are working within a doctrine called “fair chase.” This doctrine is a set of duties or obligations, first formalized a little more than a century ago, providing rules of thumb about fair methods of consuming animal life either for recreation, subsistence or both. I claim that Fair Chase’s conventional statement fails to develop an adequate perspective of the true moral status of animals: While in its usual form, it plainly aims to value animals highly, it does not seriously regard animals as moral entities in their own right, simply the passive objects or instruments of human action or experience, mere means. Fair Chase, if expanded, could consider animals as

something more than mere means, but not ends in themselves. In this way, whether moral analyses turn on intentions or consequences, on means or ends, they really turn only on the human side of the act. We, as humans and as hunters, need to do better, for hunters, for non-hunters and for animals. We can begin to do better by considering the intrinsic value of animals. We will not escape considering hunting from the perspective of the hunter—but we will distinguish hunting that is morally justified, or unjustified, by considering the hunter and the hunted together, acknowledging the importance, the role, and the abilities of both. The ultimate problem with conventional criticisms of hunting and their defenses is the typically narrow anthropomorphic base their proponents stand on. We need to be able to consider all the duties, and all the consequences, not just those nearest and dearest to our human hearts.

In this chapter, I will outline a perspective which, through the proper consideration of animals as such and in the world that they live, will indicate when their killing is—and is not—ethically justified. This will be unsurprising because it is hopefully commonsensical. When complete, I will have shown the necessary conditions for morally and ethically justified consumption of animal life ultimately showing although hunting in its current formulation is incompatible with modern societal values, the conditions for what I will call the “Ethical Hunt” will embody the most morally justified consumption of animal life in any sphere. This will be done in a way that resolves current concerns about industrial agricultural practices showing that the Ethical Hunt is the most morally justified consumption of animal life at all. Although modern agriculture has been called “the worst mistake in the history of the human race” in terms of human caused animal pain and suffering it is the most common consumer of animal life providing a simple measuring stick. (Diamond, 1987) In the same way we have critically

examined, and over time revised, agricultural practices, we can provide an adequate moral defense and revision of hunting through proper consideration of its moral criticisms.

Earlier I considered how separate pieces of the utilitarian framework were incomplete because of implicit speciesism, valuing human life above animal life while claiming some value for animals. I will not specifically quantify or articulate exactly what value or rights animals have, or should have here. Instead, I contend only that animal life has some value beyond the purely instrumental, a value society has begun to recognize and emphasize recently in other arenas, most prominently agriculture. Humans enjoy and value having enriched lives because of the hunt, successful or not, so the consumption of animal life at the end of a successful hunt cannot and will not be the only value of animal life. Hunters have also argued hunting makes human life better because a long list of coexistent goodness and comparable utility. If animal life has more than instrumental value, hunting cannot be good only because of what good it does for humans. Following such an argument reduces hunting to recreational killing, killing for fun, and is, or ought to be, fundamentally incompatible with the aim of limiting personal freedom for the sake of societal stability. In this way, a hunt is not justified only because of what good it does for humans or other animals, but it is justified in part because of the collateral benefits for other moral and amoral agents. The problem with consideration of consequences alone is answering what specific consequences to whom, and measured how. What follows is the beginning of a clarification of these concerns.

Fair Chase is the personal and formal legal articulation of the deontological hunting paradigm. Laws and regulations dictate where to hunt, when to hunt, sometimes how to hunt in the form of weapon selection or location, but not why to hunt. Specifically, Fair Chase does not tell the hunter why to kill the chosen animal. A deer cannot be shot legally when blinded at night



by a spotlight, but it can be shot while running away, or with vital organs obscured, likely receiving a wounding blow and subsequent pain/stress before being killed by the hunter or dying alone through starvation or predation. Although some may choose to avoid the shots that are likely to lead to wounding animals for the sake of personal integrity, the law does not mandate such a practice. Quantifying the rampancy of selective or accidental wounding shots is challenging or nearly impossible, statistics on shots fired versus successful hits and animals recovered is questionable at best. Anecdotally, it is not uncommon to harvest elk with other bullets stuck in their hides that did not fatally wound the animal or to find whitetails in the woods days or months after the hunt that were arrow stuck and either not found by the hunter or not immediately killed by the shot. Those who have failed to kill and successfully recover, in the form of wounding an animal, either keep the secret to themselves or do not respond to what is perceived as an anti-hunting media asking for voluntary reporting. Krueger calculates a 13% non-recovery rate in the form of misses or not immediately fatal shots but this involved a grid searched, controlled environment using means (helicopters and thermal cameras) that most hunters do not have at their disposal. (Krueger, 1995) I mean to emphasize only that animals are killed painfully and incompatibly with true “ethical” hunting but consistent with the letter of the law. Specific, regulated procedure alone will not guarantee animal death with minimal pain and suffering. A hunter can uphold his duty to the law, but not to the animal. The problem with consideration of duty alone is duty to whom, to the hunter, to the animal, to other animals or to the rule book? Again, the purpose of this chapter is a clarification of this question.

What then can be done, in the face of these shortcomings, to ethically consume wild animal life in the field at the culmination of the hunt? Both of the ethical schools mentioned above do not account for something like personal intuition and internal self-criticism that is

present, although not currently rampant, in modern hunting circles. There is more to the hunt than guns, blood and death, more than the costs and benefits have been described above. There is even more still in the hunting equation to be weighed when justifying the hunting act, there is a moral perspective, as I will argue, a particular moral and ethically justified perspective that will account of the shortcomings of earlier justifications. This question will be answered with an argument that takes the form of the “Ethical Hunter” who participates in the “ethical hunt”. Consider that hunting is an inherently moral action, an action with moral dimensions beyond simply what is happening, that is judged in the context of the world as a whole, the society at this given time and the object at hand, not from a merely human perspective. As such, hunting is an action that cannot be justified or dismissed only with facts and scientific data but that is where we will start. I will explain the Ethical Hunter by comparing the hunt with other accepted, or at least widespread, consumption of animal life using quality of animal life, pain in death and use of the animal after it is killed as measuring sticks. This will describe a more refined moral context in a framework that encompasses all sides of the hunting equation from the only ethically justified perspective.

Fair Chase provides something of a start for the Ethical Hunter. The legal dictates of this doctrine profess an interest in leveling the playing field between hunter and chosen prey by limiting the exploitation of certain animal behaviors or constraining some specific human advantages. Because of the nature of enforcement, limited wardens in the field, and the appeal of self-legislation (if a hunter is the only one who sees a law broken, does he report himself?), Fair Chase is only a start. The Ethical Hunter obeys all formal, written laws and then goes above and beyond them, filling in where the law does not formally regulate hunter action to address quality of animal death as measured by speed with an eye to minimizing suffering. More must

be done to avoid unnecessarily painful animal death during the hunt while empowering the hunter to act in a way that advances both his priorities and the duties to the prey animals. This can be done in the following ways.

