

ACCEPTED VERSION

Rachel Ankeny & Heather Bray

Ferals or food? Does hunting have a role in ethical food consumption in Australia?, in *Wild Animals and Leisure: Rights and Wellbeing* / Carr, N., Young, J. (ed./s), Ch.12, pp.210-224, Routledge, 2018.

© 2018 selection and editorial matter, Neil Carr and Janette Young; individual chapters, the contributors

*"This is an Accepted Manuscript of a book chapter published by Routledge/CRC Press in **Wild Animals and Leisure: Rights and Wellbeing** on 5 March 2018,, available online:*

<https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/e/9781315457413>

PERMISSIONS

https://www.routledge.com/info/open_access

Open Access by the Chapter

Click to learn more about our new [OA by the Chapter policies](#)

2) Archiving of a chapter on a website or in a repository. (The 'Green' OA Model).

Green open access refers to self-archiving of a chapter and often applies to earlier versions of the chapter.

Chapters from all Taylor & Francis books are eligible for green open access.

Each individual author or contributor can also choose to upload one chapter from the 'Accepted Manuscript' (AM). An AM is typically the post-contract but pre-production (i.e. not copy – edited, proofread or typeset) Word Document/PDF of the chapter. Authors may upload the AM chapter to a personal or departmental website immediately after publication of the book - this includes posting to Facebook, Google groups, and LinkedIn, and linking from Twitter. Authors can also post the AM book chapter to an institutional or subject repository or to academic social networks like Mendeley, ResearchGate, or Academia.edu **after an embargo period of 18 months for Humanities and Social Sciences books or 12 months for STEM books.**

Authors may not post the final published book chapter to any site, unless it has been published as gold open access on our website.

To encourage citation of an author's work we recommend that authors insert a link from their posted AM to the published book on the Taylor & Francis website with the following text: "This is an Accepted Manuscript of a book chapter published by Routledge/CRC Press in [BOOK TITLE] on [date of publication], available online: [http://www.routledge.com/\[BOOK ISBN URL\]](http://www.routledge.com/[BOOK ISBN URL]) or "[http://www.crcpress.com/\[BOOK ISBN URL\]](http://www.crcpress.com/[BOOK ISBN URL])"

17 October 2019

Ferals or food? Does hunting have a role in ethical food consumption in Australia?

Heather J. Bray, Sebastian Konyon, Yvette Wijnandts, and Rachel A. Ankeny

Food Values Research Group, Department of History, School of Humanities, Faculty of Arts. University of Adelaide, Adelaide, South Australia

Abstract

Although hunting is pursued by relatively few people in Australia, increasing attention to ‘ethical’ consumption is renewing interest in hunting as a source of ‘ethical’ meat and complicating our views about it as a leisure activity. Most scholarly attention about hunting practices has been focused in Europe and North America, and we argue that Australia provides a unique context for exploring hunting and its association with ethical consumption because of attitudes to native versus introduced animals and gun ownership. With increasing public attention to both animal welfare and ethical consumption, it is timely to revisit public attitudes to hunting as a leisure activity in Australia and explore the values and motivations of recreational hunters.

Introduction

There is increasing awareness of ‘ethical’ food production and consumption in most of the more developed countries, including Australia, but extremely different ideas exist about what is considered to be ‘ethical’. Although hunting as a leisure activity is pursued only by a small percentage of the Australian population, even within these groups there are radically different motivations for and understandings of this activity. In this chapter, we explore the motivations underlying hunting among Australians via a review of scholarly literature, media articles from within Australia, as well as industry, government and regulatory body reports, and show how at least some hunters see their activities as consistent with ethical consumption, for instance

because it promotes sustainability, eating local, controlling non-indigenous and feral animals, and/or taking greater responsibility for animal death. Our findings reveal the complexities associated with hunting practices, and underscore the need to pursue a deeper understanding of the values and motivations associated with these practices to facilitate a constructive dialogue about the role of hunting in food production and consumption in Australia.

Hunting as a leisure activity

Even a brief exploration of the scholarly literature reveals divergent terminology about, and rationales related to, hunting. In the broadest sense, a distinction is made between recreational and subsistence hunting (i.e., hunting for food necessary for survival). Recreational hunting includes sport hunting, which is said to be motivated by “the joy and thrill of hunting itself!” (Vitali 1990, 73) and for which the development of hunting skills is of primary importance (Leader-Williams 2009; Wade 1990). It also includes nature hunting, which fosters an “intimate experience of the complexity of ecological relationships and dependencies within a natural context” (Kellert 1996, in Simpson and Cain 2000, 185).

Hunting as a leisure activity is seen as a temporary return to nature, as “a ‘vacation’ or a diversion from the hunter’s predicament as a civilized being subject to the constraints of history, culture, and community. We hunt in order to distance ourselves from our humanity” (King 2010, 151). The use of the word ‘predicament’ is notable here, and presents a view of hunters as individuals constrained or misunderstood by a society with radically different values. Hunting can provide opportunities to “get away from the hustle and bustle of everyday living” (internet comment, in Adams 2013, 49) to have “a purpose to be in the bush” (Steve, a hunter, in Marx 2012). This shift to hunting as a form of wildlife recreation arose in the latter decades of the 20th century, as urban dwellers took up hunting to re-connect with nature and to escape the pressures of city life (Franklin 1996). Hunting encourages individuals to go into the wild, connecting them far more intimately than other forms of involvement with nature (Kover 2010; Simpson and Cain 2000). As John, a duck hunter, states: “It’s tradition to put food on the table. There’s nothing better than connecting with the environment... It might be the 21st century, but we’re still hunter-gatherers. It’s part of the life cycle” (in

Munro 2012). However, the practices of contemporary hunters are fundamentally different to those of hunter-gatherer societies, despite attempts to utilise hunter-gatherers as a rationale in hunting discourses (Reis 2009).

