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Deborah S. Wilson
Patriarchy and false consciousness are two concepts that scholars use to explain why women hunt. I attempt to understand this activity through a perspective that focuses on experience and meaning. Based on interviews with women who hunt, I contend that their accounts correspond with Nietzsche's characterization of Greek tragedy, reflecting a conscious opposition to certain aspects of modernity.
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"You might have seen
one of them holding up in her two hands
a milk-fed bellowing calf, while others pulled
together, tearing heifers apart. Then ribs
or a cloven hoof you might have seen hurled high
and low - and things hanging besmeared with blood,
dripping beneath the pine-boughs."

-- *The Bacchae*, 739-745 (Euripides, 1968 version)

Driven to the mountains by the madness of Dionysus, the women of
Thebes pass their days suckling wild animals and "hunting the fresh
blood of the slain goat and the/ ecstasy/ of the raw feast." Unrestrained
and bestial, they possess superhuman strength and are wont to rip men
from limb to limb.

Euripedes depicts the Maenads as unconscious of their actions and
bereft of reason. These are customary conditions of a bacchanal, and his
portrait of possession is appropriate to the ancient Greek stage. But
explanations of unconsciousness and coercion by powerful forces remain
prominent in contemporary academic studies of women hunters. A chorus
sings: The existence of modern hunting is a manifestation of the modern
violence and aggression that permeates patriarchal culture; when women hunt, it is because they have adopted the ideology of the ruling patriarchy.

Power structures and mainstream ideology indeed shape the lifeworlds and influence the actions of individuals. But women who choose to hunt and kill animals likely exercise a larger amount of awareness than Euripedes' unwitting Agave who carried home her son's severed head with daft pride. Ignoring the potential of other meaning in women's hunting denies agency and the possibility that women hunters make thoughtful, serious decisions about how to live as human beings in modern society. To explain women's hunting as a manifestation of patriarchal power and false consciousness also ignores opportunities to inquire into other social contexts of hunting.

My inquiry into the experiences of women hunters provides an opportunity to understand and to represent the meaning found in hunting by some women, and to examine social debates that are reflected by those meanings. In the process, I hope to demonstrate the benefits of inquiring into women's experiences through an approach focused not on their sexual identity, but on their human identity.

To help explore the significance of modern hunting, I turn to a theorist concerned with both the complexity of human experience and with life in modern society: Friedrich Nietzsche. I draw upon the theoretical framework of his first book, *The Birth of Tragedy* (1872/1968),
which focuses on the components of the tragic worldview and the inherent conflict between this perspective and certain ideals of modern society. Guided by Nietzschean theory and a familiarity with hunting literature, I ask: How can women's experiences of hunting and killing animals been seen as "tragic"? Might women's decision to hunt reflect just as much of an antagonism as an allegiance with modern society?
CHAPTER 2

NIETZSCHEAN THEORY AND MODERN HUNTING

Nietzsche as a Social Theorist

Several of Nietzsche's manifold contributions to social theory are apparent in *The Birth of Tragedy* (1872/1968). Through this inquiry into the cultural perspectives that encouraged and discouraged Ancient Greek tragedy, Nietzsche asserts the fundamental values of both tragic and modern cultures. The antagonism of these ideals manifests itself today, and his exploration of that tension provides further understanding of modern Western society.

Nietzsche also advances a perspective that acknowledges the significance of individual meaning and agency. He focuses on human experience instead of aiming to discard subjectivity and to thus uncover "true" motives (such as false consciousness) behind individual action. The later Nietzsche explicitly refutes the noumenal—phenomenal distinction and asserts that the only reality to know is the reality of "appearances" (1889/1990, p. 46). Meaning and experience are not impediments to Truth, but guides to understanding the complexity of human life and society.
Nietzsche does not discount the significance of social structure, however. He scoffs at declarations of "free will" (Nietzsche, 1889/1990, p. 64). Of major significance to his theory (and to Attic drama) is the interplay of individual action with established social conditions – known in some ancient worlds as Fate. Nietzsche forwards a perspective that neither denies the importance of social structure nor privileges some "free" will of the individual, but that sees the interaction of individual agency and social conditions to shape both self and society. This approach provides relief from the "structure or agency" argument historically engaged by sociology.

The Character of Tragedy: Nietzsche's Interpretation

The primary thesis of *The Birth of Tragedy* (1872/1968) is that modern society, unlike the Greek culture that produced tragic drama, is deficient in its acknowledgment and acceptance of the horrifying aspects of existence and is therefore degenerate and lacking in opportunities to experience full human life (p. 137). Nietzsche poses that the authentic character of ancient (pre-500 B.C.E.) Greek society can best be elucidated through an examination of the perspectives celebrated in Attic tragedy and embodied in the artistic deities, Apollo and Dionysus.

Though it is important to understand the respective characteristics of these figures, it is their interaction that is of most significant to
Nietzsche's theory of tragic society. The theoretical structure of *The Birth of Tragedy* is sometimes condemned for being dualist, but Nietzsche's primary discussion is one of an interactive wholeness – not of a dichotomous separation. In later works, Nietzsche integrates the antagonistic elements of tragedy into the one figure, *Dionysus*, which, by presenting the perspective as one entity comprised of parts, helps to discourage this oversight. Still, a careful reading of *The Birth of Tragedy* demonstrates that the Apollinian and Dionysian characters are reliant upon one another in the creation and maintenance of full and authentic human experience. The absence of one aspect destroys the whole and results in fundamental meaninglessness for the individual and society: a stage set for nihilism.

**The Apollinian Spirit.**

Nietzsche likens the realm of Apollo to a world of dreams, wherein the artist finds inspiration in beautiful appearance and form. The Apollinian spirit glorifies measure and strategy and is manifested most clearly in the arts of sculpture and architecture. This is art concerned with loveliness, harmony, and balance. The beauty in imagery celebrated by the Apollinian ideal offers protection from the dangers and horrors of life, much as Perseus' shield safely reflected the terrible Medusa.
Restraints and borders are central to the Apollinian consciousness, for boundaries promote not only structure and order, but also, the Apollinian concern for individual excellence and self-development. The creed of Apollo implicitly demands distinction in addition to introspection, as one must distinguish self from other in the quest to know the self (Nietzsche, 1872/1968, p. 46). Contemplation of self and surroundings produces wisdom with which to promote stability and harmony - in art and society. The Apollinian realm thus celebrates individuation and establishes partitions through careful judgment.