First, the hunter works to control or limit more variables in the hunt. This is challenging because part of what attracts hunters to the hunt is the chance for failure, whether real or perceived. This is a failure to see animals not a chance to fail to kill them. Almost universally, hunters distinguish between hunting and killing, between shooting a tame zoo animal, slaughtering a domesticated species or exterminating pests, and the challenge of finding, stalking and killing a wild animal or some scenario resembling that. (King, 1991) In this way, the Ethical Hunter will bring hunting as close to slaughter, the form of certainty of killing not certainty of encounter, without making the two identical. The hunter aims to increase certainty and speed of animal death but not manipulating the frequency of the chance for a kill. Eliminating or minimizing other chances for pain and suffering for the animal because of poor killing technique must not infringe on this opportunity to fail to encounter animals. At the same time, pain and suffering, stress caused only by the hunter, and in excess of what the animal could experience under the best circumstances, are vital concerns. The control of variables outside of certainty begins with the tool used for the animal killing.

The Ethical Hunter must carefully decide both what weapon is chosen and how/when it is used. In some cases, local restrictions make this decision for the hunter, mandating shotguns be used in highly populated areas or primitive weapons like muzzleloaders at different times of the season to limit hunting pressures on a given species. In cases where weapon choice is not determined by law, the Ethical Hunter is obligated to use the “best” weapon available and limit shots to match the weapon being used. By best weapon, I mean that most accurate, most

powerful and most suited to the species hunted and the area where the hunt occurs. Whitetails in the woods of Wisconsin require a different firearm than whitetails in Texas or Canada because of animal size, hunting terrain and shot distance. In most cases, this will be a high-powered centerfire rifle with some sort of optical sight as this weapon will cover the greatest diversity of shooting distances and weather conditions. This is not a treatise on weapon superiority, instead the relevance here is that a rifle, as described above, is going to be the most effective killer in the hands of most hunters of most species of game in most places under most conditions. Surely some hunters report never missing regardless of gun, caliber, species and distance, but that is the exception and I wish to account for the best possible tool for the most possible hunters. So the Ethical Hunter uses a high-powered centerfire rifle unless limited by law, then he would use the best alternative legally allowed.

For the Ethical Hunter, a scoped, high-powered, centerfire rifle will limit, nearly eliminate, the chance for failure because of the firearm since it is the apex of precision and reliability using modern ammunition and firearm technology, the result of years of technological refinement. A rifle of this sort should have an effective kill range of 200 yards in the hands of an experienced marksman given a solid rest, good lines of sight and optimal weather conditions. Such a weapon will allow an immediately fatal single shot to be placed to assure the least possible stress and pain on the animal thereby realizing the goal of the Ethical Hunter, consumption of animal life with the least possible extra suffering. The caliber of the rifle should be selected to meet the shooting situations encountered whether one that is minimally influenced by wind and distance if anticipating longer range shots or one that will deliver significant close range energy for short range shots. Caliber will vary depending on species hunted, antelope requiring a different caliber than elk. The hunter must know the limitations of both the weapon

and himself, being prepared to avoid shots that exceed these limitations even after choosing the "best" weapon as defined above.

Lesser weapons are often used under the guise of greater required skill, such as handguns, blackpowder weapons or bow and arrows. The argument supporting the use of such weapons insists that a reduced killing range will result in cleaner kills and a better connection to the prey animal due solely to increased proximity at the time of the kill. With the increase in required skill for an accurate shot being fired and hitting its mark comes an increase in the chance that the bullet will not which will then cause wounding and animal suffering. Instead of being able to travel more than 500 yards comfortably, an arrow can travel 50-75 yards, hemorrhaging energy and killing power rapidly along the way. Comparing the best possible rifle shot to the best possible shot with a bow, time to animal death rises from 21 to 30 seconds. The nine seconds of "additional" pain and suffering is very real and must be acknowledged as unacceptable. An arrow shot animal is dying because it bleeds out or has had lungs punctured while a bullet shot animal may be rendered senseless sooner from the hydrostatic shock of the projectile, decreasing time to sensory death for a gunshot animal. (Swan, 1994)

In addition to reduced range, firing the shot is more complicated. The process involved in launching a modern rifle bullet involves a primer strike from a trigger pull and a connection of springs. A handgun involves a nearly identical process but the primer strike ignites a smaller collection of powder and propels a smaller projectile down range, decreasing the energy available to kill. A blackpowder firearm is again similar, but instead of holding the primer, powder and projectile in a sealed, complete, assembly, the pieces are separate and could be more easily compromised by weather, installation in the rifle or other catastrophe. Bows and arrows, even the modern compound bow, involved knocking an arrow, achieving full draw, aligning

sight pins and steadying during follow through. This amounts to many more fine motor movements with chance for human error of mechanical failure than placing a rifle on a solid rest, lining up cross hairs and pulling a trigger. This chance for failure and increases in uncertainty opens the door for additional animal pain and suffering before death because of a misplaced shot at the animal. Because the Ethical Hunter hunts in a way that would not include any extra suffering for the animal based on the best possible death, he cannot use anything but a high-powered, scoped, centerfire rifle while optimizing shooting situations provided in the field.

Along with the weapon used in the hunt, care must be taken in terms of shot selection and personal preparation for the shot itself. All of this preparation varies between species and regions. Whitetail hunting across the Midwest and into the South involves hunting from a blind or stand of some sort. These range from primitive seats in trees to shack like structures with heat and electricity constructed to offer protection from weather and a steady platform for shooting. In these cases, the hunt, in terms of shooting, closely resembles target shooting at the firing range. Hunting moose, elk and mule deer or occasionally whitetail deer puts the hunter on foot and often results in shots offhand and without the aid of any type of rest. Target shooters recognize off-hand as the least stable shooting position, one taken as a last resort if a shot absolutely must be fired if the shooter were under duress. A rest, in the form of tree limb, bipod, backpack or similar can be used, but such aids will add time to what may be a fleeting shot opportunity. Here discipline and structured protocols of the Ethical Hunter must be remembered to prevent wounding shots. This can be done by making the shot taken in the hunt resemble the practiced, accurate, predictable shot at the target range from the bench. This means using a stationary, bench type rest in a blind, or other shooting aids in the form of sticks, bipods and portable sand type bags to steady the shot if away from the stand. The Ethical Hunter must shoot

from a position as close to benchrest as possible because this is the most accurate. If shooting from a rest is not possible, the Ethical Hunter practices his off-hand shots for proficiency and recognizes they are not as accurate or predictable as a shot from a rest. If he is not proficient, he does not take off-hand shots and is forced to rely on the best possible rest, either by carrying shooting aids or firing from stable surroundings. In such situations, an Ethical Hunter may see legal animals but not take any shots. If he can become proficient, through practice, familiarity with the position and comfort with the weapon, the Ethical Hunter may shoot off-hand but he works to avoid such shots whenever possible.

