Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

This is an author produced version of a paper published in
Human Dimensions of Wildlife.
This paper has been peer-reviewed but may not include the final publisher proof-corrections or pagination.

Citation for the published paper:
von Essen, Erica. (2017) The impact of modernization on hunting ethics: Emerging taboos among contemporary Swedish hunters. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*. Volume: 23, Number: 1, pp 21-38.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10871209.2018.1385111.

Access to the published version may require journal subscription.
Published with permission from: Taylor & Francis.

Standard set statement from the publisher:
"This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published in Human Dimensions on Wildlife on 25 Oct 2017, available online: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10871209.2018.1385111 "

Epsilon Open Archive http://epsilon.slu.se

The Impact of Modernization on Hunting Ethics: Emerging Taboos among Contemporary Swedish Hunters

Pre-published version, Human Dimensions of Wildlife, DOI: 10.1080/10871209.2018.1385111

Author:

Erica von Essen

Division of Environmental Communication, Department of Urban and Rural Development, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala, Sweden

Contact:

Erica.von.essen@slu.se
Division of Environmental Communication, Department of Urban and Rural Development, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences Ulls väg 28, SE-756 51 Uppsala, Sweden

Abstract

This study examines how processes of modernization affect hunting ethics, including commodification, cosmopolitanism, demographic shifts, technological innovation, and invasive species. The impact of such change processes has been documented in indigenous hunting societies, but not in post-industrial Western hunting communities. Instead, wildlife ethics are often seen as a private matter or a static inheritance from past generations, and not as researchable from a perspective of change. The underexposure of research on ethics in this context is explained as taking place within a framework of ethical subjectivism to the detriment of opening up ethics to a needed conversation as the context for hunting changes in modernity. This study uncovers the hunting ethic of contemporary Swedish hunters in response to modernization and reveals new lines of moral demarcation and emerging taboos for right and

wrong hunting. It concludes by considering the virtue of hunting taboos for wildlife conservation.

Keywords: Hunting; Ethics; Modernization; Globalization; Fair Chase; Wildlife; Taboo

Introduction

Research shows that hunters often establish elaborate systems of social norms around standards for propriety (Kuentzel & Heberleln, 1998; Kuperan & Sutinen, 1998; Thomsen & Davies, 2007). Today, however, it is more necessary than ever before for hunting to be "hedged by an elaborate network of restrictions, conditions, and guidelines to prevent it from lapsing into a completely unacceptable activity" by modern standards In brief, if hunters are to continue hunting, they must conduct their shooting, snaring, and trapping practices of wildlife in a way that is acceptable to the public (Knezevic, 2009).

At the same time as higher social standards dictate acceptable forms of hunting today, the context for hunting changes through processes of modernization (Manfredo, Teel, & Dietsch, 2016). Modernization entails a shift in socio-cultural values, including those toward wildlife, that coincides with a rise in urbanization, wealth, technological innovation, individual autonomy, and post-materialist values (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005). In modernity, hunting moves away from satisfying existential needs and instead becomes a realization for self-expression values (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005; Manfredo, Teel, & Henry, 2009). One modernization process that also facilitates the dissemination of associated cultural values is globalization. With respect to hunting, these processes invite new forms of hunting, types of hunters, motivations to hunt, and values toward wildlife. Some of these issues are becoming new taboos of hunting in modernity.

Principal manifestations of modernization first include cosmopolitanism, where hunters travel greater distances, sometimes to other countries, for the privilege of the hunting experience rather than to meet basic existential needs (Komppula & Gartner, 2013; MacDonald, 2005). The ability to travel great distances to hunt reduces the impact of local norms and customs, as these hunters bring their own expectations of appropriate conduct with them. An increased portion of

hunting no longer “takes place within a moral economy in which norms are enforced by virtue of close familiarity” (Dizard, 1999, p. 112). In the argument of at least some local hunters, “leisure seeking city dwellers” (Heley, 2010, p. 323) without a connection to the land, its cultural heritage, or concerns for its future sustainability, impose a new indiscriminate ethic when they hunt to maximize self-expression pursuits emerging in post-industrial society. Second, modernization is manifested in the technological paraphernalia now available to the ordinary hunter (Wall & McClanahan, 2015). This technology (e.g. smartphone alerts connected to wildlife cameras) profoundly stretches the parameters of fair chase and social values that have guided many Western hunting ethics in the past, in particular in the US (Grund, 2017; Pauley, 2003). Increased travel and the acquisition of new weapons and gear are greatly facilitated by globalization (Lovelock, 2008). Third, guided or ‘canned’ hunts reflect a phenomenon of commodification of hunting and with it, its capacity to offer a consumer-based form of self-actualization for the paying client.