The Apollinian Spirit in Contemporary Hunting Literature

The importance of individuation and self-knowledge in hunting is apparent in descriptions (Stalling, 1996; Wrede, 1996; Wolfe, 1996) of the judgment and responsibility central to hunting. In Beyond Fair Chase: The Ethic and Tradition of Hunting, wildlife biologist Jim Posewitz (1994) stresses the desirability of making thoughtful decisions when hunting, particularly when choosing to fire a weapon or to release an arrow (p. 69). In any situation that involves killing an animal, "the important thing is that you make that decision yourself" (Posewitz, 1994, p. 71). Hunting can also nurture a larger sense of individual responsibility. Editor David Petersen (1996) hunts in part "to accept personal responsibility for at least some of the deaths that nourish" his life (p. 161).
Hunters cite appreciation of natural beauty and harmony as another significant aspect of hunting (Swan, 1995; Carter, 1996; Murray, 1996; McIntyre, 1996). Concern for balance and harmony (equilibrium of food sources, herd size, shelter, and land) is suggested in hunters' discussions of wildlife management (Dizard, 1999; Posewitz, 1994). Admiration and awareness of natural beauty and balance can perpetuate itself as knowledge of the environment increases through further hunting experience (Woods, 1996; Posewitz, 1994).

The Dionysian Spirit

Those Apollinian aspects of ancient Greek society – appreciation of beauty, harmony, and balance – have historically been regarded as the essence of Hellenism and of higher society. Nietzsche argues in The Birth of Tragedy that it is another influence, that of the chthonic and disorderly Dionysus, which provides the foundation upon which the ideals of Apollo may rest and that is the underlying source (necessarily manifested through Apollinian form) of Greek tragedy.

In contrast to Apollo, the "shattering of individuation" and the striving toward Oneness exemplifies the spirit of Dionysus (Nietzsche, 1872/1968, p. 65). Here, separation is the source of all suffering, and the Dionysian spirit seeks unity through participation in the world flux. It rejoices in the destruction of the individual being, for in the one

The Heraclitean maxim "All is flux" is the Dionysian counterpart to the Apollinian "know thyself." In the intoxication of Dionysus we experience ecstasy (ἐκ στασις) and participation in the flow of life. The disorderly aspects of the Dionysian spirit are a consequence of that participation relished by the Dionysian urge; contradiction and conflict is inherent in unification. Full involvement in the human experience also requires recognition of the chaotic and uncertain aspects of life. The Dionysian realm thus celebrates participation through the annihilation of the individual and through acceptance of the chaos, contradiction, and horror of life.

The Dionysian Spirit in Contemporary Hunting Literature

Dionysian themes of participation appear in the expressions of hunters like Peter Dunne (1996), who likens hunting to "becoming part of the play itself" (p. 31). Journalist John Madson (1996) describes that moment in the woods when one's "presence is either forgotten or accepted," declaring this instant as the point when "you have begun to be part of it . . . when the hunting really begins" (p. 133). For these hunters and others, hunting affords participation in the daily activities of the natural world that they do not find through observing or photographing
nature. Some hunters (Petersen, 2000; Posewitz, 1994; Swan, 1995; Stange, 1997) view stalking and killing as an activity which, through its instinctual and unpredictable characteristics, unites the hunter with the animal world and with a primitive human past. Outdoor writer Mike Gaddis (1996) relates: "The urge and emotions spring from instinct as purely as do the wiles of the quarry" (p. 122).

Hunting also entails participation in destruction; hunters kill. This is an action over which many hunters articulate unease and guilt, but this disquiet is not always something to be avoided. Poet Bruce Woods (1996) explains, "to hunt and not despise the killing would be to become not an animal but a form of human that is already far too common in the festering cities" (p. 166). Several hunters describe the experience of killing an animal for food as participatory, celebratory acceptance of the destructive and cyclical aspects of nature and life (Stange, 1997; Clifton, 1996). Death is essential to the perpetuation of life and is not to be shunned.

The Opposition of Tragedy and Modernity

Human experience reaches its fullest potential through the antagonistic interaction of Dionysian participation and Apollinian individuation (Nietzsche, 1872/1968, p. 61). This tension of tragedy, says Nietzsche, is necessary in order to put the "stamp of the eternal" on
everyday existence, and is the foundation of healthy society (p. 137). The tragic worldview is rooted in an experiential recognition of the importance of selfhood and the inevitable doom of the individual, who is but part of the "one wholeness" (Nietzsche, 1872/1968, p. 38). Through celebration of this cycle of individuation and participation, creation and destruction, the tragic worldview advances an affirmation of life even in its strangest and sternest problems . . . not so as to get rid of pity and terror . . . but, beyond pity and terror, to realize in oneself the eternal joy of becoming – that joy which also encompasses joy in destruction" (Nietzsche, 1889/1990, p. 121).

The Modern (Socratic) Worldview

Just as Nietzsche uses the figures of Apollo and Dionysus to represent the tragic tension, he employs another figure to embody the nemesis of tragedy: Socrates, who venerates reason above all else and is the progenitor of modern culture (1872/1968, p.110). Belief in Knowledge as Virtue and in Science as Savior is exemplified in Socratic efforts to decipher and to correct the material world (Nietzsche 1872/1968, p. 87). The terrifying aspects of life such as suffering, violence, and death are unfortunate flaws of human existence; temporary sicknesses for which, through adequate reasoning and information, a cure might be found. This scientistic optimism is a fundamental denial of life, argues Nietzsche, and is indicative of a central social decay. It focuses upon a "mendaciously
invented ideal world" rather than on present conditions and on the full experience of existence (Nietzsche, 1872/1968, p. 674). This Socratic preoccupation with beauty, comfort, and bliss does not reflect a society's health and strength, but rather, its weakness and underlying melancholy. Consumed by longing for ease and pleasure, the modern Socratic human "no longer wants to have everything whole, with all of nature's cruelty attaching to it" (Nietzsche, 1872/1968, p.113). The Socratic character focuses upon eliminating the discrepancy between is and ought. Artifice and imitation replace experience in the aim of creating ideal existence. Rather than seeking to participate and engage in human existence in all its terror, the Socratic ideal endeavors to encompass, conquer, and correct the world through reason and information.

The Distinction Between Socratic and Apollinian Ideals

The values of a Socratic society – information and control – resemble Apollinian ideals, but the Socratic spirit lacks an experiential, contextualized concern for knowledge and individuation. Where the Apollinian engages in contemplation, the Socratic praises the coldly theoretical (Nietzsche, 1872/1968, p. 83). Where the Apollinian is concerned with self-development and self-knowledge, the Socratic is egoistic yet self-ignorant, seeking to "spread itself in ever-widening circles" (Nietzsche, 1872/1968, p. 97). The Socratic worldview presents a
harmonious picture of life and nature, but is disingenuous. It falsifies rather than mirrors the world, portraying the terrifying Medusa as a feisty but feckless hag.