Even with a stable rest, there are other parameters affecting the placement of an immediately fatal shot. Heavy winds, rain, extreme range and moving animals all pull the hunt farther away from repeating the act of target shooting from a bench at a stationary bullseye and remove certainty that must accompany the ethical hunt when an animal is in the crosshairs instead of a paper target. Some of this certainty can be controlled with practice and knowledge, being sure of the ballistics of the chosen weapon or carrying a rangefinder to accurately measure the distance to the target. The Ethical Hunter avoids shots at moving animals over long ranges or at angles that would limit bullet placement in the animals' vitals. That is, operating outside the effective killing ability of the combination of a given hunter and given weapon. Such risky shots may occasionally be immediately fatal, but will not be immediately fatal frequently enough to offset the frequency of wounding and the resulting pain and suffering for the animal. The Ethical Hunter knows the limitations of a particular combination of weapon, hunter, species and location through practice, calm and discipline. He operates within these constraints so that every shot is a fatal one, leading to the fastest, least painful and minimally stressful animal death. The Ethical Hunter shoots stationary animals from a rest in the best possible weather/wind/range

conditions possible, which may involve not shooting or even not hunting when the field becomes too unpredictable for steady, accurate shooting.

Ultimately, these concerns distill to the practice of using the best tools under the best possible conditions with the best possible preparation. This means not hunting some days and not shooting on others even when a hunter encounters legal animals during legal shooting hours. Although killing shots may be possible under circumstances different from those listed, they are not likely. Because of this, such shots should not be attempted so as to avoid animal suffering caused by wounding shots. This also means practicing and becoming proficient with the chosen weapon for the given species. In the US, "weapon proficiency" actually is included as part of the Hunter's Education curriculum which most hunters complete around the age of twelve or thirteen. I use the term loosely as this "proficiency" involves taking a small number of shots in a range with a rest and a simple firearm, usually a .22 long rifle and mostly for the purpose of rehearsing the BRASS acronym for calm shooting. Any further training comes electively as the hunter grows older and is administered by friends who are passing on, for better or worse, the practices they have learned. After that, securing a hunting license relies only on presenting identification, proof of Hunter's Education course completion and payment. Any practice occurs, or is forgotten, at the discretion of the particular hunter. Some hunters let a box of twenty rounds last them a hunting career, three to sight in the rifle and one a year to fill their tag. Others incur the expense of practice through hundreds of rounds of ammunition fired during many trips to the target range. An Ethical Hunter will regularly practice to improve weapon familiarity and shooting competency with weapons for his chosen species. He will then continue to practice to maintain proficiency so that he can pull the trigger during the hunt confidently,



knowing the animal death will be fast and sure. This involves greater frequency and volume of practice than shooting three rounds a year at the target range the week before deer season.

When defining the Ethical Hunter here, care must be taken to avoid overstatement of the priority of the ethical hunt. The Ethical Hunter wants to choose a weapon and shooting situation that eliminates the chance for failure caused by the shooter in the form of shots that are not immediately fatal for the animal. This does not mean that hunter is concerned only with the efficiency of the hunt and does not mean to suggest that highly trained snipers are the only people who ought to be licensed to hunt. For instance, fully automatic belt-fed weapons allow many projectiles to be fired quickly so if the first shot is not fatal, the second or third will arrive quickly to avoid suffering in the form of a wounded animal, a luxury not afforded by a bolt action rifle or single shot weapon. Such automatic weapons are illegal for use while hunting and highly limited in personal ownership by the National Firearms Act along with being less accurate. Instead, I argue here that the Ethical Hunter will go to the greatest possible lengths to assure his shooting in the field will quickly kill the chosen animal with the least possible stress and pain for the animal every time that he chooses to pull the trigger by choosing the best weapon, the best preparation and the best shot.

The final characteristic of the Ethical Hunter is that he hunts and kills only animals that he will consume and then consumes the majority of the animal killed. This may sway the line of hunting and killing, as the Ethical Hunter may not then be able to hunt pests since eating prairie dogs or coyotes killed to control local populations for livestock health and property destruction is uncommon. This is in part, because not much is left when a prairie dog is shot under these hunting conditions. Such a hunt, as coyote or prairie dog “hunting” is often called, would be extermination or pest control instead of proper, ethical hunting. This is because it involves only

consuming animal life for a coexistent benefit, having fewer prairies dogs in a pasture or fewer coyotes wandering the fields. For all other species, the Ethical Hunter must consume the animal directly or by sharing the meat with other people. What and how much of the carcass has to be consumed to constitute “enough” use or consumption here may best borrow from the agricultural practices, internal organs are often left out of the chain of human consumption, the hide or skin may be useful for other things as cow hide becomes shoes or boots and deer or elk skin becomes slippers or gloves.

If these conditions can be observed and obeyed, in addition to all relevant legal regulations in terms of season, location, hunting hours, etc. the killing involved in hunting wild animals becomes increasingly like the use of animals in agriculture. The killing is nearly mechanical and failsafe, or as mechanical and failsafe as possible without making hunting identical, in terms of certainty of animal encounter and outcome, as domestic slaughter. Consider the wilderness as a great pasture, the hunters as slaughterhouse workers, all with minimal direct investment in the feeding and tending of the animals throughout the year. The animals enter the slaughterhouse in the form of a field or woodlot close to the hunter, some are chosen by the hunter and then expeditiously killed before being transported to consume. Such a comparison here is hopefully natural and will provide a concrete measure of how hunting compares with the only other way modern society consumes animal life for food. Hunting will be measured against current industrial agriculture practices and free range/organic type practices, providing the two modern paradigms for consuming animal life. These three will be compared in terms of lives consumed in production, carbon/water/resource consumption throughout the growing process, including transportation, and quality of animal life quantified in terms of the

realization of animal telos measured before the animal is killed because of the profound differences between the practices and the prolific data available to quantify the difference.

First, we must dispel the myth that being vegetarian metaphorically excuses a consumer from any animal "blood on their hands." This is mistaken because of both the prevalence of animal products in arenas other than the foods we eat, and because of the animal lives lost in production of comparable caloric measures of vegetables vs. a single deer, elk or comparably sized agricultural animal. One needs only look at a bale of hay or witness hawks and buzzards scavenging freshly cut fields to see there has been some animal death caused directly by the harvesting of these plants even though the end consumer is not directly using those animal lives. Using the benchmark of a 150 pound deer which produces sixty pounds of meat and following the USDA listed protein content of venison at 130 grams per pound, a deer kill yields 8,000 grams of protein. Modern industrial agriculture practices using hybrid seeds produce more than one ton of soybeans per hectare at 34% protein by weight or 370,000 grams of protein which must be ultimately processed to extract the protein unlike the venison. Using Davis' figure of 15 deaths per hectare of land harvested, soybeans grown in this way yield 24,000 grams of protein per death or just more than twice that of hunting, a price the vegetarian does not hesitate to pay. Implicit in this judgment is that the lives of charismatic megafauna are worth more than small field animals, insects or even domesticated agriculture species like cows, pigs and goats as the vegetarian anti-hunter protests the hunt but not his or her soybean protein source. I do not accept the argument either that we can kill all these other animals coincidentally to produce vegetables for consumption and not be viewed as an animal killer OR that killing the small animals is all right as they are without personality or affection from the general public. It does appear easier to pass off the death of so called "trivial" animals like mice and voles in the production of

vegetable protein, but for this examination, we will count all mammalian lives as equal. The insect lives lost in the agricultural process are even larger in number than the small animals killed in producing any field crop but will be excused from consideration here because of their exceptionally high number, limited pain capacities and decreased spoken societal value.