There is also a demographic shift in hunting toward the ‘urban tourist’ hunter (Hansen, Peterson, & Jensen, 2012). In the Nordic countries in general and in Sweden in particular, hunters express concern over the new and potentially unethical practices this invites as in recent ethics awareness programs (e.g. ‘etiksatsningen’ in Sweden and ‘jaktetiket’ in Denmark). Swedish hunters often pride themselves on their position as wildlife stewards and their high moral standards for hunting, declaring themselves as among the most ethical hunters in the world (Kaltenborn, Andersen, & Linnell, 2013; von Essen, 2016). In fact, the term for ‘wildlife management’ translates euphemistically into ‘wildlife care’ (*viltvård*) in Swedish (von Essen & Allen, 2016).

To shield against changing values and norms related to hunting, some Swedish hunters internally sanction practices perceived to be unethical as ‘taboos’ (von Essen, 2016; Erica von

Essen, 2017) These taboos represent acts of moral demarcation along some distinctly new ethical lines associated with the evolution of environmental values in hunting communities in a post-industrializing world. This phenomenon is one of increased self-reflexivity in modernity (Giddens, 1991). This paper explores Swedish hunters' informal system of taboos from a point of view of cultural change and whether these taboos serve as proxies for emerging values at a time when hunting as an institution is *permeable* to external change processes. This paper attempts to discern the most controversial hunting practices, and in so doing fills a gap in the literature over taboos in postindustrial societies.

Literature Review

Hunting Taboos

There are three notable gaps in the literature on hunting taboos; the first is that the exploration of hunting taboos is something that is primarily undertaken by (Western) ethnographers among indigenous communities. Researchers often look for curiosities in cosmologies and views on hunting and nature that differ from the dichotomies found in Western thought. Do indigenous hunters, for example, have in-built wildlife conservation mechanisms through their beliefs, such as how some scarce species are taboo because of ancestral association (Pooley et al., 2016)? Researchers have also applied a modernity perspective to indigenous hunting ethics. Some, for example, examine the change brought by colonialization to examine what happens when Christianity is superimposed on a totemist cosmology in a local community (Golden & Comaroff, 2015), such as when new evangelist churches are associated with increased negative attitudes toward carnivores among the Maasai in Kenya and Tanzania (A. J Dickman, 2010), when capitalism and supranational conservation directives intrude on ancient social norms in local cultures (Sodikoff, 2011), or when processes of centralization clash with local

ecological knowledge (Hendriksen & Jørgensen, 2015). In short, researchers have examined the various manifestations of modernization and globalization on hunting ethics. This work has often argued that global processes of rationalization for conservation may erode social norms that already provide an adequate basis for species protection and natural resource management in the respective indigenous hunting or fishing community (Jones, Andriamarovololona, & Hockley, 2008; Paulson, 2012; Sodikoff, 2011).

The preoccupation with exotic cultures' natural resource harvesting ethics in modernity has not been matched by equivalent study in postindustrial contexts (Hettinger, 1994). As noted by Sodikoff (2011), these are norms that are to be found "not merely by marginal societies of the global south but also in secular, industrialized societies" (p. 75). Western hunting communities face globalization and arguably face on a daily basis the input of (often North American) hunting styles that include ATVs, rifles, gear to be shipped internationally, and even new huntable species. The pressures of modernization are thus palpable in post-industrial countries, such as Nordic countries.

Where researchers have shown interest in exploring post-industrial Western hunting ethics (see Marvin, 2006, 2017, 2013 on English fox-hunting, and the deconstruction of fair chase in the US context by Posewitz, 1994), there are few efforts at charting how such ethics undergo *change* in light of the processes of globalization that potentially impact the integrity and stability of such hunting ethics. Hence, the second gap in the literature is that hunting ethics are generally treated as artefacts inherited from previous generations. Building on Sodikoff (2011), then, this paper contends that hunting ethics encounter *at least* as much external influence from modernization processes, including globalization, in these settings as they do among indigenous hunting communities.

Third, the body of literature on hunting ethics in the secular Western context is circumscribed by a tendency to privatize ethics and make them off-limits to research – something that cannot be said for its treatment of exotic cultures' ethics where curiosities are to be studied and picked apart. Western hunting ethics have instead been relegated to the private sphere, as personal affairs of individual experience or situational ethics (see for example Hanna, 2006; Leopold, 1946; Marvin, 2013; Posewitz, 1994). Leopold (1946), in particular, contended that hunting ethics are a matter of individual reflection in a way that has likely borne on the willingness of hunting scholars after him to 'expose' them to research. Some scholars have even contended they have no ostensive "coherence or design," with the implication they – much like hunters themselves – are best left alone (Cohen, 2003). In this way, ethics are not deemed to be researchable on any cultural level. This paper emphatically challenges this assertion by arguing that there exists a collectively agreed upon grammar to any system of hunting ethics that transcends the individual's morality in the moment and is researchable. It also argues that the ethic of the past Protestant Nordic countries (which are seen as a 'homogenous cultural cluster' with respect to values from modernization, see Inglehart & Welzel, 2005) may represent such a system. In this paper, grammar is considered a system of do's and don'ts in hunting that cut across class, locality, and background (Sodikoff, 2011). These have a logic to them and have not been "sifted from the clouds" (Morris, 2010, p. 5).