**The New Opposition: Socrates Versus Dionysus**

Nietzsche maintains that the basic character of Attic tragedy, though reliant on Apollinian imagery to manifest itself, is Dionysian (1872/1968, p. 130 and 141). Dionysus is the source of tragedy's myth, musicality, and recognition of inevitable suffering. The optimistic, Socratic concern with correction is implicitly moralistic and contrasts sharply with acceptance of horror and suffering. The Socratic drive to control the future reveals a hostility toward unpredictability. Its veneration of knowledge betrays a dislike for mystery and for the unknown – particularly for that ultimate unknown, death.

Nietzsche thus conceives the fundamental opposition of tragic society and modern society to lie between Socrates and Dionysus (1872/1968, p.82). He charges the character of Socrates: "And because you abandoned Dionysus, Apollo abandoned you" (Nietzsche, 1872/1968, p. 75). Reflecting on this "new opposition," Nietzsche imagines that the re-awakening of the Dionysian spirit in modern society will elicit a rebirth of the tragic worldview (1872/1968, p. 119).
Definitions of Tragedy and Modernity.

Insofar as Nietzsche sees the defining characteristics of modernity to mainly include those very ideals of Socratism – optimism, rationale, and progress – the terms *modernity* and *Socratism* may be seen to be analogous in this inquiry. The concept of *tragedy*, in these pages, refers to Nietzsche's characterization of Attic drama with its foundational Apollinian—Dionysian tension. My allusions to *the opposition of tragedy and modernity* refer specifically to that new tension, which Nietzsche (1872/1968) elucidates in *The Birth of Tragedy*, between his interpretation of tragedy, outlined above, and what he sees as the highest values of contemporary society and collectively labels "Socratism."

Nietzsche and Socrates

The characteristics of Socratism, *a priori* reason and goals of correction, correspond with the concept of scientism. However, Nietzsche's view of Socratism (science) is not restricted to this definition. He is disdainful of scientific aims of objectivity, of a longing for "progress," and of an *a priori* scientific method, but he does not reject the scientific project insofar as it is empirically grounded. Nietzsche imagines that Socrates (science), given the artistic impulse, can provide an authentic "way to knowledge" (1889/1967, pp. 261,324,333), and he holds Socrates to
be the noblest opponent of the tragic (artistic) perspective (1872/1968, p. 99). This tension between Art and Science is similar to the tension between the Apollo and the Dionysus. These antagonistic elements of existence are interdependent, meaningful, and full of creative potential.
CHAPTER 3

ACTIVE INTERVIEWS

Some recent hunting literature suggests the tragic character of modern hunting experiences through the presence of both Apollinian and Dionysian themes within individual hunters' accounts, and through an articulation of that tragic voice that says "'Yes' without reservation, even to suffering, even to guilt" (Nietzsche, 1872/1968, p. 728). However, it is, as feminist Marie Comninou suggests, "uncertain how women might interpret their kill-mediated connection with nature" (1995, p. 141). Are the tragic themes prominent in recent hunting literature broached by women? How might some women hunters' stories echo Nietzsche's characterization of tragedy, and how do they relate hunting to their lives in an "information age"?

Method

I conducted in-depth interviews with 8 women who hunt. I assumed an approach to qualitative research that emphasizes the interactive nature of interview research and that challenges several traditional notions concerning the goals and evaluation of sociological
research. Critical to the active interview method outlined by sociologists Holstein and Gubrium (1995) is the rejection of a "vessel of answers" approach to interviewing. Rather than perceiving the respondent as a human receptacle of truth through which we may view a static reality (or the "thing-in-itself"), Holstein and Gubrium (1995) assume a subjectivist epistemological stance that sees meaning as constructed during the interview process through exchanges between the researcher and respondent.

This interactive quality of the interview presupposes what Guba and Lincoln (1996) term "multiple, apprehensible, and sometimes conflicting social realities" (p. 111). What the respondent sees as an accurate representation of her experience may vary according to her present life circumstances, the identity of the interviewer, the framework of the inquiry, or even the location of the interview. Rather than upholding post-positivist or quantitative research concerns of contamination and reliability, this perspective acknowledges the mutable nature of the participants' interpretations and the unavoidable influence of the researcher upon the products of the interview. I acknowledge that these representations of women's stories are my interpretations of their words, and that they have been shaped by my specific inquires, research interests, and style of presentation.
Participants

I became acquainted with respondents through acquaintances who put me in contact with other possible participants. All 8 women were Michigan residents and ranged in age from 19 to 45 years old. They were two university students majoring in fish and wildlife studies, a student of criminal justice, a court clerk, a bank teller, a psychology graduate student, a police officer, and a mother of three young girls. All participants were white women who had been hunting between 2 and 10 years. Only one of the women I interviewed hunted as an adolescent. Two women began hunting in their late teens, and the others started later in life. Five of these women hunters reported usually hunting alone. Those women who described hunting with a partner or in a group named their spouse or other family members (not always male) as their usual companions.

The women I interviewed identified themselves as primarily deer hunters, with the exception of one woman, who reported mainly hunting rabbits, and another women, who has hunted big game animals in several African countries. Most of these hunters also occasionally pursue small game animals (e.g. varying hares and fox squirrels) and upland birds (e.g., pheasants, grouse, and woodcock). All of these women have hunted with firearms, three women have also hunted with compound bows, and one
woman has additionally hunted with a muzzleloader.

Interviews

These interviews were loosely structured and conversational. I dressed casually, and as a female in my late twenties with a small amount of hunting experience, it was fairly easy to establish a rapport with these women. Conversation rarely strayed from the topic of hunting. I interviewed in a court office, a bagel shop, a cafe, and a crime lab, among other locations. One interview was conducted over the telephone. Interviews ranged from one hour to two and a half hours, depending upon the participant's availability.

I employed a general interview guide in order to allow myself time and energy to listen carefully to respondents. As suggested by anthropologist Grant McCracken (1988), I began interviews by inquiring about general points of interest (e.g., "What do you like about hunting?"). Only rarely did I introduce specific prompts (e.g., "Have you ever not taken a shot when faced with the opportunity?"). I refrained from asking direct and leading questions such as, "Do you feel like a part of nature when you are hunting?" or, "Do you see your hunting as an active acceptance of the life-death cycle?"

Much of the information that I present from these interviews came in the form of narratives. I encouraged the women to talk about the
aspects of hunting most important to them and asked them to comment on anti-hunting sentiment. I pursued themes that emerged from these tales, keeping in mind Nietzsche's theoretical framework. Working on the assumption that these women are conscious agents, I explicitly asked how they viewed their hunting in relation to larger social conditions and values. I also read aloud or referred to two short excerpts (see Appendix A) written by anti-hunters and asked for responses to the content.