Quantifying the magnitude of life lost along with the relevance or uniformity across practices being considered, vegetarian vs. meat-eating, is neither practical nor helpful at this point and I leave it to the more skilled. Instead, note animal life is consumed in some way at the most basic steps of any agricultural process, even those processes that do not kill animals as an intentional outcome of the process. (Nelson, 1997)

This eliminates some speciesism as unnecessary and includes others because of the reality that living in 2013 requires immense care to completely avoid consuming animal life or causing animal death. Such prejudice is real and not surprising but must be remembered; the calculus of animal life consumption should measure a life for a life or establish some other currency. I am neither prepared nor able to effectively quantify or justify the worth of an elk life in terms of numbers of mice, rabbits and birds killed in the production of a similar amount of calories of vegetables or other animals. This means even intentionally avoiding eating animals leads to animal death in some part of the process which anti-hunters sometimes pass off as necessary as it suits their desire to have houses, shoes or flight in airplanes. Kerasote laments, "the myriad of small creatures lost as the combines turn the fields, even the Douglas fir hidden in the walls of our homes--every day we foreclose one life for another...a constant choice of who will suffer that we may live", acknowledging almost every step of living requires something else dying. (Kerasote, 1993) Consider then that if eating anything requires loss of animal life, humans, as those beings most able to assure this loss of life is justified and the most able to

justify this loss, must take care in how these animal lives are consumed. This justification will begin with a series of comparisons.

Imagine wild animals would live freely without lengthy intervention from man, as opposed to the domesticated farm animal currently accepted in modern life. Compare livestock on established farms with conscious, intentional, constant human intervention to a free roaming deer or elk. At the same time, wild animal grazing is not far removed from the investment in the eating experience of animals kept in less intensive agriculture practices, like free range cattle or pigs allowed grazing pastureland and taking the food of their choosing. This practice avoids the additional loss of animal life that would be found in cutting an entire field of hay or similar feed crops and bringing the resulting harvest to the domesticated animals. The growing and harvesting process for domesticated animals represents a tremendous investment of both time and lives lost in production of the feed as well as the transport, processing, handling and distribution of the harvest to the confined animals. Domesticated animals flourish because humans constantly intervene and invest energy into the process of growth, reproduction and slaughter. The wild animals killed at the end of a successful hunt are the paradigmatic herbivore, eating plants that grew freely and only eating what they need, avoiding the large-scale harvests required to feed animals in industrial agriculture settings where many animals are kept in a small space and brought food requiring many more acres to be used for feed production instead of allowing the animal to graze. Choosing to kill and eat the hunted animal avoids significant loss of life related to feed harvests giving the hunted animal an advantage in total lives lost per calorie of animal consumed. Davis calculates 15 field mice lives being lost per hectare of land harvested by single pass harvesting, which assumes one pass through the field and monitored one species of mice, but this is not the only way animal lives are lost to agrarian practices. There

are also significant numbers of non-insect animals killed by habitat loss from pasture of crop land creation, poisoning by pesticide and fertilizer application, and direct killing of wildlife to protect crops. (Nelson, 1997) These numbers do not take into account the animal lives lost from environmental degradation from fossil fuel use in farming, processing and transport of products of industrial agriculture. In this way, hunting is better in terms of lives lost per calorie when compared to current industrial agriculture standard practices as one elk or deer browsing the hillside does not require supplemental feed to be harvested which avoids killing additional field animals and investing additional energy.

Besides lives lost, hunted wild animals have an advantage compared to industrial agriculture in terms of energy invested/fossil fuels burned/resources consumed. Again, it is not fair to assume that wild animals exist passively in the world, entirely free of intervention or energy investment from humans or hunters, but their existence does not require an active human investment compared to comparable food sources. If we grant that wild animals would exist and reproduce provided their habitat was not overly polluted or developed by humans, and flourish within the constraints of the given ecosystem without external energy investments by humans, then we can examine the acquisition cost of the animal, for lack of a better term, and the transport of the specific dead animal to its place of ultimate consumption. Assume any human assistance or investment, as done by Ducks Unlimited, Whitetails Unlimited or the motivated hunter in the form of food plots or feed stations, is an elective and unnecessary supplement for the wild animal. Such things are done to improve the outcome of the hunt for the hunter, not to maintain animal life. Counting on such hunting practices for animal survival would only tilt the scale back towards a hunter being a camouflaged farmer. If the food, time and energy invested by these groups were required for subsistence of the wild animals, these animals would look

more like wild animal species farmed in confinement. Still, the thousands of acres of crop land that must be planted and cultivated to feed thousands of cows or pigs in confinement, takes an exceptional energy input in the form of pesticides, herbicides, and diesel fuel compared to wild animals eating what is there for them as a product of the environment. A pound of beef produced through traditional industrial agricultural means (selective breeding, antibiotic, pellet fed) requires 1,045,000 calories of energy in the form of fossil fuels to grow, feed, transport and process the animal from birth to death (Capper, 2011). A pound of elk, shot by a local hunter near his home which he then butchers himself requires only 526 calories of fossil fuel in making the gun, driving to the field, and ending up ready to cook. (Kerasote, 1993) Water consumed to produce the beef above is similarly shocking, more than 200 gallons required for a pound of ground beef irrigating cropland and watering the animal itself. (Capper, 2011) This gives the Ethical Hunter an advantage in consuming wild animal life compared to domesticated animal species as the Ethical Hunter consumes animal life that requires less total energy investment per pound consumed.

If we compare the same local, Wyoming elk hunter who ends up with 150 pounds of self-butchered meat at the end of his hunt, 79,000 calories of fossil fuel energy are required to produce that 150 pounds. (Kerasote, 1993) An equal caloric content of store bought potatoes would require 151,000 calories for production. Store bought, canned beans and rice require 477,000 calories for production. The local hunter of wild game requires less fossil fuel energy than the alternatives, this time weighed against vegetarian alternatives. The hunter loses his edge if the vegetarian is growing local, organic potatoes to produce a caloric equivalent as that requires only 42,000 calories of fossil fuel energy for seed, planting, growth and harvest. (Kerasote, 1993)

To balance some of the costs of production and transportation, we must realize the majority of hunters are not walking off the back porch to kill and butcher a deer they will then put on their dinner table, but they are also not leaving their state of residence often. The average hunter travels between 20 and 40 miles to kill a given animal, depending on species and weapon used. One who travels from his home state in pursuit of a given species would be immediately cancelling any argument the Ethical Hunter has for superiority of the ethical hunt because of energy used in production, transport or consumption of the animal. Such a hunter would have to account for his travel with an argument justifying the need for a different animal species with a more significant energy investment. As a result, the Ethical Hunter cannot be an out of state hunter without elaboration and exploration that I am not prepared to offer here and his hunt looks more like a trophy chase than an ethical hunt.