The relationship between hunting and killing is complex. It is almost impossible to read anything on hunting as a leisure activity without coming across the work of Ortega y Gasset, especially his assertion that “one does not hunt in order to kill; on the contrary, one kills in order to have hunted” (Ortega y Gasset 1995, in Reis 2009, 584). However, the idea of killing as a necessary component of the hunt is contested by the work of Reis with hunters in New Zealand, who found that hunting for them was much more about the overall experience, and therefore they “need not kill in order to have hunted. The kill is just an episode within the hunting experience” (Reis 2009, 584). This attitude is quite widespread amongst hunters. For example, Adams reports an online comment from a hunter whose grandfather used to say “the hunt is more important than the kill” (internet comment, in Adams 2013, 50). Even so, the intent to kill often remains, regardless of success, and is important to the desired experience. Franklin asserts that non-consumptive forms of wildlife leisure “derive from relations that create distance rather than proximity, separation rather than interaction and spectacle rather than sensual, embodied relations” (Franklin 2008, 36).

In contrast, there are increasing numbers of hunters who are primarily driven by the acquisition of meat (Cerulli 2010a). Some authors claim that self-provisioning hunters, for whom the goal is supplementing food stores, rather than the sole source (Curnutt 1996), are a type of recreational hunter, as their practices are not necessary for survival. Michael Adams describes his hunting for self-provisioning as “opposed to ‘subsistence’, because we don’t need to do this, we choose to do it” (Adams 2013, 49). However, the recreation–subsistence demarcation is not firm. Both types of hunters share many of the material and psychological benefits of hunting (Cerulli 2010a; List 2004). Subsistence hunters often enjoy the hunt, and there is strong consensus amongst both hunters and non-hunters that recreational hunters should eat the meat from the animals that they kill (Cohen 2014; Fischer et al. 2013).

Why might hunted meat be more 'ethical' than farmed meat?

Recent decades have seen a surge in attention to food ethics. Popular books such as Michael Pollan's *The Omnivore's Dilemma* and films including *Forks over Knives*, *Cowspiracy*, and *Food Inc.* have made such discourses commonplace. In addition, the internet and magazines have provided new sources of information about alternative food movements (Teitelbaum and Beckley 2006). Coupled with the socio-economic prosperity in post-industrial countries, consumers now have the ability to be more discerning in their food choices (Manfredo, Teel, and Bright 2003). There are two consequences of these trends relevant for our analysis. First, criticisms increasingly have been directed at conventional meat production methods, especially in relation to ethics, health, and the environment (Gressier 2016), including their contribution to greenhouse gas emissions and climate change (e.g., Bauer and English 2011; Garnaut 2008). Second, anti-neoliberal movements such as locavorism and the slow food movement, which represent rejections of the assumptions underlying modern food production and distribution such as low cost and convenience (Guthman 2008; Leroy and Degreef 2015). A large focus in these movements is 'self-provisioning,' producing material goods that are consumed or shared, but not sold (Teitelbaum and Beckley 2006); as a result, hunting has come to be viewed by some as an alternative means of sourcing meat.

It is not only alternative food movements that are promoting game consumption. Food writers and celebrity chefs - "modern food heroes" - are playing a role in this new promotion of game by "embracing pre-industrial values" (Dubecki 2013). Drivers range from blogs and local newspapers (Dubecki and Han 2013) to television programs such as "Masterchef" (Gressier 2016, 50) and promotion by globally-recognised figures such as Jamie Oliver (Lunney 2012, 13; see also Phillipov 2016 for further discussion of television cooking shows and food politics). For some segments of society, "gastronomic novelty" is a significant motivator for growing interest in wild meat consumption (Gressier 2016, 59). In some locales, game is a delicacy due to how difficult it can be to acquire.

In Europe and the US, recent increases in demands for game meat stem from consumer preferences for healthier and more ethical meat sources (Hoffman and Wiklund 2006). In a recent survey in New York

State, 88% of respondents stated that their primary motivations to hunt were to harvest local, natural meat (Quartuch et al. 2016). As Cerulli asks, “where else can you get organic, free-range, grass-fed, arguably cruelty-free, roughly 100-mile diet?” (Cerulli 2010b, 3). A trend away from intensively-farmed meat has been noted in Australia where wild-caught game is seen by some members of the public as a more ethical alternative (Gressier 2016), a view echoed in philosophical literature (Bruckner 2007). “Within this ideology, hunting meat is seen as more noble than purchasing it, while wild meat is seen as preferable to farmed” (Gressier 2016, 58). Meat is one of the products which consumers desire the most to be natural (Rozin et al. 2004) and hunted meat has been found to be considered more deserving of adjectives such as ‘good’ or ‘green’ than intensively-farmed meat (Fischer et al. 2013). This type of discourse is especially relevant in Australia, given that Western-style agriculture has only been utilized relatively recently and hence is considered by some to be ‘unnatural’ (Saltzman, Head, and Stenseke 2011).

A review of the scholarly literature reveals two main perspectives on hunting as compared to animal farming. First, deaths of animals from hunting are morally superior to those raised for meat and killed in slaughterhouses (Bruckner 2007; see also Bauer and English 2011 for discussion of problems with modern meat production). An Australian survey found 51% agree or strongly agree that ‘factory-farming’ methods are unnatural, and 52% that they are cruel (Franklin 2007). This contrast with ‘factory-farms’ is a common theme in hunting literature: “What is worse? Hunting? Or the bio-industry where pigs who never saw daylight are being fully automatically butchered?” (Koelewijn 2014, in Van Heijgen 2015, 45). Or as an internet post, quoted in Adams (2013, 50) puts it: “Hunting? A creature is peacefully in its own domain, it is shot. How is that worse than being carried for hours in a truck, being forced into a crush, hearing the bellows of other creatures, being physically restrained at the peak of terror, then culled? Or bred in an area hardly big enough for the creature to move, then bundled off to be slaughtered en masse?”