Based upon my readings of contemporary hunting literature and my understanding of Nietzsche's characterization of Apollinian, Dionysian, and Socratic qualities, I compiled a list of hunting phrases and descriptions that I interpreted as exemplary of these expressions (see Appendix B). After transferring my notes into a word processing program, I analyzed the major ideas that emerged in each interview. I color-coded the text according to how the interview notes reflected the Apollinian, Dionysian, and Socratic (or anti-Socratic) themes in hunting that I compiled. I then compared notes from all interviews, looking for commonalities in the experiences of these women hunters. I used pseudonyms in relating my findings from these interviews.
CHAPTER 4

WOMEN'S HUNTING AND THE SPIRIT OF TRAGEDY

In questioning whether women's hunting can be seen as a tragic activity, I am asking whether it provides an experience of individuation and of participation that includes acceptance of destructive, unknowable, and unstable aspects of existence. These women's stories, while undoubtedly filled with other meaning, included descriptions similar to Nietzsche's characterization of Attic tragedy. Their views of modern U.S. culture also coincided with Nietzsche's characterization of Socratic society's craving for beauty, ease, and pleasure.

Apollinian Individuation

My interviews with women hunters generated three common themes corresponding with Nietzsche's characterization of Apollinian aspects of experience. These three themes are: awareness of surroundings, skill development, and individual judgment.

Awareness of Surroundings

Appreciation of the natural world is possible without hunting. Liz,
a 22-year-old university student, said she sometimes takes to the outdoors armed with only a camera. But for Liz, hunting promotes increased focus and awareness of her surroundings. She is intent on spotting a particular animal while hunting, and this goal requires her to pay close attention to markings, tracks, and any disturbances in the woods. Donna, a graduate student in her 40's, explained that hunting

wakes up the senses. We go about our daily business without knowing about the weather, or which way the wind is blowing. We're not really listening. Senses are so much more alert [when hunting] ...

This focused appreciation of the environment is also vital to 21-year-old Susan, who explained that she learns much more about the workings of the natural world from hunting than she would otherwise. Hunting requires a practical understanding of the details of nature not demanded by casual walks and photography. As Susan and others explained, this understanding of the world provides knowledge about what she calls the "way things work."

Margaret, a police officer in her thirties, also described appreciation of the natural world as a big part of hunting. She cite the chance to watch animals in their environment a primary motivation to hunt, and she reported being a careful observer of the natural world. Kathleen, 28, began hunting as a way to get some quiet time away from two toddlers and a baby. "I thought: Just sit in a deer stand for three hours watching
the woods? I can do that," she recalled. She said she feels privileged to observe animals performing their daily routines, whether she is studying a 10-point buck or a black-capped chickadee. Like Jennifer, a 19-year-old bank teller, she related deep interest in watching things "come to life" in the woods at dawn and settling again (or transforming) at dusk. These women hunters' concern with observation and comprehension evokes Nietzsche's description of the Apollinian character who strives to be "a close and willing observer, for these images afford . . . an interpretation of life" (1872/1968, p. 34).

Skill Development

Discipline and training is a manifestation of the Apollinian spirit (Nietzsche 1872/1968, p. 47). The women I interviewed described such skill development as a significant part of hunting, and they related this cultivation of skill to their personal development.

"Hunting is not easy," Laura explained, "people do not realize the preparation that goes into it." Jennifer agrees: "You have to work early mornings and late nights . . . it is not just fun or sport. It's something to overcome." Kathleen practices archery in her back yard year-round in order to sharpen her skills for the October bow-hunting season. She expressed a feeling of accomplishment in providing food for her family, and called hunting an "empowering" experience in its opportunities to
cultivate skills and meet challenges. Susan cited this development and application of skills as the characteristic of hunting most attractive to her. She chooses to stalk deer, to use calls, and to "rattle in" the bucks because of the challenges those techniques present.

Theresa, a 45-year-old government employee, expressed satisfaction in developing her hunting ability and in her reputation around the deer camp for being a "good shot." She has honed her aim in her 10 years of hunting, and she now feels confident enough in her abilities to "always go for head shots." Margaret prefers hunting with a compound bow rather than a firearm because of the increased challenge. She requires herself to get within 30 yards of the animal before she releases an arrow, calling this favorite method "spot and stalk." She enjoys hunting a variety of big game animals, because, she explained, each animal differs in its strengths and guiles. The ultimate challenge, she said, is to use her skills to "outwit that particular animal."

The challenge of stalking is also a significant appeal of hunting for Laura. Though she has years of experience with firearms and enjoys practicing at the range, she rarely chooses to shoot animals. For Laura, hunting is primarily tracking and locating animals.

**Individual Judgment**

The Apollinian spirit demands conscious and conscientious
decision-making, and "Apollo, as an ethical deity . . . requires self-
knowledge" (Nietzsche 1872/1968, p. 46). These women hunters reported
serious regard for the consequences of their actions. They described
making decisions based on personal and situational ethics, and they
commonly expressed appreciation for thoughtful, individual judgments.

A variety of hunting practices and equipment (baiting, applying
hormones and scent covers, using mechanical or digital calls, rifle scopes,
or binoculars) require assessments about what gear and techniques are
ethical or "fair" to employ. Liz said she chooses not to use scents or calls,
but that she does not "have a problem with them." She related about
baiting, "if other people do it, fine, but I personally wouldn't." Susan said
she would not use a bait pile to lure deer, but that hunting near year-
round food plots was "appropriate." Donna would not shoot something
would not eat (squirrel, for example) but she said, "if that's your thing,
that's fine . . . but not for me." She explained, "everyone has to make
peace with what they do," and some styles of hunting are "just not [her]
bag." When I asked Theresa to comment on decisions to not eat meat, she
responded: "I have absolutely no thoughts on the topic. . . to each their
own." When it comes down to choices about hunting, Liz explained: "You
have to decide for yourself."
My interviews with women hunters also generated three common themes corresponding to Nietzsche's characterization of Dionysian aspects of experience. These three themes are: appreciation of ambiguity, self-forgetfulness, and acceptance of destruction.

**Appreciation of Ambiguity**

Liz and Kathleen described successful hunting, for all its strategy and skill development, as entailing "mostly luck." "Hunting's not a sure thing," Margaret concurred, comparing hunting to a trip to the grocery store: "You don't always come home with meat." Theresa claimed that she is "lucky" to have seen deer at certain times, and stated that her hunting success often has less to do with skill or with information about deer behavior than with chance.