Upon killing the animal, the hunter must register the animal and then either return home to butcher it or take it to a processing plant, depending on personal ability and equipment. A successful day or week of hunting may involve between 100 and 300 miles of travel from field to table. This is a fraction of the distance covered by the average industrially farmed animal, some 50 million of which are transported up to twenty-eight hours without food or water in the process of finishing or slaughter. Each year in the US, 250 000 pigs die during transport between feeding facilities in the process of fattening a young piglet to market weight before being slaughtered. (Appleby, et al. 2008) Compared to a hunted animal that is only transported once dead, a measure of stress on the animal would differ by orders of magnitude, moving a live, domesticated animal vs. a dead wild carcass. This is impressive, more so when considering the lives of those animals who survive the trip. Riding in a semi-trailer traveling across the country may be common practice while moving modern domesticated species, but it is not a standard



animal behavior. Although the wild animal is transported some from the site of the kill to the place of processing to the place of consumption, it covers less distance than a domesticated animal. Importantly, the wild animal does this traveling as a dead carcass, not as a live, conscious animal. The Ethical Hunter then has the advantage in transport energy costs and risks along with animal stress compared to a domesticated animal, comparing thousands of animal carcasses and hundreds of miles to hundreds of thousands of animals and tens of thousands of miles.

Processing the animal, that is converting a carcass to a collection of useable pieces of meat also takes time and energy, but this is closer between the wild and domestic animal as cutting up a dead animal pays little attention to species or place of growth. Converting wild animal from field dressed to ready for cooking or consumption takes some time, money and energy, ranging from two dollars per pound of live weight animal for butchering by a professional, to more than \$10 per pound if other products are made from the animal. A hunter who owns his own equipment can recover the costs of basic butchering/processing supplies after five to seven deer and process all future animals at a cost of only his personal time. Most domesticated meat is purchased in the already steak or ground form, as a finished product ranging in price from a few dollars per pound to more than \$20 for higher end, specially produced steaks. The Ethical Hunter who processes all his meat at home then has the advantage compared to those who consume domesticated species as cost, in terms of license, ammunition, time and gas to complete the hunt and consume the dead wild animal is smaller, a few cents up to few dollars per pound for free range, antibiotic free venison.

Another way energy is required for production of agricultural animal life is the widespread use of fertilizer, genetically modified plants and genetically enhanced animals

common in modern farming. Crop species are being planted in places they would not ordinarily exist or thrive to fill the bottomless appetite for animal feed to keep the large operations quickly and cheaply producing meat. Compared to what hunted animals are eating, largely the local browse which allows and encourages their existence, there is again a tremendous disparity in energy required for production and total environmental impact. The time and energy taken to cut the maturation time of chickens in half compared to earlier generations or the selective artificial insemination used to produce the best and most milk-laden dairy cows has been significant. The more recent outbreak of genetically modified wheat, showing up years after the strains were tried in the field and away from the original locations of the trials was the linger byproduct of decades of work and investment. Wild animals exist without such investment or modification, and again, at the risk of convenience, they are the standard of purity and simplicity, void of extra or exceptional, external energy investment and with the purest possible food input.

One problem in understanding the apparent advantage of the hunted animal death and human consumption of that life compared to the animal death and consumption in industrial agriculture is scope. Industrial agriculture, by necessity, has to get the most out of each animal, the most investment return out of every inch of barn space and the most out of every acre of field. This means tremendous investment of time and resources, as seen above, along with maximizing animals per dollar and animals per square inch of a given facility. This drive for efficiency has caused some to even ponder a redefinition of animal health to include carcass productivity. Because industrial agriculture puts a premium on efficiency of space, hunting cannot provide a direct replacement as hunting requires vast acreages of land to produce animals and provide escape paths to limit certainty of the encounter; otherwise the hunt would be like slaughter instead of the hunting of wild animals. So instead of the one merely resembling the

other, the two can never become indistinguishable in terms of total number of acres used and animal lives lost.

The total number of animals hunted could not possibly be increased to match the numbers used in industrial agriculture because there is just not enough space in the world to have that much wild and unfettered land where animals will grow and flourish so that humans could kill them as the dominant meat source. In this why, hunting should appear superior in terms of resource consumption and ethical justification, not imminently practical as a universal replacement. Recall only that hunting takes significantly less animal lives, a lower resource investment in terms of production and a lower carbon and water investment to prepare in terms of transportation to a comparable amount of industrial calories for human consumption. If a US population of over 300,000,000 requires an agriculture industry of its current scale when theoretically supplemented by roughly 15,000,000 hunters, the US cannot afford to convert croplands to hunting grounds in hopes of eliminating our reliance on an industrial agriculture food supply. Although some have argued the world could convert to vegetarianism using only the land currently used for animal feed, I am not convinced land required for a conversion to hunting is used as efficiently. (Waggoner, 1994) Although the Ethical Hunter and ethical hunting have a place as the most justified consumption of animal life, they cannot be a wholesale replacement of the agricultural infrastructure already in place. For some, the ethical hunt can be a supplement or even a replacement, but for many it will remain a highly examined ideal.

Finally, the animals at the focus of the hunt have lives that are maximally wild and without intentional human constraint giving the Ethical Hunter an ideological advantage compared to consumers of domesticated animal life. Wild animals are only coincidentally in contact with humans, if in direct contact at all; from birth to the time their carcass is gutted and

carried away by the hunter they are wild. In this way, the Ethical Hunter completes the ethical hunt by taking an animal life that has been more wild and "animal-like" than those lives taken at the hands of slaughterhouse workers who kill domesticated animals which are born on some farm, live on some potentially different farm and die on yet another farm. I accept that there are few if any pockets of "pure" nature left, where the impact of man is not present at all or is functionally insignificant. There are, however, some places where deer and elk are left to do what deer and elk do; eat, sleep and reproduce, being the best elk or deer that each individual can possibly be in 2013. Specifically, a deer that is allowed to graze around southern Wisconsin eat alfalfa, corn and whatever browse is not covered by snow in the winter without confinement to pens or reliance on a caregiver for food and water is living as much "like a deer" as deer can live in the modern day. Avoiding a formal definition of wild, the life described is deer-like at the very least. If there is more to "deer-ness", I cannot conceive of it or articulate it here. Hunted animals that live free of confinement and without reliance on humans are actualizing the greatest extent of their telos, often embodying the human concept of wild and free, without limit, boundary or any real constraint. Wild animals killed at the end of a hunt lived the best possible, most animal-like life for the longest period of time giving the hunter an advantage compared to modern, industrial agriculture in terms of quality of animal life.

Domesticated species used in agriculture are not allowed to be wild and free in the sense being considered here or in any sense really. They are robbed of nearly all animal life actualizations short of breathing, most resigning their life of selective breeding or artificial insemination foregoing anything else but eating and pooping in a concrete, climate regulated pen with hundreds or thousands of others. It has been argued there is some animal telos specific to each species that is not constrained by their domestication; pigs still try to root in their pens

when in captivity and survive well enough in the wild away from farms in the south and southwest. At the same time, a modern dairy cow is bred to be walking milk carton that does not seem to be their ultimate telos. So, keeping the animals locked in pens, some never seeing the light of day, eating, sleeping and dying on some human schedule is a significant and egregious stifling of telos realization as the Ethical Hunter must argue. This fact is currently disputed, and occasionally understood, in current Agriculture literature. The reality of such telos suppression and importance of responding to this reality has been the focus of some of the most productive applied ethics work to date. Assuming that domesticated animals do not have their telos altered in some way in virtue of being domesticated, wild animals lead more animal-like lives than their domesticated counterparts because at their base, all animals are wild and live to be free, only wild animals are actually allowed to do so. There is some part of all animals, some basic piece, that defines a life without humans and this piece is present in all animals, even the smallest piglet or calf. Manifestation of this telos is limited by the confinement that is common in most modern agriculture settings. Some of the pain, suffering and instability of life which is removed by domestication, will not offset the quality of living a life that is not free. So, hunting wild animals results in a better life for the animal than consuming domesticated livestock life, giving the ethical hunt and the Ethical Hunter an advantage in ethically justifying this consumption compared to modern agricultural practices.