A second perspective is that the problem of animal death cannot be avoided even by abstaining from meat consumption, and thus hunting is preferable. Adams writes that “it is not really possible to avoid the deaths of animals in human lives, although you can distance yourself at various scales from those deaths. At its best, hunting can do the opposite: you do the killing yourself, taking personal moral responsibility” (Adams

2013, 48). Because even plant food production requires the killing of pests, loss of habitat for wild animals, and accidental deaths due to farm machinery, some hunters see killing a smaller number of larger animals as an ethically preferable alternative (Cerulli 2010b; Davis 2003). Hunting is also seen as a way to confront the nature of these necessary deaths. Thus, killing one's own meat is "being reconfigured as honourable engagements within an albeit unpleasant reality" (Gressier 2016, 58), in that it makes "the materiality of food production explicit" (Peterson et al. 2010, 127). If you are a hunter, "You can no longer go to the supermarket to buy meat and ignore the consequences," states Rohan Anderson, who moved out of Melbourne and now only eats meat he raises or hunts himself (Dupleix 2012). For some hunters, involving their children in hunting activities provides an opportunity to teach ethical meat consumption, as described by a participant in Bray et al (2016, 6) "[The children] ... understand the implications of taking a life to feed a life."

Hunting in Australia

Finding exact numbers of hunters in Australia is difficult, but a recent survey estimates that there are 200,000 – 350,000 recreational hunters in Australia, or 1.5% of the population (Finch et al. 2014), which may be linked to the highly limited amount of land where recreational hunting is permitted compared to other countries (Woods and Kerr 2010; Burgin 2015). Even with low hunter numbers compared to Scandinavia and North America, there are over 50 recreational hunting clubs in Australia, most of which are based in the states of Victoria and New South Wales (Craig-Smith and Dryden 2008). Little empirical research has been done on hunting in Australia compared to scholarship in Europe and North America (Fitzgerald, Fitzgerald, and Davidson 2007). Of this research, the majority is concerned with the hunting practices of Indigenous Australian people. As the relationships between humans and animals vary "according to historical, regional and cultural contingencies" (Franklin 1996, 43), it is impossible to understand the place of hunting in Australia, either for food or leisure, without understanding the contingencies that make Australia unique. These circumstances also mean that much of the research done on hunting in Europe and North America may not be directly applicable to the Australian context.

Animals in Australia

One critical issue is the place of animals in the history of Australian colonisation and the impact that this legacy has had on today's attitudes towards hunting in the country. Australia was colonised for its value as a penal colony, not for the economic value of its land or wildlife, both of which were unfamiliar to Europeans (Burgin 2015). Thus, early settlers often did not appreciate native animals either economically or recreationally (Franklin 2011; Smith 2011), although there is increasing evidence that some native animals were in fact consumed in the early colony (Newling 2011; Santich 2012; Cushing 2016). As time went on, native animals came to be seen as food for the poor (Bauer and English 2011) and agricultural pests. The small number of native species that were suitable for sport were soon hunted to extinction (Franklin 1996). As a result, species such as foxes, rabbits, and deer were introduced by the colonial upper classes for private hunting (Burgin 2015; Franklin 1996).

In the decades preceding Federation in 1901, attitudes towards native animals underwent a marked shift. In an attempt to create a national identity, native species were valorised as part of an 'Australianisation' discourse (Franklin 1996, 2008; Gressier 2016). In the early part of the 20th century, particularly during the Depression, introduced species such as rabbit became the "poor-man's meat" (Gressier 2016, 50) and the public rallied around campaigns to prevent hunting of possums and koalas for skins, creating an anti-hunting sentiment that has lasted in Australia until the present day (Burgin 2015). Despite this complex history, together with Australia's status as one of the most urbanised countries in the world, hunting tends to be associated with "a formative origin myth in Australian culture" (Franklin 1996, 54), one that valorises the outback and the farmer who lives off the land. Hunting culture in Australia is not as focused on education as it is in Europe and the United States, and has relatively little contact with international hunting organisations (Bauer and English 2011).

An additional issue arising out of Australia's colonial history is the dichotomy between native and introduced species. All game species (particularly deer and pigs) in Australia are introduced species (Bauer and English 2011; Craig-Smith and Dryden 2008). Native species are much more valued than introduced species, and thus their hunting is far more controversial (Fitzgerald, Fitzgerald, and Davidson 2007; Franklin

1996; Franklin 2007). Native species are often rejected precisely because they are closely identified with the nation. One respondent interviewed by Waitt and Appleby expressed disgust at the prospect of eating kangaroo meat: “I’m an Aussie and I don’t think... I wouldn’t eat my national emblem” (Waitt and Appleby 2014, 95). An additional issue is the distinction made between ‘useful’ introduced species and ‘ferals,’ inasmuch as cows, sheep, and other farm-related animals provoke different reactions. This discrepancy may be due, at least in part, to the way that domestic working animals factor into the creation myth of Australian identity and form a central part of the economy (Gressier 2016).