These women spoke of other uncertain aspects of hunting such as weather conditions, navigation in dark and unfamiliar terrain, and encounters with other hunters; Margaret has been shot at twice. Laura described possibilities of danger in hunting "wherever you are, whatever you are hunting." In her experience, hunting is unpredictable: "You never know what is going to happen." The capriciousness of hunting described by these women echoes the ambiguity of tragedy and its repudiation of
rationale and a *deus ex machina* (Nietzsche, 1872/1968, p. 84).

**Self-Forgetfulness**

Laura spoke appreciatively of hunting as an activity in which "you lose yourself." She said she forgets about bills, family stresses, and other problems of daily life. Theresa, Liz, Susan, Kathleen, and Donna also characterized hunting as an escape from mundane concerns, recalling Nietzsche's "chorus of transformed characters whose civic past and social status have been totally forgotten" (1872/1968, p. 64).

Self-forgetfulness is further amplified by the empathy required by hunting. When I asked Margaret to identify the difference between hunting and exterminating household rodents, she explained that, unlike killing pests, hunting involves "going into the animal's environment and getting into their mind . . . you're in their element, they're not in yours." Spending hours or days tracking animals and mimicking their sounds and smells can result in a loss of sense of self and an identity with the animal. Laura identified hunting as "being on the [animal's level] and in their environment." Liz called hunting "going by [the animals'] rules," and Susan described it as "playing the animal's game." The opportunity to experience a different view of the world appeared significant to these women. As Nietzsche describes the Dionysian dramatist: "Here we have a surrender of individuality and a way of entering into another character."
Acceptance of Destruction

"It's not pretty," Theresa announced about the killing. Her first shot at a deer only wounded the animal. "It was blatting and everything . . . it was awful," she recalled. She shot the deer at close range to end the misery. Ten years later, Theresa will "pull out the heart and all that" but she still cannot make the initial cuts into the deer's skin "without getting sick." Yet Theresa said that hunting is "not sadistic: it's food chain."

Margaret, too, called hunting "definitely a bloodsport," but explained, "it provides meat and it's natural." Laura, who rarely kills animals, said she does not "mind splitting them up and gutting them," and characterized the bringing home and butchering of meat as "part of the primal instinct." Susan said she might one day become a vegetarian, but "not to avoid cruelty." In the meantime, hunting gives her "hands-on experience in the eco-system." This acknowledgment of the cruel aspects of hunting as part of existence reflects the Dionysian urge to go "beyond pity and terror" (Nietzsche, 1872/1968, p. 121) in order to actively embrace life.

Kathleen expressed guilt and distress over the killing, which she said has not subsided in her few years of hunting. Along with her regard for destruction as part of life, Kathleen takes solace in the idea that the
deer population remains as a whole. She "takes a few lives, but helps to keep the herd alive." This sentiment was expressed by all the women I interviewed, recalling Nietzsche's description of the Dionysian perspective that "does not heed the single unit" but finds redemption "as one being" (1872/1968, p. 38).

Women Hunters and Views of Modern Society

The presence of Apollinian and Dionysian elements in these women's stories is reminiscent of Nietzsche's characterization of tragedy. Just as importantly, the conclusion of tragedy - that "life is at the bottom of things ... indestructibly powerful and pleasurable" (Nietzsche, 1872/1968, p. 59) - resounded in my conversations with these women. Despite their perceptions of cruel and harsh aspects of existence, they expressed an underlying joy in "the way of nature" and a lack of what Nietzsche (1872/1968) terms "womanish flight from seriousness and terror" (p. 78).

Further suggestive of a tragic worldview was their common characterization of hunting as oppositional to Socratic aspects of modern society. They contrasted their experiences of hunting with an artificiality of modern society and its denial of "the whole picture" of life. "Society is too focused on video games," Liz explained. She suggested that most people would rather stay inside their homes watching television in
"climate-controlled environments" than go outside and enjoy the natural world. Many modern people, she said, are primarily concerned with comfort, and she does not want to live that way. Hunting, with its sometimes-miserable experiences, provides what she called an "escape from suburbia."

Jennifer criticized many modern consumers for being removed from sources of food: "Most people just go to the grocery store and do not understand where the food comes from." Kathleen said she refuses to distance herself from food sources. Killing animals bothers her, but she explained, "I interact with the food we eat. Others choose to disassociate." Hunting, she explained, also allows her to procure healthy food for her family that is free of the injected hormones and artificial additives that she finds in modern, store-bought meat. She expressed the importance of providing food to her young girls that hasn't been unnaturally "farmed" or "tortured" in slaughterhouses.

Susan similarly characterized hunting as an opportunity to be "a conscious consumer." For her, she said, getting meat from the grocery store is not as responsible an action as killing the animal herself. Margaret likened people who eat meat but criticize hunting to "scavengers . . . vultures" who reap the benefits of others' killing. These women described seeing a significant distinction between the challenging experience of hunting, killing, and eating an animal and the convenience
and disassociation of purchasing meat from the store.

These hunters did not criticize people who choose not to eat meat, but many of them remarked on a general denial of death in society. They described this general attitude as the root of anti-hunting sentiment. Regarding people opposed to hunting, Liz commented: "They shut their eyes" and "don't see the whole picture." She suggested that many people "don't want to see anything die," but that "the real world doesn't operate that way." Kathleen, too, described anti-hunters as people who are "anti-death and don't want anything to die." Donna agreed, "[Anti-hunters] don't look at the whole picture – they just look at poor Bambi in the woods." These criticisms of modern U.S. culture echo Nietzsche's disparagement of a Socratic society that rejects destructive aspects of life and that seeks, with "irreverence and superiority," to improve and ease existence (1872/1968, p. 87).

The opposition I noted in these women's descriptions of anti-hunting attitudes in modern society coincides with the opposition of tragedy and modernity, which is fundamentally a conflict between optimism, a key element of Socratism, and action within the realm of "the way it is," an worldview that is prominent in Attic drama. Rather than seeking to avoid death, these hunters related the decision to live with and participate in (however uneasily) in the view that they personally gain from the destruction of other life. This attitude is in accordance with
Nietzsche's echoing of the sentiment, "life always exists at the expense of other life" (1883/1967, p. 199).
CHAPTER 5

HUNTING AND MODERNITY

Nietzsche's theory of tragedy has helped to illuminate how, for some women, hunting is a conscious activity that provides relief from Socratic aspects of modern society. Their hunting experiences relate opposition, not allegiance, with some main social values. This conflict, examined more closely, can offer insight into larger social tensions. In this section, I further explore the opposition between women's hunting and modern society by investigating three contentious themes that emerge in my interviews and in hunting literature: identity, death, and science.