In terms of death itself, the domesticated species are supposed to be killed without emotion but with great mechanical certainty. Recalling the wild vs. domestic killing distinction earlier, the death of a domesticated, agriculture animal at the hands of a trained slaughterhouse worker should be, when done correctly, less painful and stressful than starving to death or getting eaten alive by a predator. This slaughter is most commonly done with a captive bolt gun to

render the animal unconscious before bleeding him out. Domestic killing is meant to be immediate, efficient and effective, usually of an animal in otherwise good health at the time of human choosing to maximize carcass quality for human ends. Wild animal deaths are quite different. The wild deaths, from predation or starvation, may be a better fit the telos of wild animals when not being hunted by humans or killed accidentally by other human action, like being hit by cars or poisoned by pollution. The death faced by wild animals is at a time convenient for predators and may occur when the animal is too weak to feed or defend itself. The death that the hunter has the chance to inflict on a wild animal should be better in terms of animal stress and suffering compared to other wild death, starvation and predation, though it still occurs at a time of human choosing. Boone and Crocket trophy books are not filled with old and frail animals, nor are the stories of killing a grand old cow elk with grisly meat a point of pride for most hunters. Instead, a young to middle -aged, otherwise healthy animal is chosen because of his health and large antlers or significant physical size. So the animal killed in the ethical hunt may be of a different sort than the animal that dies of predation or starvation but should be similar in kind to the animal killed in agriculture. If a hunter can adhere to the guidelines of an Ethical Hunter, the death he inflicts will be almost identical in outcome to the stunning and butchering that accompanies domestic killing of domesticated species and should then be considered no worse than current practices that consume animal life while being better than what the animal may experience in the wild.

Hidden in the argument for the advantage of hunting over agriculture given above is an argument about the life an animal is intended to or suited to lead. If wild animals are meant to have wild lives, they then would be required to have wild deaths, or wild deaths would be most consistent with their respective telos. Wild animals live wild lives, defined by the lack of human

interaction, and then they must die away from or in spite of humans. Hunting, then, would not be at all consistent with wild animal telos, unless the hunter could somehow account for the importance of his fulfilling the role of killer of these animals in place of an unavailable animal predator. Earlier, the hunter attempted to license the killing at the end of the hunt by asserting it was his place in the world as the ultimate predator. This was not accepted there and cannot be accepted here without additional support or elaboration. The hunter is justified in killing these wild animals in an ethical fashion because of the telos fulfillment before the kill, the nature of the death inflicted and the use of the animal by humans compared to the death other animals experience. The Ethical Hunter is the ultimate predator when he hunts in a way that maximizes telos realization during animal life through minimal human interactions, minimizes pain and suffering during the animal's death through practice, care and weapon choice and finally uses the resulting animal carcass completely and thoughtfully. Although a wild animal life may not require human action, if done in the manner elaborated here, it may include these human actions.

Now the Ethical Hunter has been defined and contrasted to other, widespread and largely accepted forms of animal life consumption. It appears the Ethical Hunter provides a superior position to justify this consumption of animal life when compared to industrial agriculture. After reformulating the hunting position, how does the Ethical Hunter fit with a modern value system that appears to be gradually pushing hunting into its grave? The apparent superiority of the Ethical Hunter may be surprising because hunting appears to have, at its root, primitive brutality driven primarily by a desire to kill. However unexpected, hunting must be acknowledged here as consistent with the absolute center of sustainable, system-oriented agriculture found in the middle of modern thought driving a revolution of sorts. Farm shares, farmer's markets and increased awareness in thoughtless consumption of all things, not just clothes and hard goods,

but in things from produce to steaks to flowers, is blossoming around the US with organic product retail sales increasing 20% annually since 1990. (Dimitri and Greene, 2002) The new found appeal of the Ethical Hunter is identical to the justification of this “locovore” behavior, just extended to animals. It is easier to trust the quality or purity of something you yourself have gathered with little or no "extra" energy investment and the least possible consumption of resources to produce, transport, and consume a given thing. This trophic responsibility is driving American citizens who can afford to be picky to face their food using less energy and higher quality when feeding themselves. (Pollan, 2002) Closer examination reveals that because ethical hunting has been shown to be superior to the use of animals in agriculture, ethical hunting may actually be more consistent with some aspects of the modern mindset.

The first consistency can be seen comparing hunting and the Ethical Hunter to current organic and free range agriculture practices. What is more wild, free and pure than a deer or elk, particularly one that has never been treated with antibiotic or any other synthesized immunizations? Grass-fed, free range and organic labels are being stuck on more and more products in the grocery as consumers re-evaluate exactly what is going into their body with the food they eat. Suddenly the public is increasingly sensitive about preservatives, artificial coloring, artificial flavors and antibiotics given to the things they eat. In this way, hunting and eating wild animals provides the ultimate pure protein source with no additives, preservatives or impurities compared to other animal protein sources in industrial agriculture.

The second consistency between modern values and the Ethical Hunter views hunting as potentially well aligned with an increased interest in and disapproval of exploitative agricultural practices when raising and consuming animal life. I have shown that all but the most regimented and extreme modern human life involves the loss of animal life at some stage. Modern society



has not sworn off using animals, but they are in the process of realizing animal lives can be consumed in better and worse ways. We have also realized that prior to killing the animal, there can be better and worse ways for the animal to live. This can be seen in both the work and success of Bernard E. Rollin, Peter Singer, Tom Regan and others who have awakened Americans to the importance of thoughtful animal consumption in all areas of life. Any manifestation of better animal life that is seen in organic farming or free range farming of cows, sheep, pigs or goats is seen to an even higher degree or greater depth when inspecting the hunted animals in life and death when pursued and killed by the Ethical Hunter. Further, death for domesticated species may end up the same for organic or factory farmed animals, at the hands of a slaughterhouse worker. In cases where it does not, the Ethical Hunter has the advantage in telos realization because the hunted animals were freer than any animal raised by humans, even when these animals were raised with the least possible restriction and allowed the best possible animal lives. The free range animals still had some human contact and were not completely free to die a "wild death" but do have a better life in terms of telos than their industrially confined counterparts but not as good as ethically hunted wildlife.