Once introduced species have become well-established in local ecosystems, doubt can be created in the public consciousness even about their introduced status. For instance, surveyed landholders in Queensland (Finch and Baxter 2007) associated deer more with native species (50% agree, 40% disagree) than feral pests (39% agree, 51% disagree), believed that wild deer populations should be preserved for future generations to enjoy (56% agree, 32% disagree), and were not considered ‘significant’ pests in comparison to wild cats, pigs, and rabbits. These perceptions may be related to the history of deer legislation in Queensland where deer were protected fauna from 1952 to 1992, giving them a legal status similar to that accorded to native species (Finch and Baxter 2007). In contrast, only 19% of respondents in an older Victorian survey believed that “introduced animals should be considered to be ‘native’ if their populations were established for 100 years or more” (Johnston and Marks 1997, in Fitzgerald, Fitzgerald, and Davidson 2007, 14). Some authors suggest that native species, such as kangaroo, should be re-defined as game for environmental and economic reasons (Bauer and English 2011), and hence not protected by legislation covering native species.

Motivations for hunting in Australia

Pest control is the major self-reported motivation of Australian hunters (Finch et al. 2014). Thus, unlike Britain and the United States, hunting in Australia is seen more as work than leisure or pleasure (Franklin 1996). A study of wild pig management found that “benefits from the ‘wild boar’ meat export industry and recreational hunting are attractive and appear to be a factor in people’s control/management preferences for

feral pigs” (Fitzgerald, Fitzgerald, and Davidson 2007, 32). However, with the exception of pigs, hunting does not comprise a major part of the management for introduced species (Franklin 2011), although recreational hunting and game meat harvesting were the favoured techniques to manage deer populations among surveyed landholders in Queensland (Finch and Baxter 2007). As the species recreationally hunted in Australia are all introduced, a large part of the justification for hunting is that hunters are serving a vital ecological function by preventing overpopulation. This argument is very common in the hunting literature (Bauer and English 2011; Enck, Decker, and Brown 2000; Heberlein 1991; Oldfield 2015; Peterson 2004; Vitali 1990), and also contributes towards the mitigation of negative views towards hunters, as they are both “killers of European interlopers [and] at the same time heroic defenders of a fragile Australian natural purity” (Franklin 1996, 52). Although recent data is lacking, a survey conducted in 2000 found 68% of Australians agree or strongly agree that it is acceptable to hunt feral species that degrade the environment (Franklin 2007). Furthermore, some contend that objections to hunting based on the potential damage it can create for the ecosystem are not as relevant in Australia as elsewhere, as all hunted species are introduced (Vitali 1990). However, there is tension between pest management efforts and maintaining populations for recreational hunters. Hunting advocacy groups have been successful at lobbying state governments, especially in Victoria, to create management policy which serves the interests of hunters, but which has been noted to be ineffective at reducing deer numbers (Barber 2016; Bilney 2013; Burgin et al. 2015; Shoebridge and Hopley 2014).

A final rationale relevant to hunting in Australia relates to waste and food security, as large swathes of the continent are unsuitable for farming. Hunted animals are a useful part of the food production network by converting inedible protein, such as grass, into edible meat (Adams 2013). As feral animal populations are so large, they could easily be used as a renewable meat source. Bauer and English estimate that up to 10 million wild pigs could be harvested for meat each year without endangering the population (2011). Even if we do not hunt feral animals specifically to eat in Australia, meat from culled animals could still be consumed domestically or exported to avoid wasting edible meat (Houghton 2014; Lagan 2016), so long as they were killed in a manner that would allow the meat to be usable.

Attitudes to hunting in Australia

There is evidence that public attention to hunting is growing, but that public opinion is becoming more critical of hunting, however recent Australian empirical data on this issue is scant. Although we argue throughout this chapter that the context for hunting in Australia differs from that of Europe and North America, studies in these locales show that attitudes differ according to the purpose and target species, as well as other variables such as rurality, gender, and game meat consumption (Gamborg and Jensen 2017; Ljung et al. 2012). A 2000 survey found that 14% of Australians would be less likely to hunt than “a few years ago” and only 2% were more likely to hunt (Franklin 2007, 21). Many people are more likely to modify their activities to be more ‘animal-friendly,’ such as eating less meat, buying free-range eggs, avoiding animal-tested products, and donating to animal charities than previously (Franklin 2007). A content analysis of coverage by the Tasmanian newspaper *The Mercury* in the second half of the 20th century also shows “rises in zoocentrism and sentimentality... [and] attention to native animals and... decline in stories on angling and hunting” (Franklin and White 2001, 235).

Hunting remains a controversial issue. Hunters “must convince their critics that deer hunting is not cruel, that hunters are not blood-thirsty killers but are responsible citizens who respect the deer and other wildlife” (Harrison and Slee 1995, iv). The question of the social acceptability of hunting is made easier in Australia insofar as the primary game species are introduced, and the discourse of native versus non-native allows hunters to claim they are serving a vital ecological function. Some also point out that recent legislation and regulation of hunting in Australia (e.g., the creation of the New South Wales Game Council) have made processes more transparent and contributed to legitimising hunting in the public consciousness (Bauer and English 2011). Additionally, hunting for food is far less controversial, whereas hunters who do not eat the animals they kill are widely condemned (Fischer et al. 2013). These factors combine in opposition to hunting activities such as the Victorian duck hunts, which not only kill native species, but result in many birds being discarded rather than consumed (Munro 1997). A 2013 editorial in Australian newspaper *The Age* condemned duck hunting as serving “no real purpose other than to stir the adrenalin of gumbooted shooters” (“Failure on so many levels” 2013).