Ethical Relativism and Hunters as "Moral Islands Unto Themselves"

The tendency to privatize ethics should be understood within a conceptual framework of ethical relativism. This is the idea that morals cannot be objectively justified or absolute, but are relative to their time and place, or even individual (Callicott, 2004; Dickman, Johnson, van Kesteren, & Macdonald, 2015). Although ethical relativism as a doctrine of understanding of different hunting ethics is instructive, Harris (1999) argued that *normative* ethical relativism of the kind here applied to

Western hunting ethics instead functions as a “conversation stopper” (Harris, 1999, p. 44) Harris (1999) criticized ethical relativism for collapsing into an unhelpful *ethical subjectivism* (pp. 36-37) and ultimately for construing people as “moral islands unto themselves” (p. 37), whom no one has the right to criticize, for no one is in their position. Such moral isolationism is problematic in the context of globalization for three reasons. First, the interaction of individuals from across cultures necessitates guidance “about how to interact with other cultures” (Harris, 1999, p. 46). Second, as argued here, part of globalization involves the ‘commoning’ of wildlife (i.e., to appropriate wildlife as a global resource for biodiversity), becoming a public good that can no longer be autonomously governed by individual landowners (Nurse, 2016). Public goods, moreover, require public societal discussions about the ethical principles that govern these goods. Ethical cosmopolitans (see van Hooft, 2009) would thus reject the morally relativist approach to Western hunting ethics in a globalizing world and, in Harris’ (1999) words “begin a conversation” about such ethics (p. 325). Third, wildlife researchers are becoming aware of the need to monitor value change in modernity and stress that we need to improve our understanding of the changing dynamics (Manfredo et al., 2016).

In summary, there are three important limitations in the literature that prompt the research in this paper: (a) the limited research on postindustrial hunting ethics, (b) the limited understanding of sportspersons and fair chase in the context of social change and globalization, and (c) the morally isolationist approach that is often applied to understanding one’s hunting ethic. The following case study complements the literature by showing the need for conversations about ethics in modernizing post-industrial countries. This paper also contributes to understanding how globalization conditions, erodes, or gives rise to new environmental values, even to the point of prompting the re-activation of nostalgia and traditions around moral norms as a rejection of the change and uncertainty that globalization is seen to bring to rural communities (von Essen & Allen, 2017). These values may be

seen as denoting moral progress *or* moral decline to the particular culture's ethics, hence they are simply referred to as 'moral change' with hunting respondents making their own value judgments. This case study involved qualitative research of Swedish hunters.

Methods

Soliciting and interviewing hunters about some practices, such as illegal hunting and other practices perceived to be unethical, necessitated an indirect approach with respondents. Versions of this indirect approach have been used in recent studies of illegal hunting with success in uncovering candid reflections of both unlawful and unethical actions (Liu et al., 2011; Moro et al., 2013; Nielsen, Jacobsen, & Thorsen, 2014; Nuno & St. John, 2015; Pohja-Mykrä & Kurki, 2014). The selection of this study's respondents ranged from having profound ethical scruples and elaborate social sanctioning systems (including ex-military officers) to those who were more accommodating of transgressions. Respondents were identified by a snowball sampling approach based on three sources: contacts to the researchers, hunters posting on the largest online forum for hunters in Sweden (*robsoft*), and hunters affiliated with local branches of either of the two Swedish hunting associations in the areas visited. Areas included the counties of Värmland, Uppland, Dalarna, Västmanland, Skåne, Norrland and Örebro to name a few, which represent a geographic and cultural spread of hunting styles and game. Hunters with active positions in membership associations most often functioned as a liaison for connecting with other hunters in their counties.

The snowballing process resulted in a respondent sample ranging from 21 to 90 years of age. The sample comprised of both male and female hunters, hunters from a variety of occupations (e.g., industry, service, academic), and hunters who varied in terms of when and how they were introduced to hunting. In this way, the respondent sample was consistent with

the demographic diversity that characterizes Nordic hunting communities today (Hansen et al., 2012). Although interviews were conducted in northern, southern, western, and eastern counties to capture local hunting traditions, many respondents also had geographically diverse backgrounds, having lived or hunted in several places. This proved to be a proxy for getting hunters to reflect on hunting taboos, as they were more comfortable commenting on what they saw as ethically questionable practices in *other parts* of Sweden.

Indirect and hypothetical questioning techniques were employed in the interview (Pohja-Mykrä & Kurki, 2014). These included, for example, asking respondents about what *other* hunters would do, if one *knew* of someone who had behaved in an unethical manner, and what had been done in this case. Speaking about ethical transgressions in this way imparted a veil of anonymity to respondents (who were kept completely confidential throughout the research) and a 'safe' distance to taboos (Scott, 1985). Over the course of interviewing, however, nearly all hunters struggled with a simultaneous desire to publicize their own ethical credentials (which was most easily done through condemning the hunting practices of others in other areas) while also trying to protect the integrity of hunting as a reputable institution comprised of "law-abiding good-honest people." As a result of this internal conflict, most interviews with hunters began defensively by stressing how ethical hunters were in general, but then subsequently discussed different themes that gradually revealed misconduct. As a result, these in-depth, semi-structured interviews were the appropriate format for teasing out these candid reflections. The interviews lasted approximately 1.5 to 2 hours.