Identity

Ideas about human and animal identity were prominent in my interviews and are apparent in literature about hunting. Two specific points of controversy emerge: Beliefs about the human – animal relationship as a "self – other" relationship, and beliefs about human - animal equality.
"A world of made/ is not a world of born . . ."

-- e.e. cummings (1944)

The women I interviewed made distinctions between the human and animal worlds. The animal world "plays by different rules," said Liz, and as Margaret explained: to hunt is to deliberately "go down into the animal's environment." In the views of these hunters, the animal environment does not "belong" to the human realm, and is attractive for that reason. Differences between humans and nonhumans appear significant to many modern hunters (Swan, 1995).

Human ecologist Paul Shephard (1982) writes about this important distinction of a hunting worldview: "This Me in a non-Me world is the most penetrating and powerful realization in life" (p. 35). The experiential knowledge of a realm not wholly manufactured by humans allows for the conception of a self who is not mechanical and easily comprehensible, but rather, complex and needing close examination. Recognition of a "non-self" is also required for the experience of union and participation; there must be an other with which to unite.

Several scholars opposed to hunting (Kheel, 1985; Warren, 1989; King, 1998) uphold this perception of animal otherness to be fundamentally problematic and a source of suffering. Feminist Carol
Adams (1994) poses that the labeling of otherness results in domination of the animal others, and provides a sense of entitlement "to those who position themselves as the same" (p. 73). Adams and some animal defense activists suggest that rejection of the concept of otherness is necessary in order to alleviate the oppression of animals (and other "others" such as women) and to "end the degradation of nature" (King, 1998, p. 80).

The abolition of otherness, in effect, is an assertion of the selfness of all. This perspective reflects that Socratic spirit which "seeks to spread itself in ever-widening circles" (Nietzsche, 1872/1968, p. 97). Dualism dissolves into monism. Recognition of self and other – of differences between human and animal life – may include discord and destruction, but it provides an opportunity for relationship and creativity. In a Socratic, other-less, "world of made," there is but ego and the ongoing extension of ego. Nietzsche (1872/1968) poses there to be no urge more violent than the Socratic "craving to complete this conquest" (p. 97).

The ever-widening circles of the Socratic spirit are manifest in positivism, yet are arguably visible in contemporary concerns with "representing voices" and "blurring boundaries." For example, some scholars opposed to hunting suggest that the nonhuman animal world be included in the realm of legal rights, responsibilities, and political platforms through which humans might speak for animals (Regan, 1983; Singer, 1975). It is debatable how fundamentally different this advocacy
is from traditional colonialism. The intent to speak for animals and to
dissolve differences is suggestive of paternalism and coercive assimilation.
This destruction of boundaries is distinct from Dionysian union, as it
precludes a non-self with which to unite and relate (however chaotically).
A tragic worldview proclaiming *All is Flux and Mysterious* transforms
into the Socratic declaration: *All is Human and Knowable.*

Equality

Feminist Zuleyma Tang Halpin (1989) poses that "the other, by
definition, is the opposite of the 'self,' and therefore comes to be regarded
as intrinsically of lesser value" (p. 286). Environmental philosopher Roger
King (1998) concurs that dualisms inherently involve rank ordering.
Resistance to an animal "otherness" is a cry for equality between humans
and nonhuman animals. It is also a general advancement of an
egalitarian ideal.

Not everyone is a winner in the course of hunting. Inequality exists
between individuals, and hunters assign value according to the skills and
prowess of that human or animal at that time. Hunters employ various
equipment and techniques in order to temporarily adjust their abilities.
In due course, the hunter may assert superiority in the act of killing - like
Margaret, who applies her skills to "outwit that particular animal." This
individual and mutable assessment is distinct from unconditional and
automatic valuation of (any sentient) life. Egalitarianism is not an ideal of a hunting worldview.

Death

The topic of death was also notable in my interviews with women hunters, and is prominent in criticisms of hunting. Disagreement over the presence of death in society and in attitudes about death are significant aspects of the hunting debate.

Death in Society

Some scholars suggest that hunting is indicative of contemporary "necrophiliac" society (King, 1998; Daly, 1978). The women I interviewed found opportunity to acknowledge death and destruction through hunting in ways not present in general society, and they felt their hunting to diverge from mainstream social values. In listening to these hunters, contemporary society sounds anything but "necrophilous [sic] and death-loving" (King, 1998, p. 82). "They shut their eyes," Liz remarked, concerning mainstream attitudes toward death. "They don’t want to see anything die," explained Kathleen.

Nietzsche’s characterization of Socratic society helps to elucidate this disagreement about social fixation on death and violence. Just as the Socratic spirit replaces Apollinian contemplation with speculation, it
replaces Dionysian suffering with "fiery affects" (Nietzsche, 1872/1968, p. 83). Portraits of destruction saturate contemporary media, but the spectator remains distanced from the experience. The death and violence portrayed in screenplays and video games are Socratic artifices, performed for an audience (like the newer Greek dramas Nietzsche detested). These depictions are often romanticized versions of death and suffering, and the audience is privy to information that would be unavailable in lived space and time. Much existent death and suffering is ignored, buffered through media broadcasts, or otherwise shellacked with a Socratic veneer. Death and violence are prominent social themes, but experiential knowledge of real horror is not pervasive.

**Attitudes Toward Death**

These women reported feeling troubled by causing death and pain, but for the most part they related no urge to avoid either or their own disturbance. They spoke strongly about the need to accept death as a part of life. "Like it or not," Liz said, that's the way it is." This attitude of active affirmation - not necessarily resignation - corresponds with *amor fati* - that love of fate which Nietzsche names the doctrine of the tragic spirit (1888/1967, p 536).

Recourse to "the way it is" does not sit well with many critiques of hunting, and it is here that the struggle between *is* and *ought* is clear in
hunting discussions. Human action is not condonable through appeal to "natural" processes, and hunting has "no moral justification" according to some hunting critics (King, 1998; Luke, 1998). The conditions of life, natural or not, may (and should) be improved. To some hunters, this stance rejects the present material world as being as a "botched experiment." The ideals that some hunters see critics to propose - "prolong any life, minimize any death" - appear to them to be based less on a respect for life than on a will to control to correct the world (Stange, 1997; Clifton, 1996).

Science

The women I interviewed described a tragic character of hunting and expressed a worldview commensurate with tragedy. They also relied upon scientific information to hunt and to talk about hunting. Some scholars critical of hunting likewise turn to science in condemnation of hunting. The application of science and the relation of hunting to science are two prominent topics in debate over modern hunting.