Another important factor shaping Australian attitudes toward hunting relates to perceptions of gun ownership, which became more negative following the 1996 Port Arthur massacre and the subsequent amnesties and buybacks of guns together with tightening of Australia's state and territory gun laws, which are now among the strictest worldwide (Alpers 2013; Chapman 2013). Australians generally have held more negative images of hunters than Europeans and Americans (Bauer and English 2011; Burgin 2015). Hunting culture is linked to Anglo-Saxon traditions of small numbers of hunters who follow a 'sporting' code and hunt on private land, but is also strongly related to pest control (Sharp and Wollscheid 2009). Despite this history, hunting more generally in Australia is perceived as a middle or lower class pursuit (Franklin 1996), often associated with 'bogans' (a slang term for the lower class (Adams 2013)) or recent migrants. Goat hunting, for example, is especially popular with hunters of "southern European and Middle Eastern backgrounds" (Bauer and English 2011, 113) due to the popularity of goat meat in their traditional cuisines.

Gun culture is a matter of some debate in Australia. For instance in the *Bateman's Bay Post* in response to a local hunting expo, defenders of hunting claimed that "contrary to popular publicity, the 'gun culture' is tolerant, responsible and respectful of others and the law. Shooters are targets for prejudice and vilification because 'guns are bad'" (Burg 2013). On the other hand, critics ask, "how responsible is it to encourage children to think killing animals is fun?" (Cruttenden 2013). Wildlife management in Australia has more of a focus on being 'humane' than is the case in the United States (Fitzgerald, Fitzgerald, and Davidson 2007), with the level of community resistance to management techniques increasing with lethality (Burgin et al. 2015). Thus, some have concluded that Australia has more recently become a "bastion" of animal-rights groups (Bauer and English 2011, 228). This is a change even from the 1990s when Franklin observed that in Australia "anti-hunting activity is discernibly low key" (1996, 52).

The 'right' way to hunt? Eating as a justification for recreational hunting

At the intersection of these discourses, we are confronted with an overarching and fundamental question: is there a 'correct' way to hunt? Arthur Bentley, the founder of the Australian Deer Research Foundation, a hunters' advocacy group, acknowledged that a certain level of professionalism was required of hunters "in

today's climate of protest and confrontation” (Harrison and Slee 1995, iii). Hunting involves “an ethical code, which the hunter formulates for himself, and must live up to without the moral support of bystanders” (Leopold 1933, in Bauer and English 2011, 5). Most hunters believe in principles such as that of a ‘fair chase’ (Sharp and Wollscheid 2009). Brian Luke (1997) provides an overview of the points shared by various ethical hunting codes: safety first, obey the law, give fair chase, harvest the game, aim for quick kills, and retrieve the wounded.

Against this backdrop we return to the distinction between hunting to kill and killing to hunt, and to the questions of whether the eating of game meat is merely a justification for recreational hunting and where the line between recreation and self-provisioning is. These are important questions to ask if we wish to understand self-provisioning as a component of use of animals in leisure. Even subsistence hunters, who must hunt to survive, derive (and prize) social, cultural and psychological benefits (Emery and Pierce 2005) from their hunting activities. While some hunters hunt primarily for food, for others the experience of eating wild-caught game is the most significant outcome (Teitelbaum and Beckley 2006). A study in Denmark found that the vast majority of participants hunted to experience nature and be with friends, with 90% saying they did not hunt for meat (Hansen, Peterson, and Jensen 2012). A literature review from a variety of countries concluded that while acquisition of meat was a greater motivation than trophy hunting, there were many other reasons people hunted, with experiencing nature and socialising with other hunters being the most important (Woods and Kerr 2010). An Australian study found that the primary motivation to hunt was pest control, followed closely by recreation and then meat (Finch et al. 2014). Critics of hunting have observed what they view as the ‘hypocritical’ nature of some recreational hunters who use discourses of sustainability, environmentalism, or spiritual identification with nature “to camouflage and to legitimate violence and biocide” (Kheel 1995, 87). Even hunters who claim their primary motivation to be the acquisition of meat are aware that they also appreciate other aspects of the experience, as can be observed in statements such as “I enjoy the thrill of the chase and the feeling of satisfaction after a successful hunt” (Helen, a hunter, in Merskin 2010, 229-230). The experience becomes embedded in understandings of hunting: “you know, certainly, the fish, or, or the venison or whatever happens to be, is the, the end result, but certainly the whole package is actually getting to that end result... you know, organizing the trip, going

on the trip, the boat ride out there, the company, the company on the trip..." (Marty, a hunter, in Reis 2009, 581). There is a strong feeling that eating meat legitimises the killing of animals, regardless of the primary motivation: "if you want to shoot a buck and have it mounted, that's fine. Do something with the meat. If you want to kill 10 does, that's fine too, as long as you do something with the meat" (Ed, a hunter, in Littlefield and Ozanne 2011, 346). Waste, then, becomes a primary concern: "a common denominator of all sporting codes is not to waste good meat" (Leopold 1966, in Simpson and Cain 2000, 189-190). For example, The Australian Deer Association (2014), a recreational hunting organisation, states in its code of conduct that "If a deer is shot, the whole carcass should be taken, but if this is not possible the venison should be utilised".

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have synthesized scholarly literature, media articles, and governmental agency reports to explore the motivations underlying hunting among Australians, with a view to examining whether self-provisioning activities are consistent with popular ideas of ethical consumption. This exploration in turn allows reflections on when and whether hunting should be viewed as a leisure activity. Our findings reveal the complexities associated with hunting practices, including views about how it can be viewed as a form of subsistence and provisioning, and thus is morally permissible as it is not simply or primarily a leisure activity. This debate suggests that further consideration is warranted for other activities that are 'hybrid' in similar ways, including what the implications are for our understandings of them as part of leisure. The case of hunting also raises themes that could fruitfully be considered through the lens of 'dark leisure' (Stone 2013), especially as it clearly raises questions about morality and taboos associated with leisure activities involving death.