A total of 39 interviews with Swedish hunters were recorded, transcribed, and open-coded in QDA Miner software using a thematic analysis. The data first became subject to targeted papers focusing on hunters' relationship to state rules and their trust in state institutions.

As such, ethical matters were most often discussed by respondents in relation to how well they were reflected in law or how they presently failed to do so. There may have been a potential bias on the part of the interview design where hunters were encouraged to present their ethics as something with great integrity cultivated over generations and to contrast them with laws recently imposed by wildlife conservation policy. Nevertheless, respondents were asked to be reflexive and self-critical about their ethics. This was done, for example, by asking if they felt legislation was too lax on a particular point and their morals compelled greater sanctions. In this case, respondents started to identify not only shortcomings in the law, but critiques toward the sort of ethic that had undergirded the legislation in the first place. Taken together, an inductive finding of both the coding and interview processes was that there was a dense informal system of do's and don'ts among hunters.

Results

This section presents a synthesis of the results of interviews with some Swedish hunters, their taboos in hunting, and how these relate to the impact of globalization. Some responses appear to result from diffusions of attitudes toward wildlife from other hunting cultures and modern values around self-expression, whereas others may be seen as *responses* on the part of members of the Swedish hunting community *to* globalization, such as taboos around North American hunting styles or southern European commodity-based 'trophy' hunting. The results comprise four themes, including: (a) the growth of an invasive species ethic, (b) social taboos around competitiveness and property rights, and (c) commodification of hunting invites 'gearhead hunters.' The fourth and final theme involves sanctioning systems for unethical conduct, which explores *how* hunters enforce codes of conduct when taboos emerge in their groups.

Growth of an Invasive Species Ethic

Globalization facilitates the spread of invasive alien species at a rapid pace (Meyerson & Mooney, 2007). In the hunting context, game species have been both intentionally and unintentionally imported across national boundaries. In some cases, the invasive species face added animosity by mobilizing xenophobic resentment because they are associated with a foreign threat and may be seen as 'illegal' immigrants, which has facilitated their persecution (Martínez-Jauregui, Linares, Carranza, & Soliño, 2017; von Essen & Allen, 2016).

Even when new species are cherished for the new game opportunity, they struggle to find a place in hunters' moral hierarchy for wildlife. Respondents, for example, considered the influx and rapid proliferation of the wild boar *"corrupted a lot of the hunting today"* and brought out *"the worst side of hunters."* They saw the sorts of practices that wild boar hunting compelled (discussed below), as taboo, as wild boar had quickly gained the reputation of a pest species because of its crop damage. Varmint status of this species constituted a "*moving and shifting*" of ethical boundaries, as one respondent in charge of hunter education suggested. Other respondents affirmed this directly by critiquing its pest status and the subsequent *"cull*" or "*control*" rather than hunting practices that befell it, which were spoken of with distaste.

Respondents reflected on several taboos that had arisen around wild boar shooting, such as premature calling off tracking efforts for wounded boars, leaving carcasses in the woods, reckless shooting practices, and overreliance on technological aids. "*You can use lighting in a whole different way [to other game] and you can use trapping which is shocking when you think about it really,"* one respondent observed. He added that hunting boars with dogs was still in its experimental phase, and consequently invited some morally suspect practices, with highly

sharp/aggressive dogs imported from continental Europe (e.g., Poland). This was seen as tainting Swedish dog hunting culture and as a rising taboo.

Respondents also reflected on what had become a mix of a recreational character to shooting wild boar. On the one hand, the species was objectified as "*more like funny black dots*" rather than seen as sentient animals. On the other hand, this was seen as a utilitarian form of pest control that had few of the virtues of true process-oriented hunting. Two respondents argued *"people talk about them like shooting rats; they just want them gone"* and "*it's become more like a kind of clean-up pest control and less like a hunt, a bit like getting an ant infestation in your house."* These quotes were said with apparent distaste and criticism. Of the clean-up character to wild boar hunting, respondents noted that they took cues from North America, where they argued one resorted to more extreme measures. But, they also suggested the element of recreation followed modern hunting's development away from meeting basic needs and toward becoming a means of self-expression.. They exemplified coyote tournaments in modern US hunting culture that became contests at the expense of the wildlife. For two respondents, the varmint status of a game species meant "*relaxing if not rules then ethical standards,"* and at times could mean "*a whole different ethic*" that was ethically indefensible when taken to its extreme. Respondents further criticized bad language for reflecting or contributing to unethical shooting practices:

> *Don't say, I shot that son-of-a-bitch.*
>
> *I hear people speak in a way that makes me question where they were educated; it bothers me something awful - 'He shot a pig devil', stuff like that.*
>
> *The more pigs we get, the more such discussion is heard. Pig-bastard? It's still a life.*

Given this discourse is both constitutive and reflective of reality, it may be worrisome from an ethical perspective, then, how wildlife is talked about.