Applications of Science

"Our teeth are set up the way they are because we are meat-eaters," Donna explained. Margaret discussed the ecological ramifications of a vegetarian world, calling upon her observations in Namibia and other
African countries. She agreed with Donna that people who have problems with hunting probably "do not understand" wildlife management. These hunters turned to biology and anatomy to aid in their hunting and to defend its value.

Some scholars opposed to hunting are not surprised by the use of science to justify it, asserting that science is taxonomical, divisive, and that it has been used to justify all manner of human pursuits and domination (Adams, 1994; Singer, 1975; Birke, 1995). But just as they link science to domination and disconnection, those critics also turn to science in defense of their position (Adams, 1994; Singer, 1975). Feminist Marti Kheel (1985), for example, declares the laws of quantum physics to "have reaffirmed a feminist vision" of interconnectedness (p. 136).

The Relation of Hunting to Science

Ideas of science as both connective and as divisive, condemnatory and supportive, of hunting are understandable in light of Nietzsche's perspective: Science is a systematic "way to knowledge" that is influenced by other underlying ideals and disciplines (1888/1967, p. 253). Although often taxonomical, science also promotes connections and dissolves boundaries (Kellert, 1997). We learn that chimpanzees are 99 percent genetically identical to humans (Diamond, 1992), that we share identical
genes with zebra fish (Mazzetenta, 2002), and that whales are descendents of ungulates (Chadwick, 2002).

Thus, any accord between science and hunting is due to agreement on a boundary between human and animal worlds. Any antagonism between science and hunting is a manifestation of the Socratic – tragic disagreement over boundaries. Science is inimical to the foundations of hunting to the extent that it engages the Socratic spirit. Definitions of hunting are reliant upon accepted belief in differences between humans and nonhuman animals, and insofar as science blurs boundaries between humans and animals, hunting takes on the quality of murder. As Cartmill (1993) indicates, "giving up the distinction between [the animal and human] worlds means discarding the whole system of symbolic meanings that have distinguished hunting from mere butchery" (p. 243-244).

The Hunting—Modernity Opposition: Socrates Versus Apollo

Throughout The Birth of Tragedy, Nietzsche emphasizes the absence of Dionysian character as the fundamental degeneracy of Socratic society, and he presents the "new opposition" as that one between Socrates and Dionysus (1872/1968, p. 82). He evidences the rigidity and melancholy of his contemporary late 19th-century Germany, and he calls for a rebirth of myth, ecstasy, and passion. From the Dionysian spirit of
music he supposes that society might be rejuvenated and fortified (Nietzsche, 1872/1968, p. 124).

Based upon examination of central themes in contemporary hunting debates, I contend that this opposition between tragic and contemporary worldviews is of a fundamentally different nature. The tensions surrounding identity, death, and science point not to a lack of Dionysian passion and myth, but to a dispute over Apollinian individuation.

The Tension Surrounding Identity

The Socratic – Apollinian tension is clear in controversies over human identity and hunting. These debates concern the maintenance or dissolution of a human-animal boundary: Hunters make references to crossing the human-animal boundary. Anti-hunters tend to focus on dissolving it.

Assessment of the individual life in the hunting perspective is often situational, based on individual skill and merit. In the criticism of hunting, proof of individual worth is unnecessary insofar as the life is sentient (recall the Socratic maxim, "Knowledge = Virtue") and therefore, equal to other sentient life (Regan, 1983; Singer, 1975; Kheel, 1995). In these matters of boundaries and individual merit, Apollonian individuation is challenged by Socratic depersonalization.
The Tension Surrounding Death

The Socratic – Apollinian tension in discussions of death and hunting is less apparent than in hunting debates over human identity. Controversy over the destruction and suffering caused by hunting may appear to center on Dionysian recognition of life's horror and the opposing Socratic conquering of death. But these disagreements ultimately concern proper attitudes toward existence and the role of individual humans in affecting material conditions and processes. "Hunters should be stopped because they "make wildlife dead dead dead," explains novelist Joy Williams (1991, p 265). Such statements from anti-hunters suggest less that animals should not die than that people should not kill. Death may be unseemly, but it is the hunter's choice to kill that is the principal point of contention.

Some hunters also revert to themes of responsibility when speaking of animals' death (Peterson, 2000; Stange, 1997). Donna described a disagreement with a co-worker who justified eating meat to her by saying "I'm not the one doing the killing, so it's okay." Donna responded, "Indirectly, you are [killing]. If you are willing to buy it, someone's willing to kill it." She described her co-worker's attitude as irresponsible. Such debates as these shift the problem from one of death to one of killing, thus moving the crux of the conflict from the world of Dionysian horror to the
realm of Apollo and individual judgment.

Anti-hunting sentiment concerned with ending the killing of animals is further distinct from tragic appreciation of individual decision and situational ethics: under no circumstances is the killing of animals acceptable (Adams, 1994; King, 1998). Socratic moralism precludes individual dissent. Again, individual action is the central point of controversy, and the tension lies between Socrates and Apollo.

The Tension Surrounding Science

Science could have (and has) been used to promote blurring of human - animal boundaries and thus to condemn hunting for centuries (Cartmill, 1993). Its application to these ends is indicative of underlying Socratic expansionism. Hunting debates involving application of scientific knowledge thus revert to the issues of identity boundaries – a tension between the Socratic and Apollinian spirits.

Another difference between these women hunters' application of science and those of some anti-hunters lies concerns the distinction between experiential knowledge and information. Calling upon information gleaned in anatomy class when gutting a deer entails an element of experience that is absent in relating information that 'subatomic particles do not occur with certainty at definite places but rather "show tendencies to exist"' with feminist perspectives (Kheel, 1985,
This contrast between experiential knowledge and decontextualized information is also present in debates about human identity and death. The women I interviewed justified their claims about identity and animal death with their experiences of hunting, while many anti-hunters justified their claims on information or a priori rationale (Gaard, 1996; Regan, 1983). This tension surrounding science and its relation to hunting is one of Apollinian knowledge and Socratic information.

Implications of the Hunting—Modernity Opposition

"Ninety-nine percent of wildlife management is people management," said Susan. Hunting debates are indeed disputes between and about humans, regardless of their frequent references to nonhuman life. These controversies are fundamentally conflicts over human identity and roles, reflecting larger concerns about social equality and ideal human life. Prevalent Socratic - Apollinian tension in hunting debates suggests not that contemporary society is devoid of passion and myth, but that some aspects of modern society challenge individuation and experiential knowledge. Personal experience (particularly of hardship), comparison between individuals, responsibility, and self-development are tragic-Apollinian ideals that conflict sharply with modern cravings for comfort, rejection of comparison, unconditional self-esteem boosting, and
reverence for information for its own sake.