We have highlighted that both the discourse around which animals should or should not be hunted because of their place in the Australian landscape and public views towards gun ownership provide a unique context for discussions about meat obtained by hunting and wild-harvesting as types of ethical consumption which invite further empirical exploration. As increasing attention to animal welfare and animal rights in

association with hunting practices may affect public attitudes, the issues raised in this chapter will need to continue to be monitored. This chapter also highlights the need for deeper understanding of the values and motivations associated with hunting practices given their evolution and diversity in order to facilitate more constructive dialogues about the role of hunting in food production and consumption in Australia and beyond.

References

Australian Deer Association 2014. "Code of Conduct 2014.", accessed January 20.

<http://www.austdeer.com.au/about-ada/code-of-conduct/>.

Adams, Michael. 2013. "'Redneck, Barbaric, Cashed up Bogan? I Don't Think So': Hunting and Nature in Australia." *Environmental Humanities* 2 (1):43-56. doi: 10.1215/22011919-3610342.

Alpers, Philip. 2013. "The Big Melt: How one democracy changed after scrapping a third of its firearms." In *Reducing Gun Violence in America: Informing policy with evidence and analysis*, edited by Daniel W. Webster and Jon S. Vernick, 205-11. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Barber, Greg. 2016. "As deer control fails, time to call in professionals." *The Weekly Times*, 14 September.

Bauer, Johannes, and Anthony English. 2011. *Conservation through hunting: an environmental paradigm change in NSW*. Orange, NSW: Game Council NSW.

Bilney, Rohan. 2013. "The protected pest: deer in Australia." *The Conversation*, 11 February. Accessed 3 December 2016. <http://theconversation.com/the-protected-pest-deer-in-australia-11452>.

Bray, Heather J., Sofia C. Zambrano, Anna Chur-Hansen, and Rachel A. Ankeny. 2016. "Not appropriate dinner table conversation? Talking to children about meat production." *Appetite* 100:1-9. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2016.01.029>.

- Bruckner, Donald W. 2007. "Considerations on the Morality of Meat Consumption: Hunted-Game versus Farm-Raised Animals." *Journal of Social Philosophy* 38 (2):311-330. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9833.2007.00381.x.
- Burg, Oren. 2013. "Straight shooting on 'gun culture'." *Batemans Bay Post*, 24 July.
- Burgin, Shelley. 2015. "Why the difference in the recreational hunting ethic between Australians and North Americans? An opinion with emphasis on 'furbearers'." *International Journal of Environmental Studies* 72 (5):770-783. doi: 10.1080/00207233.2015.1077592.
- Burgin, Shelley, Mariama Mattila, Daryl McPhee, and Tor Hundloe. 2015. "Feral Deer in the Suburbs: An Emerging Issue for Australia?" *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 20 (1):65-80. doi: 10.1080/10871209.2015.953274.
- Cerulli, Tovar. 2010a. "Hunting and heresy: A skirmish with Ortega y Gasset." *Tovar Cerulli: Catalyzing Insights for Conservation*, June 14. <http://tovarcerulli.com/hunting-and-heresy/>.
- Cerulli, Tovar. 2010b. "Hunting Like a Vegetarian: Same Ethics, Different Flavor." In *Hunting: In Search of the Wild Life*, edited by Nathan Kowalsky, 45-55. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Chapman, Simon. 2013. *Over our dead bodies: Port Arthur and Australia's fight for gun control*. Sydney: Sydney University Press.
- Cohen, Erik. 2014. "Recreational Hunting: Ethics, Experiences and Commoditization." *Tourism Recreation Research* 39 (1):3-17. doi: 10.1080/02508281.2014.11081323.
- Craig-Smith, Stephen J, and Gordon McL Dryden. 2008. "Australia as a safari hunting destination for exotic animals." In *Tourism and the Consumption of Wildlife: Hunting, Shooting and Sport Fishing*, edited by Brent Lovelock, 268-280. London: Routledge.
- Cruttenden, Susan. 2013. "Say no to promotion of guns." *Batemans Bay Post*, 28 November.
- Curnutt, Jordan. 1996. "How to Argue For and Against Sport Hunting." *Journal of Social Philosophy* 27 (2):65-89. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9833.1996.tb00238.x.

- Cushing, Nancy E. 2016. "Interspecies Entanglements of Eating Kangaroo, 1788 – 1850." *History Australia*, 13 (2): 286-299.
- 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):387-394. doi: 10.1023/a:1025638030686.
- Decker, Daniel J., and Tommy L. Brown. 1987. "How Animal Rightists View the 'Wildlife Management: Hunting System'" *Wildlife Society Bulletin (1973-2006)* 15 (4):599-602.
- Dubecki, Larissa. 2013. "The happy hunting grounds of the modern food hero." *The Age*, 3 March.
- Dubecki, Larissa, and Esther Han. 2013. "Hunter-gatherer master chefs." *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 3 March.
- Dupleix, Jill. 2012. "Future set to dish up the past." *The Age*, 17 January.
- Emery, Maria R. and Alan R. Pierce. 2005. "Interrupting the Telos: Locating Subsistence in Contemporary US Forests." *Environment and Planning A* 37 (6):981-993
- Enck, Jody W., Daniel J. Decker, and Tommy L. Brown. 2000. "Status of Hunter Recruitment and Retention in the United States." *Wildlife Society Bulletin (1973-2006)* 28 (4):817-824.
- "Failure on so many levels." 2013. *The Age*, 14 May.
- Finch, N. A., and G. S. Baxter. 2007. "Oh deer, what can the matter be? Landholder attitudes to deer management in Queensland." *Wildlife Research* 34 (3):211-217. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/WR06002>.
- Finch, Neal, Peter Murray, Julia Hoy, and Greg Baxter. 2014. "Expenditure and motivation of Australian recreational hunters." *Wildlife Research* 41 (1):76-83.
- Fischer, Anke, Vesna Kereži, Beatriz Arroyo, Miguel Mateos-Delibes, Degu Tadie, Asanterabi Lowassa, Olve Krange, and Ketil Skogen. 2013. "(De)legitimising hunting – Discourses over the morality of

hunting in Europe and eastern Africa.” *Land Use Policy* 32:261-270. doi:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2012.11.002>.