It was not just in the context of shooting or talking about wild boars that taboos were emerging. Hunters also found some management practices associated with this species morally objectionable. Where there are typically strict regulations for the supplementary feeding and baiting of game in Swedish hunting culture and law, including types of food and season hunted, there appeared to be open season as far as leaving food out to wild boars was concerned: "*nobody would ever sit and stake out to kill a deer at a feeding station. But for pigs that's allowed*." One feeding practice included presenting wild boars with high-starch processed foods year around. Such feeding and baiting, one respondent complained, "*takes away the wildness"* of the species. The taboo of this feeding and baiting may be a double-edged sword for respondents, as it involved less dispositional wildness and hence an easy kill (although a taboo for any self-respecting sportsperson), but it also meant a reduced constitutive wildness of the wildlife where human interference had compromised the autonomy of a wild animal philosophically by crossing a boundary (cf.Palmer, 2010). More concretely, the feeding and baiting was also taboo to hunters on account of involving obvious deception for the sake of recreation, again detaching hunting from existential security to modern leisure. To one hunter, it imparted "*more calculated butchering than hunting*," with the implication the former was not proper sportsmanlike hunting.

Social Taboos around Competitiveness and Property Rights

Hunters have always been self-critical in terms of demarcating 'good' or 'real' hunters from 'slob hunters,' 'poachers,' 'thrill-killers,' and more (Heley, 2010; Kuentzel, 1994). In Sweden, the latter questionable types of hunting seem to be infusing the culture at some key junctures. Respondents, for example, agreed there were "*certain things you do and certain things you don't"* and recently there was increased clarity around what these things were. The first connected to *social* taboos. Respondents emphasized a unique Swedish ideal of 'jägarmässighet'

(sportsmanlike hunting). Within this, hunters who overshot their bag limits manifested a competitive disposition that was not welcome in their group and was seen as un-Swedish. It was associated with North American hunters and Southern European trophy-motivated hunters. Several respondents contrasted their dispositions with that of other countries' hunting traditions and communities. Swedish prudence was said to be *"…definitely a cultural thing. Swedes and Sweden are very thorough and hunters have high expectations of themselves. Then you get down to Spain and Italy.*" Here, two respondents criticized the 'macho' character of Finnish hunting culture, five pointed out the sloppiness of Danes in the south of Sweden, and four criticized the trophy fixation of Germans: "*They go for the horns. Whereas for Swedes, out of custom and culture, meat is what matters to us*". Foreign hunting, seen to be more immersed in modernity's values of self-expression and self-actualization, had a contaminating effect on hunting ethics generally, as foreigners increasingly travelled to Sweden to hunt moose or large birds in the north for the sheer experience.

One attitude that respondents admitted to not having imported from what they saw as North American hunting culture and hunting communities globally, was the *"my ranch is my castle"* mentality. Although they agreed that trespassing on other landowners' land was taboo (inconsistent with showing tact and respect for the community), they noted that modern Swedish hunters tended toward the dissolution of private property boundaries in a way that was perhaps a reaction to the old way and how they viewed other hunting cultures. For example, respondents reflected on the tension between wanting to be a socially tactful hunter and ensuring animal welfare, using the case of a wounded animal running into a neighbour's land. One hunter concluded that today, the welfare of the animal overrode the ego of property rights: "*ideally I should call him, but the best thing to do might be to go in and euthanize it and then get in*

contact. And, as a rule I've done that […] it's better for the animal that I put it out of its misery first."

A majority of respondents acknowledged that the sanctity around private property and patrolling one's borders from neighbors had declined in recent years. The line of criticism toward older generations was that they presumably had more riding on their harvest than present hunters: *"They grew up with a different hunting form than the one that's here today."* Another respondent suggested this rationality was improving with time: "*It's gotten loads better now the old generation is dying out,*" but that there were still quarrels with neighbors over boundaries. In part, the severity of trespassing depended on the preexisting relationship one had with their neighbor. Perhaps more importantly, however, hunters said they now took as much or stronger aversion to zealous policing of boundaries as they did to trespassing during hunts in the first place. One hunter recalled neighbors who had "*put up these ribbons to make sure the moose would stay in the forest and they'd rake dirt roads to be able to track moose prints and stuff like that.*" Another talked about a stubborn hunter who always policed his property: "*this guy is getting old, he's 75 […] he closes down routes and barks at people who walk their dogs without leashes, like Labradors and such […] it's some kind of grudge*." A third hunter recalled how in his hunting region "*people would stake out at the land boundaries to make sure a moose wouldn't go into your neighbor's land. It was pure jealousy*." Another two respondents critically observed that most such activity had its roots in "*good old fashioned Swedish jealousy*" or could "*…be traced back to jealousy."* The latter hunter added that "*jealousy is some of the worst things you can have, and there's actually quite a bit of it in hunting*." Inasmuch as hunting was facing global influences, then, this typically Swedish jealousy was being dissolved by more animal welfare conscious concerns. The taboo, however, was also in part a reaction against North

American “*my ranch is my castle*” mentality from diffusing into Swedish hunting culture at a time when such influence was profound.