A third consistency with the Ethical Hunter and modern societal consensus is an increase in value of connection to older time, simplicity and self-sufficiency in more aspects of life. In the past, limited infrastructure meant traveling to shop at a market or consuming foreign goods was a profound expense compared to farming ones' own plants and animals. Family farms and local pockets of agriculture meant people ate what was grown locally either by the work of their hand or that of their neighbors. If not a food grower, people were food supporters/processors, if not the farm owner, a farm worker. With the advent of the suburbs, average daily life changed substantially and people became estranged from the food production process. Food could be

grown in one place and shipped all over the region, then all over the US and now all over the world. Human life has gone from working with animals like horses, cows and chickens to owning domesticated pet species like cats, dogs and hamsters. In 2013, the reality that someone can walk into the supermarket and purchase a package of animal parts for eating rather than a whole animal furthers this rift between human and their food. The US created a breadbasket that spanned several states instead of only the bountiful side of town for growing crops. Hundreds of thousands of cattle are raised and slaughtered for distribution via train car instead of visiting the local rancher. Hunting and killing locally common species, near your home is more like the culture of the past, where area residents were at the mercy of the bounty of their local ecosystem, not what could be thrown on a truck or boat or train and transported half way around the globe. Hunting spans this gap from modern to historical, connecting consumers directly with their food through the hunt. The Ethical Hunter does not hunt only because he values killing, but experiences the value of the significance of personally taking a life because he has hunted.

An attack on hunting relies on the assumption that ending hunting would end senseless or painful loss of animal life, which is completely mistaken. Eating anything, animal or not, requires some loss of animal life as shown above. Regardless of the type of killing, it is up to humans to choose what animal lives are ended, when they are ended, how they are ended and whether the animal is killed on purpose or collaterally in production of other food. The issue of hunting, like most other “ethical” questions, has not faced the facts and been subjected to inter-subjective criticism as it is often thought of as an unalienable right, one filled with tradition and habits but short on reflection, which I aimed to define here. The Ethical Hunter, a well practiced, competent marksman using a scoped centerfire rifle to take shots with the highest likelihood of being immediately fatal to a chosen individual of a wild game species. All of this will be done

while observing all legal constraints required to hunt an animal that he will consume as completely as possible. The ethical hunt is the most ethically tenable resolution to both the prescribed internal and vocal, external criticisms of the hunt. The Ethical Hunter accounts for all of the shortcomings of the modern hunt and hunter resolving them in a way that is often superior and occasionally no worse than the lives and deaths faced by domesticated animals in agricultural settings, the other standard consumption of animal life. Further, the connection to the simplicity and significance of death, the process of food acquisition along with the purity of the product of a successful hunt are in direct alignment, rather than conflict, with the ever growing locovore revolution focusing on local, organic food production and consumption. Using the arguments created here, I intended to create a foundation to ground an expanded consciousness now on the horizon. In the face of tradition, habit and in some places a right, we must become thoughtful, reflective and analytical of a process that takes another animal's life knowing we as humans are the only ones capable of such analyses or stopping such practices. Ultimately, humans are going to kill animals for food as we have for generations, since long before man was a farmer. If we continue to do so, we must kill these animals in a morally and ethically sound way, in the process of the ethical hunt completed by the Ethical Hunter. Doing so will make the hunt as close to domestic slaughter while still allowing a chance that there may be no animal death; recognizing the animal is not an end, not a product, but part of a planned, intentional process. The Ethical Hunter should not be cast aside as a relic but rather embraced as the most justified consumption of animal life, a collection of searching, connection, awareness, and minimized environmental impact not justified because of any one of these reasons, but because of how all of them make ethical hunting superior to current alternatives. (Krech, 2000; Shepard with Sanders, 1985; Ortega y Gasset, 1972)

## **Bibliography**

- Appleby, M.C., Cussen, V., Garcés, L., Lambert, L., and Turner, J. (eds). 2008 *Long Distance Transport and Welfare of Farm Animals*. CAB International, Wallingford.
- Bradford, Eric, et al. 1999. *Animal Agriculture and Global Food Supply*. Ames, IA: Council for Agricultural Science and Technology, No. 135.
- Callicot, J. Baird. 1989. "Animal Liberation: A Triangular Affair." *In Defense of the Land Ethic: Essays in Environmental Philosophy*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Capper, J.L. 2011. "The environmental impact of beef production in the United States: 1977 compared with 2007". *Journal of Animal Science*. 2011 Dec;89(12):4249-61.
- Cartmill, Matt. 1993. *A View to a Death in the Morning: Hunting and Nature Through History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Causey, Ann S. 1989. "On the Morality of Hunting." *Environmental Ethics*. 11:327-343.
- Davis, Steven L. 2003. "The Least Harm Principle May Require that Humans Consume a Diet Containing Large Herbivores, Not a Vegan Diet." *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*. 16. 4:387-94
- Diamond, Jared. 1987. "The Worst Mistake in the History of the Human Race." *Discover*. May. pp. 64-66.
- Diamond, Jared. 1999. *Guns, Germs and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Dimitri, Carolyn and Greene, Catherine. 2002. *Recent Growth Patterns in the U.S. Organic Foods Market*. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, Market and Trade Economics Division and Resource Economics Division. Agriculture Information. Bulletin Number 777
- Dizard, Jan. 1994. *Going Wild: Hunting, Animal Rights and the Contested Meaning of Nature*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts.
- Duda, Mark Damian, Steven J. Bissell, and Kira C. Young. 1998. *Wildlife and the American mind: Public opinion on and attitudes toward fish and wildlife management*. Harrisonburg, Virginia: Responsive Management.
- Evans, J. Claude. 2005. *With Respect for Nature: Living as Part of the Natural World*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Fox, Camilla. 2002. "The Case Against Sport Hunting." *Animal Issues*. 33:2. Summer.
- Gates, Elgin. 1971. *Trophy Hunter in Asia*. Winchester Press.

- Geist, Valerius. 1978. *Life Strategies, Human Evolution, Environmental Design: Toward a Biological Theory of Health*. New York: Springer Verlag.
- Geist, Valerius. 1995. *North American Policies of Wildlife Management. Wildlife Conservation Policy*. Ed. Valerius Geist and I. McTaggart-Cowan. Calgary:Detselig. Pp.77-129
- Geist, Valerius. 2000. "Under What System of Wildlife Management are Ungulates Least Domesticated." *Antelopes, Deer and Relatives: Fossil Record, Behavioral Ecology, Systematics and Conservation*. Ed. Elisabeth Vrba and George Schaller. New Haven: Yale University. Pp.310-19.
- Geist, Valerius. 2004. "The Future of Wild Elk, Elk Country, and the Hunt: A Conversation with Valerius Geist." See Peterson 2004.
- Gunn, Alastair S. 2001. "Environmental Ethics and Trophy Hunting". *Ethics and the Environment*. 6 (no.1):68-95.
- Hettinger, Ned. 1994. "Valuing Predation in Rolston's Environmental Ethics: Bambi Lovers versus Tree Huggers." *Environmental Ethics*. Spring. 16:3-20.
- Kellert, Stephen. 1976. *Attitudes and Characteristics of Hunters and Anti-Hunters and Related Policy Suggestions*. PhD thesis. Yale university Behavioral Sciences Study Center. Fish and Wildlife Servicers of US Dept. of the Interior.
- Kerasote, Ted. 1993. *Bloodties: Nature, Culture and the Hunt*. New York: Kodansha International.
- King, Roger J.H. 1991. "Environmental Ethics and the Case for Hunting Environmental Ethics." *Environmental Ethics*. Spring. 13: 59-85
- Kowalsky, Nathan, ed. 2010. *Hunting-Philosophy for Everyone: In Search of the Wild Life*. Hoboken, NJ:Wiley-Blackwell.
- Krech, Spehard III. 2000. *The Ecological Indian: Myth and History*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Krueger, Wendy J. 1995. *Aspects of Wounding of White-tailed Deer by Bowhunters*. Thesis. West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia. Rpt, Farmland Wildlife Populations & Research Group, Madelia, MN.
- Krutch, Joseph Wood. 1957. "The Sportsman or the Predator?" I. A Damnable Pleasure." *The Saturday Review*. August 17.
- Leopold, Aldo. 1970. *A Sand County Almanac with Essays on Conservation from Round River*. New York: Ballantine Books.