Fitzgerald, Gerard, Nic Fitzgerald, and Carl Davidson. 2007. *Public attitudes towards invasive animals and their impacts*. Invasive Animals Cooperative Research Centre, Canberra.

Franklin, Adrian. 1996. “Australian hunting and angling sports and the changing nature of human-animal relations in Australia.” *Journal of Sociology* 32 (3):39-56. doi: 10.1177/144078339603200303.

Franklin, Adrian. 2007. “Human-Nonhuman Animal Relationships in Australia: An Overview of Results from the First National Survey and Follow-up Case Studies 2000-2004.” *Society & Animals* 15 (1):7-27. doi: [doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/156853007X169315](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/156853007X169315).

Franklin, Adrian. 2008. “The 'Animal question' and the 'consumption' of wildlife.” In *Tourism and the Consumption of Wildlife: Hunting, Shooting and Sport Fishing*, edited by Brent Lovelock, 31-44. London: Routledge.

Franklin, Adrian. 2011. “An Improper Nature? Introduced Animals and ‘Species Cleansing’ in Australia.” In *Human and Other Animals: Critical Perspectives*, edited by Bob Carter and Nickie Charles, 195-216. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Franklin, Adrian, and Robert White. 2001. “Animals and modernity: changing human–animal relations, 1949–98.” *Journal of Sociology* 37 (3):219-238. doi: [doi:10.1177/144078301128756319](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/144078301128756319).

Gamborg, Christian, and Frank Søndergaard Jensen. 2017. “Attitudes towards recreational hunting: A quantitative survey of the general public in Denmark.” *Journal of Outdoor Recreation and Tourism* 17:20-28.

Garnaut, Ross. 2008. *The Garnaut Climate Change Review*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press

Gressier, Catie. 2016. “Going feral: Wild meat consumption and the uncanny in Melbourne, Australia.” *The Australian Journal of Anthropology* 27 (1):49-65. doi: 10.1111/taja.12141.

- Guthman, Julie. 2008. "Neoliberalism and the making of food politics in California". *Geoforum* 39 (3): 1171 – 1183.
- Hansen, Hans Peter, M. Nils Peterson, and Charlotte Jensen. 2012. "Demographic transition among hunters: a temporal analysis of hunter recruitment dedication and motives in Denmark." *Wildlife Research* 39 (5):446-451.
- Harrison, Mike, and Ken Slee. 1995. *The Australian Deerhunter's Handbook*. 2nd ed. Melbourne: Australian Deer Research Foundation.
- Heberlein, Thomas A. 1991. "Changing Attitudes and Funding for Wildlife: Preserving the Sport Hunter." *Wildlife Society Bulletin (1973-2006)* 19 (4):528-534.
- Hoffman, L. C., and E. Wiklund. 2006. "Game and venison – meat for the modern consumer." *Meat Science* 74 (1):197-208. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.meatsci.2006.04.005>.
- Houghton, Des. 2014. "How to combat ferals: Eat 'Em." *Courier-Mail*, 28 June.
- Kheel, Marti. 1995. "License to Kill: An Ecofeminist Critique of Hunters Discourse." In *Animals and women: Feminist theoretical explanations*, edited by C. Adams and J. Donovan, 85-125. Durham: Duke University Press
- King, Roger J. H. 2010. "Hunting: A Return to Nature?" In *Hunting: In Search of the Wild Life*, edited by Nathan Kowalsky, 149-160. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kover, T. R. 2010. "Flesh, Death, and Tofu: Hunters, Vegetarians, and Carnal Knowledge." In *Hunting: In Search of the Wild Life*, edited by Nathan Kowalsky, 171-183. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lagan, Bernard. 2016. "Send wild dogs for the Chinese to eat, urges ecology expert." *The Times*, 17 August.
- Leader-Williams, Nigel. 2009. "Conservation and Hunting: Friends or Foes?" In *Recreational Hunting, Conservation and Rural Livelihoods*, edited by Barney Dickson, John Hutton and William M. Adams, 9-24. Oxford: Wiley.