Commodification of Hunting Invites ‘Gearhead Hunters’

The technological innovation in hunting and the increased importation of new gadgets from overseas meant that “*hunting has become so technified*” as one respondent stated, including ATVs, drones, rifle scopes, GPS trackers, electronic lures, and baiting cameras connected to smartphones. Approximately one-third of hunters interviewed in this study distanced themselves from what they saw had become too much of modern gearhunting:

> *Things like image amplifiers and sound amplifiers. No, I distance myself from that. Some people can sit with the pigs 300 meters away. That doesn’t feel ethical to me.*
>
> *It’s not hunting. It’s something else.*
>
> *It’s gotten out of hand in some places. It’s a far cry from traditional hunting.*

Respondents also implied that the “*global green agenda*” for biodiversity conservation that was increasingly imposed on hunters undermined hunting ethics. They connected this to the increased presence of wolves in Sweden, a problematic “*modern project*” attributable to globalization (seeing natural resources as ‘shared’), which made untethered dog hunting impossible and, in turn, invited more gadgetry in hunting. One respondent argued the dog tradition has so far inoculated against technological shortcuts in hunting by maintaining an organic nature to the practice that took the emphasis off shooting. “*Because of our loose dog hunting and our tradition in Sweden, I along with most people value the experience of taking your dog out in the woods for a hunt above anything else [ATVs or other gadgets of convenience] have no place there*”. Gadgets were thus becoming a new taboo to these hunters.

Several respondents also argued that increased wolf populations devastate the countryside in two crucial interrelated respects. First, the problems of living with wolves meant the countryside was gradually depopulated of people who had lived there for generations. Second, with their exodus, the countryside was argued to be vulnerable to an influx of new hunters not rooted in the morals of the older generations. These hunters were described by respondents as "*a whole different clientele*" of lower moral caliber. These hunters were identified as a new demographic of hunters who would be considerably less ethical about their hunting because they were based in cities and want to maximize their shooting and harvesting. These hunters, one respondent argued, were all about making sure "*everything has to happen right now, fire off a shot and be home by noon*" – a disposition that was morally suspect because it violated the process element of hunting. Another respondent suggested that urban hunters meant a shift in ethics toward treating "*hunting like golfing*." He added that this was problematic, because "*you don't step in to do the stewarding stuff. You just go out a few days a year, the leasing prices are through the roof so when you're out there you want to shoot yourself an animal. You want to maximize your investment."* To him, the influence of modern life and globalization on hunting meant *"there's been a slippage from what you'd normally call public everyman's hunting in Sweden, where you hunt on your own plot of land*."

The commodification of hunting also extended to an increased trend toward paying for canned hunts in exotic locations. These canned hunts were criticized for their lack of sport and for being "…*on someone else's terms*." From this perspective, the 'pro hunter' orchestrated the affair down to the last detail: *"You don't go a single meter without a hunting guide.*" Money, greed, and commercial hunts were taken to *"…bring out the worst in hunters*" as it did not *"feel as sportsmanlike when the animals aren't free-roaming."* Higher costs were thought by others to

have "*an effect on morals and ethics and norms"* by conveying the ideal that hunting should be about maximizing one's investment. One respondent likewise suggested that hunting ethics that had been cultivated over a long time were now challenged to keep up with new technology and conveniences in society – "*for good and bad,*" with the implication that hunters also had to become more reflexive about and adaptive in their ethics.

Sanctioning Systems for Unethical Conduct

An essential part of realizing such reflexivity and maintaining order in a changing hunting culture was social sanctioning systems. These were increasingly strict, and hunters were often seen as "*quick to criticize each other.*" Sanctions ranged from temporary or permanent exclusions of 'slob hunters' to relatively sophisticated mechanisms in place, including mentor vouching systems, probationary periods, and evaluation assessments. Shooting the wrong animal was arguably the most frequently raised taboo among respondents. It was seen as problematic because it potentially 'mix-taxed' the wildlife populations (i.e., undermining its future reproductive potential):

> *If you shoot a heifer moose when we've agreed we only shoot bulls or calves, for example. Even if there was game left on the license and it wasn't a crime in the legal sense, it was a violation of the hunting group's own rules.*

Although most hunters were sympathetic toward genuine mistakes (e.g., "*There's not a single person with a driver's license who doesn't occasionally speed"*), "*chronic bad luck*" with these things, as one respondent put it, would typically result in the loss of one's place in the group. The hunting group is the central social organizing unit for Swedish hunters, although they can be a member of several such groups (Gunnarsdotter, 2005). If it were isolated incidents, respondents suggested he could be driven home, given a different task, or receive some form of probation.