- List, Charles. 1997 "Is Hunting a Right Thing?" *Environmental Ethics*. Winter 19: 405-16.
- List, Charles. 2004. "On the Moral Distinctiveness of Sport Hunting." *Environmental Ethics*. Summer. 26: 155-69.
- Littlebird, Larry. 2001. *Hunting Sacred, Everything Listens*. Santa Fe, NM. Western Edge Press.
- Loftin, Robert W. 1984. "The Morality of Hunting." *Environmental Ethics*. Fall. 6: 241-50
- Lopez, Barry. 1987. *Arctic Dreams: Imagination and Desire in a Northern Landscape*. Toronto, New York. Bantam Books.
- Luke, Brian. 1997. "A Critical Analysis of Hunters' Ethics." *Environmental Ethics*. Spring. 19: 25-44
- Magnuson, Jon. 1991. "Reflections of an Oregon Bow Hunter." *Christian Century*, March 13.
- Marvin, Garry. 2006. *Wild Killing: Contesting the Animal in Hunting*. The Animal Studies Group Killing Animals. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press (pp. 10 – 29)
- McShea, William and H. Brian Underwood, and John H. Rappole. 1997. *The Science of Overabundance: Deer Ecology and Population Management*. Washington and London: Smithsonian.
- MNDNR (Minnesota Department of Natural Resources). 1992. *Constituent inventory: What Minnesotans think about hunting, fishing and native plant management*. St. Paul, Minnesota: Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Division of Fish and Wildlife.
- Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks. 2008. Hunter and Hunter Education. Montana Hunter Education. Kalkomey Enterprises, Inc.  
<http://fwpiis.mt.gov/content/getItem.aspx?id=30929> accessed 6/1/13.
- Moriarty, Paul Veatch and Mark Woods. 1997. "Hunting ≠ Predation." *Environmental Ethics*. Winter. 19: 391-405.
- Nelson, Richard. 1997. *Heart and Blood: Living with Deer in America*. New York: Vintage.
- Ortega y Gasset, Jose. 1972. *Meditations on Hunting*. trans. Howard Westcott, New York: Scribner.
- Pauley, John A. 2003. "The Value of Hunting." *Journal of Value Inquiry*. 27:233-244.
- Peterson, David. 2000. *Heartsblood: Hunting, Spirituality and Wildness in America*. Boulder, CO: Johnson Books.
- Peterson, David. 2003. "Valerius Geist." *Bugle: The Journal of the Rocky Mountain Elk*

- Foundation. 20:6. Nov/Dec.
- Peterson, David. 2004. "The Future of Wild Elk, Elk Country and the Hunt: A Conversation with Valerius Geist." *Bugle: The Journal of the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation*. 21:1. Jan/Feb.
- Pollan, Michael. 2002. "An Animal's Place." *New York Times Magazine*. November 10, 2002.
- Pollan, Michael. 2006. *The Omnivore's Dilemma: A Natural History of Four Meals*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Posewitz, Jim. 1994. *Beyond Fair Chase: The Ethic and Tradition of Hunting*. Helena and Billings, MT: Falcon Press.
- Quammen, David. 2003. *Monster of God: The Man-Eating Predator in the Jungles of History and the Mind*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Regan, Tom. 1983. *The Case for Animal Rights*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Responsive Management. 2003. Public awareness of, attitudes toward, and propensity to become a member of the Izaak Walton League of America: Research implications for increasing public awareness of and membership in the Izaak Walton League of America. Harrisonburg, Virginia: Responsive Management. (Izaak Walton League of America allowed the release of some of the data from this study, which otherwise was proprietary.)
- Responsive Management/National Shooting Sports Foundation. 2008. *The Future of Hunting and the Shooting Sports: Research-Based Recruitment and Retention Strategies*. Produced for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under Grant Agreement CT-M-6-0. Harrisonburg, VA.
- Rollin, Bernard. 1981. *Animal Rights & Human Morality*. Prometheus Books.
- Rollin, Bernard E. 1995. *The Frankenstein Syndrome. Ethical and Social Issues in the Genetic Engineering of Animals*. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press.
- Rolston, Holmes. 1988. *Environmental Ethics: Duties to and Values in the Natural World*. Philadelphia: Temple University.
- Roosevelt, Theodore. 1926. *The Works of Theodore Roosevelt: Memorial Edition*. Vol. III. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923-26), pp 269-70.
- Scully, Matthew. 2002. *Dominion: The Power of Man, the Suffering of Animals and the Call to Mercy*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.

- Shepard, Paul. 1973. *The Tender Carnivore and the Sacred Game*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Shepard, Paul. 1996. *Traces of an Omnivore*. Washington, DC: Island Press/Shearwater.
- Shepard, Paul with Barry Sanders. 1985. *The Sacred Paw: The Bear in Nature, Myth, and Literature*. New York: Viking Press.
- Southwick Associates. 2012. *Hunting in America: An Economic Force for Conservation*. Produced for the National Shooting Sports Foundation in partnership with the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies.
- The Shooting Party. 1985. Directed by Alan Bridges. U.K.
- Singer, Peter. 2002. *Animal Liberation*. New York: Ecco Press.
- Swan, James. 1994. *In Defense of Hunting*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Taylor, Angus. 1996. "Animal Rights and Human Needs." *Environmental Ethics* 18: 249 - 60.
- Taylor, Paul. 1986. *Respect for Nature: A Theory of Environmental Ethics*. Princeton: Princeton University.
- Terbough, John, et al. 2001. "Ecological Meltdown in Predator-Free Forest Fragments." *Science*. 294. November.
- Vitali, Theodore. 1990. "Sport Hunting: Moral or Immoral?" *Environmental Ethics*. Spring.12: 69-82.
- Waggoner, Paul. E. 1994. *How Much Land Can Ten Billion People Spare for Nature*. Ames, IA. Council for Agricultural Sciences and Technology, No. 121.
- Weaver, John (1996). "The Wolves of Yellowstone". In Schullery, Paul. *The Yellowstone Wolf-A Guide and Sourcebook*. Worland, WY: High Plains Publisher.
- Williams, Joy. 1995. "The Killing Game." In Pam Houston, ed. *Women on Hunting*. Hopewell, N.J. Ecco Press.248-6
- Wood, Forest, Jr. 1997. *The Delights and Dilemmas of Hunting*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Young, Gayne C. 2013. "Doing My Part," *Peterson's Hunting*, March 2013. pp.56-61.