- Leroy, Frédéric, and Filip Degreef. 2015. "Convenient meat and meat products. Societal and technological issues." *Appetite* 94:40-46. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2015.01.022>.
- List, Charles J. 2004. "On The Moral Distinctiveness of Sport Hunting." *Environmental Ethics* 26 (2):155-169.
- Ljung, Per E., Shawn J. Riley, Thomas A. Heberlein, and Göran Ericsson. 2012. "Eat Prey and Love: Game-Meat Consumption and Attitudes Toward Hunting." *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 36 (4): 669-675.
- Littlefield, Jon, and Julie L. Ozanne. 2011. "Socialization into consumer culture: hunters learning to be men." *Consumption Markets & Culture* 14 (4):333-360. doi: 10.1080/10253866.2011.604494.
- Luke, Brian. 1997. "A Critical Analysis of Hunters' Ethics." *Environmental Ethics* 19 (1):25-44.
- Lunney, Daniel. 2012. "Wildlife management and the debate on the ethics of animal use. I. Decisions within a State wildlife agency." *Pacific Conservation Biology* 18 (1):5-21.
- Manfredo, Michael, Tara Teel, and Alan Bright. 2003. "Why Are Public Values Toward Wildlife Changing?" *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 8 (4):287-306. doi: 10.1080/716100425.
- Marx, Jack. 2012. "A Christian Shooting Party." *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 8 September.
- Merskin, Debra. 2010. "The new Artemis?: Women who Hunt." In *Hunting: In Search of the Wild Life*, edited by Nathan Kowalsky, 225-238. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Munro, Lyle. 1997. "Framing Cruelty: The Construction of Duck Shooting as a Social Problem." *Society & Animals* 5 (2):137-154. doi: [doi:https://doi.org/10.1163/156853097X00042](https://doi.org/10.1163/156853097X00042).
- Munro, Peter. 2012. "Young, old and angry gather for the duck shoot." *The Age*, 18 March.
- Newling, Jacqui. 2011. "Dining with Strangeness: European Foodways on the Eora Frontier." *Journal of Australian Colonial History* 13: 27-48.
- Oldfield, Jamie-Lee. 2015. "Shooters firm on hunting as viable control." *The Land*, 19 February.

- Peterson, M. Nils. 2004. "An Approach for Demonstrating the Social Legitimacy of Hunting." *Wildlife Society Bulletin (1973-2006)* 32 (2):310-321.
- Peterson, M. Nils, Hans Peter Hansen, Markus J Peterson, and Tarla R. Peterson. 2010. "How hunting strengthens social awareness of coupled human-natural systems." *Wildlife Biology in Practice*, 6 (2): 127-143.
- Phillipov, Michelle. 2016. "The new politics of food: Television and the media/food industries." *Media International Australia*, 158 (1): 90-98.
- Pollan, Michael. 2006. *The omnivore's dilemma: A natural history of four meals*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Quartuch, Michael R., Richard C. Stedman, Daniel J. Decker, William F. Siemer, Meghan S. Baumer, and Lincoln R. Larson. 2016. *Taking a Non-traditional Path to Hunting in New York: Insights and Implications for Recruitment and Retention*. Ithaca: Cornell University.
- Reis, Arianne Carvalhedo. 2009. "More than the kill: hunters' relationships with landscape and prey." *Current Issues in Tourism* 12 (5-6):573-587. doi: 10.1080/13683500903042881.
- Rozin, Paul, Mark Spranca, Zeev Krieger, Ruth Neuhaus, Darlene Surillo, Amy Swerdlin, and Katherine Wood. 2004. "Preference for natural: instrumental and ideational/moral motivations, and the contrast between foods and medicines." *Appetite* 43 (2):147-154. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2004.03.005>.
- Saltzman, Katarina, Lesley Head, and Marie Stenseke. 2011. "Do cows belong in nature? The cultural basis of agriculture in Sweden and Australia." *Journal of Rural Studies* 27 (1):54-62. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2010.09.001>.
- Santich, Barbara. 2012. *Bold Palates: Australia's Gastronomic Heritage* Adelaide: Wakefield Press.
- Sharp, Robin, and Kai-Uwe Wollscheid. 2009. "An overview of recreational hunting in North America, Europe and Australia." In *Recreational hunting, conservation and rural livelihoods*, edited by Barney Dickson, John Hutton and William Adams, 23-35. Oxford: Wiley.

- Shoebridge, David, and Caroline Hopley. 2014. "Amateur hunting: It's a blood-sport not a conservation measure." *Nature New South Wales* 58 (3):28-29.
- Simpson, Steven V., and Kelly D. Cain. 2000. "Recreation's Role in the Environmental Ethics Dialogue: The Case of Aldo Leopold and the Morality of Hunting." *Leisure/Loisir* 25 (3-4):181-197. doi: 10.1080/14927713.2000.9649916.
- Smith, Nicholas. 2011. "Blood and soil: nature, native and nation in the Australian imaginary." *Journal of Australian Studies* 35 (1):1-18. doi: 10.1080/14443058.2010.541475.
- Stone, Philip R. and Richard Sharpley 2013. "Deviance, dark tourism and 'dark leisure': towards a (re)configuration of morality and the taboo in secular society." In *Contemporary Perspectives in Leisure: Meanings, Motives and Lifelong Learning* Edited by Sam Elkington and Sean Gammon, Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 54-64.
- Teitelbaum, Sara , and Thomas Beckley. 2006. "Harvested, Hunted and Home Grown: The Prevalence of Self-Provisioning in Rural Canada." *Journal of Rural and Community Development* 1 (1):114-130.
- Van Heijgen, Eugenie J. 2015. *How the hunter became the hunted: A discourse analysis on how hunters cope with the emerged resistance against hunting practices in the Netherlands*. Master of Landscape Architecture and Planning Master, Department of Environmental Sciences, Wageningen University.
- Vitali, Theodore R. 1990. "Sport Hunting: Moral or Immoral?" *Environmental Ethics* 12 (1):69-82.
- Wade, Maurice L. 1990. "Animal Liberationism, Ecocentrism, and the Morality of Sport Hunting." *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport* 17 (1):15-27.
- Waitt, G., and Bryce Appleby. 2014. "'It smells disgusting': plating up kangaroo for a changing climate." *Continuum* 28 (1):88-100. doi: 10.1080/10304312.2013.854863.
- Woods, Amelia, and Geoffrey N Kerr. 2010. *Recreational Game Hunting: Motivations, Satisfactions and Participation*. Canterbury, New Zealand.