"*You are barred from hunting for a few days. At most it's five days."* To the majority of respondents, the hunting group leader should carry out these sanctions:

> *A hunting leader should maintain order […] he should have authority. He needs to be a straight shooter and speak up when things happen. At the same time he needs to be quite diplomatic.*

There was a relief in delegating sanctioning to the hunting leader. One respondent argued "*that's why you have a hunting leader. They're the ones to deal with this stuff."* An additional three respondents expressed unease over "*not wanting to pester"* fellow hunters or "*stirring the pot"* with small issues such as improper weapons handling. They connected this to a Swedish mentality of being non-confrontational. Much policing of taboos was therefore contingent on the moral authority of the hunting group leader: "*that the hunting leader gives you a ribbing is something that's very bad and public*" and "*you don't have to do it in front of the whole group, there's no reason for that.*"

Not all respondents, however, were happy with delegating moral authority to the hunting leader. Consistent with emerging modern values on emancipation from authority and a belief in democracy (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005), many respondents now formalized and indeed de-personalized ethics and rules. They emphasized how the hunting leader, rather than being a stern father figure, needed to be responsive and diplomatic and hold discussions. Another respondent gave an example of each member amending an initial proposal for ethical conduct to be worked on by all, and he added that this added weight of deliberative legitimacy meant "*now whoever breaks these rules is given hell."* Similarly, another respondent recalled discussions on wrong-doings as being followed by the democratic procedure of voting. *"it's important for me as a hunter leader to have those discussions. To examine these issues. […] we've also had votes."* Others still suggested that de-personalizing codes of conduct from the hunting leader could be

done by ritualistically repeating the rules at the beginning of each meeting. This collective responsibility was especially important in situations where the hunting group leader failed to take sufficient action.

Discussion

The previous section synthesized four main contexts in which respondents identified changing taboos: (a) the growth of an invasive species ethic, (b) social taboos around competitiveness and property rights, (c) commodification of hunting invites ‘gearhead hunters,’ and (d) sanctioning systems for unethical conduct. In these contexts, respondents’ ethics concerning appropriate hunting appear to be changing—becoming at once stricter, more accommodating, more progressive, and more reactive—consistent with findings of growing complexity of wildlife values in modernized postindustrial societies (Bruskotter et al., 2017).

These results suggest that a global hunting standard for pest species may be spreading to Sweden. The wild boar was identified as the species suffering the most from this moral change. Furthermore, non-native species challenge animal welfare standards (Scruton, 2000). Swedish hunters face several immigrating or re-colonizing species, including the raccoon dog, wolf, and wild rabbit, which sometimes trigger negligence in shooting and tracking practices either because these animals are seen as outsiders to a moral economy of predation (Arts, Fischer, & van der Wal, 2016) or because the absence of a tradition around their shooting opens these animals up to facing “*the worst in hunters*” (quote from a respondent). Although the literature notes that varmint status elicits unceremonious killing (Marvin, 2007), which as affirmed by respondents here, there was also an emerging lusory ethic (i.e., a player entering a game) associated with the recreational character of wild boar hunting. Respondents worried that hunting wild boar appeared to be motivated less by subsistence needs and more by a desire for

recreational killing. They were influenced by, for example, coyote tournaments in the US (Bogliogli, 2009) where killing pests provides a recreational outlet. Pest species hunting appeared to confer greater freedoms and experimentation in shooting practices, facilitated by technological innovation. By appealing to the self-expressive leisure goals of modern hunters, a new game species and new weapons available to shoot this species point toward some influences from modernization and globalization.

It may be argued that globalization not only facilitates the *spread* of invasive species (Meyerson & Mooney, 2007), but that some of its discourses around eco-holism (see, for example, Dudgeon, 2008, on discourses of globalization) and ecocentric values bring unfavorable dispositions toward these species at a general level. At a time when buzzwords around naturalness, indigeneity, and authenticity implicitly make us value some species above others (von Essen & Allen, 2016), invasive species are at a disadvantage (Wallach, Bekoff, Nelson, & Ramp, 2015). Hunters in this study now presented boars as a problem from an ecocentric point of view where they challenged the integrity of the ecosystem by threatening native fauna. As revealed by this argument, ecosystem integrity had become an increasingly valuable good and argumentative resource. The latter outlook is connected to Swedish hunters raising their gaze toward longer-term sustainability, as evidenced in this study.

The increasingly ecocentric ethic should not be necessarily embraced as moral progress, however. The ethic is sometimes criticized as eco-fascist in sacrificing individuals, or even species, for the purported 'good' of the ecosystem (see the critique of Leopold's land ethic by Regan, 2003). It is an approach that suffers from epistemic uncertainty where we cannot accurately predict the future consequences of our hunting actions (Wade, 1990; Wallach et al., 2015). Ecocentrism may hence be criticized on account of claiming to speak in objective-

ecological terms, a recent tendency among Swedish hunters in particular (von Essen, 2015). In this argumentation, ecocentrism masks subjective judgments that underlie hunting practices.

To this end, ecocentrism may have imparted a bigger picture view that now brings some earlier practices into disrepute. It was clear, for example, that most respondents abhorred the kind of provincial *possessive individualism* (Manning, 1993) that characterized older generations of hunters and which represented, to them, the provincial and short-sighted outlook of previously isolated rural communities. To hunters in this study, the time of isolationism was over and hunters were now accountable to a globalizing world. Where before trespassing on another's land or depriving them of a kill was a taboo that could fester locally through generations, such 'petty' feuding had now emerged as a *new* taboo to the contemporary hunter. This suggests that hunters increasingly frown on landowners who put their egos above the needs of wildlife. The taboo may also signal the growth of compassion on the part of hunters in post-modern society (Bruskotter et al., 2017).