To say that modern Socratic society is at odds with Apollinian individuation is not to say that it lacks individualism. But Socratic egoism asserts "I am," while the Apollinian self turns the eyes inward and asks, "What am I?" and outward, "What are you?" These inquiries invariably produce unequal and different answers – discrimination in the broadest sense. But the Apollinian determination to promote authenticity and development requires such evaluations and introspection.

For better or for worse, a hunting—tragic worldview involves separation and ordering of the universe. Immutable equality exists only in that fairness of which Horace (1999 version) wrote: "Pale death knocks with an impartial foot at the huts of the poor and the palaces of kings." Here, sentient life is not equal at all times or in all places. Such a perspective can permit domination and oppression, but it can also enable authenticity and development.

The question remains whether a postmodern Socratic perspective is any less violent than a tragic worldview. Announcement of blurred boundaries without acknowledgement of an other is more suggestive of consumption and metaphysical colonialism than of membership and participation, and does not necessarily result in diversity and union. Modern calls for plurality and inclusion are futile without concurrent appreciation of boundaries, restraints, and authenticity. To a worldview
that solicits unity yet refuses to recognize boundaries and otherness, we might declare: Because you abandon Apollo, Dionysus abandons you.

What About Men?

The voices of men are often and easily silenced by accusations of their sadism and aggression, and I suspect that any experiences shared in interviews with men who hunt might be easily dismissed through this common channel. Recent hunting literature demonstrates that not all male hunters are motivated by violence and hostility toward nature, but assertions about such underlying purposes continue (Kheel, 1995; Luke, 1998; Adams, 1994). Denying the potential of various meaning in men's hunting also denies agency and the possibility that they make thoughtful decisions about how to live as modern human beings.

Freelance writer Deborah Homsher (2001) proposes that "female hunters confuse [hunters'] images, and this helps to expose some of the assumptions that generally underlie these polemics" (p. 27). I chose to interview women hunters in order to demonstrate and to counter the dead-ended aspect of false consciousness explanations. I also focused on women in order to explore hunting less burdened by assumptions of violence and tradition. The experiences of these women do not allow me to generalize about the motives of all women hunters, nor about the motives of men who hunt. But the meanings these women described in
their experiences of hunting supports the suggestion that some men might enjoy hunting for reasons other than bloodlust and the exercise of aggression.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

I began this thesis hoping to understand and to represent the meaning found in hunting by some women, and to explore the relation of their hunting to their lives in modern society. Research reliant on explanations of false consciousness presumes that women's hunting is in accordance with modern social values, and it represents women as thoughtless pawns: two negligent and fruitless assumptions.

Many of these women assured me that personal experience is necessary to fully grasp the appeal of hunting. "You have to be there to really understand it, to know it," Donna explained. At the very least, sincere consideration of some related hunting experiences is crucial in order to genuinely explore the social context of women's hunting.

Guided by Nietzschean theory, my inquiries into the experiences of women hunters reveals ways in which hunting is a deliberate and meaningful activity for some women that involves both individual judgment and acceptance of destructive and uncontrollable aspects of existence. Their stories relay the character of tragedy insofar as they include individuation, participation, and a regard for both agency and
structure ("the way it is") in the human experience.

These women's accounts also convey an opposition to some aspects and ideals of modern life, and inquiry into this conflict points to foundations of larger contemporary controversies. These women cited awareness, accountability, and discipline as appealing qualities of hunting, suggesting an inadequacy of these opportunities in daily life. Examination of debates over hunting demonstrates disagreement over the nature of boundaries, ordering, and individual responsibility.

Women's motivations to hunt likely vary, but based on my conversations with these hunters, I suspect that their reasons are more complex and less puppet-like than some scholars posit. These stories demonstrate awareness and agency, convey the influence of some social contexts besides patriarchy, and suggest that these women hunters may be not so much driven by the madness and ecstasy of Dionysus as they are motivated by the measure and acumen of Apollo.
Appendix A

Excerpts Read in Interviews
"Standard justifications of the 'sport' of hunting - that those who engage in it get exercise, take pleasure in communion with nature, enjoy the camaraderie of their friends, or take satisfaction in a shot well aimed - are lame, given the rights view. All these pleasures are obtainable by engaging in activities that do not result in killing any animal (walking through the woods with friends and a camera substitute nicely) . . ." (353-4)

From:

"For hunters, hunting is fun. Recreation is play. Hunting is recreation. Hunters kill for play, for entertainment. They kill for the thrill of it, to make the animal 'theirs' . . . . Hunters believe that wild animals exist only to satisfy their wish to kill them. And it's so easy! The weaponry available is staggering, and the equipment and gear limitless . . . . Hunters use grossly overpowered shotguns and rifles and compound bows . . . . Hunters are piggy. They just can't help it. They're over-equipped, insatiable, malevolent, and vain. They maim and mutilate and despoil . . . . Sport hunting is immoral and should be made illegal. Hunters are persecutors of nature who should be prosecuted" (252-265).

From:
Appendix B

Key Phrases About Hunting
Relating to Nietzschean Concepts
Phrases Reflecting Apollinian Aspects of Hunting

Enjoying the beauty of the natural world
Strategy of the hunt
Being "me" or being "real"
Satisfaction in knowledge and skill required
The ritual (tradition) of hunting
Responsibility
Restraint (not taking shots, not moving)
Enjoyment of masks, camouflage, animal calls
Contemplation, quietness
Seeming eternalness of nature

Phrases Reflecting Dionysian Aspects of Hunting

Confrontation of death and destruction in hunting
Use of instinct in hunting
The chance ("luck), uncertainty, unpredictability of hunting
Participating in the natural world through killing the animal
Experiencing a life and death cycle
Forgetting of self and social identity
Physical discomfort
Guilt and unease of conscience
Relief from order, time, and social demands
The "rush" of hunting and shooting
The continuation of nature despite death of animal

Phrases Addressing Socratism in Society

Sameness of modern society
Predictability of daily life
Ease and comfort of daily life
Societal notions regarding how humans ought to relate to nature
Social ideas on separation of natural and human worlds
Social denial of the death and suffering of game animals
Application of politics (rights and democracy) to nonhumans
An "unreal" quality of daily life
Appendix C

Protocol Clearance From the Human Subjects
Institutional Review Board
Date: October 16, 2001

To: Gerald Markle, Principal Investigator
Deborah Wilson, Student Investigator for thesis

From: Mary Lagerwey, Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 01-10-04

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled “Women Hunters: A Sociological Analysis” has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you may only conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: October 16, 2002
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