It is worth imparting a distinction between moral progress and moral decline, which both denote 'moral change.' Taboos found in this study are of particular analytical utility because they may be said to demonstrate both progress and decline. There is moral degeneration following the influx of urban leisure hunters and the hunting practices that befall new invasive game species such as wild boar. At the same time, hunter reflexivity in *identifying* these developments as new taboos may be said to represent the kind of moral progress characteristic of modernity (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005). Wallace (1996) suggested that as part of this reflexivity, practices become morally questionable with time because people realize they violate those norms that are inherent in other practices that we accept and virtues that we value. Much like slavery was condemned because of a fundamental belief in human rights and freedom, some hunters now condemn

technology, canned hunts, and unethical shortcuts because they are seen to violate the principles of fairness they value in this and other sports. These also violate virtues of *authenticity* in nature-based reaction in modernity such as being on nature's terms and reconciling with nature (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005).

Ethics are "*under continuous change*," as stated by one of the respondents. They are embedded in a particular culture at a particular time and place, and indeed culture comes from the word *cultivate*, which implies growth and change. Modernization scholars acknowledge that cultural change is path dependent within 'cultural clusters' (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005). This change process, however, is not in any way easily predictable or linear, as it can sometimes take one step forward and two steps back. There may be reason to believe, for example, that the strong emphasis expressed by some hunters in this study on the "Swedish way" of caring for wildlife – in contrast to their perceived influences from abroad – is a way of coping with the fear of loss of tradition and values at a time when a global hunting culture encroaches on local hunting histories and embodied knowledge of the land (von Essen & Allen, 2017). This phenomenon can sometimes trigger what the public might understand as moral regression in hunters reverting to nativism and nostalgia over the way they used to steward wildlife (for this reaction in the political sphere, see e.g. Inglehart & Norris, 2016). Certainly, such a discourse was present here where 'urbanites' and cosmopolitans were perceived as agents of moral degeneration in almost xenophobic ways. Research shows that these same hunters also showed tendencies of voting for populist right-wing parties, such as the Swedish Democrats, and lament the 'death' of the tradition (von Essen & Allen, 2017). As such, there may be a strong element to hunting ethics that is at least partially regressive and involves romanticizing traditional virtues against globalization and modernization.

One particular reaction may be found in the example of enacting the typically "Swedish way" of resolving taboos in hunting groups, understood here as formalizing and encoding ethical principles for conduct. In some ways, this can be interpreted as a counter-reaction to the influence of international hunting ethics on the one hand (e.g., the ethical subjectivism inherent in Leopold's assertion that ethics are personal and situational) and the influence of ethical relativism, which states that ethics can never be objectively justified or absolute. At this juncture, Swedish hunters in this study demonstrably called for formalizing such ethics, yet it is also a manifestation of modernization's emancipation from authority and strengthening of democracy (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005). In sum, then, given that modernization precipitates not only cultural change in attitudes toward wildlife, but more importantly invites conflict, paradoxes, and pluralism in hunter relationships to wildlife, it is essential that future research focuses on disentangling these complexities and examining reactions and counter-reactions in new change-oriented frameworks. This must arguably be encouraged above research that collapses the phenomenon into existing human-wildlife value debates (e.g., anthropocentrism vs. non-anthropocentrism, utilitarianism vs mutualism). Clearly, the situation is much more nuanced.

Insofar as this research raises insights for further study, the critique of ethical relativism has implications for the current discussion on the role of cultural taboos in conservation. This debate emphasizes that on one side, many hunting taboos are beneficial for conservation and should be accommodated, even encouraged by wildlife managers (Dickman et al., 2015). Such values are justified on this perspective because they may lead to the same end goal of enhancing biodiversity (see the 'convergence hypothesis' by Norton, 1991). However, since this study has demonstrated that cultural values behind conservation are unreliable and at times *regressive* when clashing with globalization and modernization (Dickman & Hazzah, 2016), it may be

precarious for managers to embrace all hunting ethics as moral progress. This is especially tenuous so long as research continues to view hunting ethics in the West as a matter of ethical subjectivism – up to the individual in the situation. At the very least, as endorsed by ethical cosmopolitans, these ethical issues need to be taken up for conversation among members of the scholarly community.

Conclusion

Environmental values are compelling to research in hunting contexts because they translate into practical behaviors or codes of conduct that are then upheld through sanctions. Indeed, hunting communities have always been "saturated with codes" (Seitz, 2010, p. 77), where even Plato's *The Laws* distinguished between "vicious" and "virtuous" hunting (Scruton, 2010). This paper began by observing a research gap on changing hunting ethics in post-industrial hunting communities, who are strongly influenced by processes of modernization and globalization. This gap was argued to have been facilitated by a paradigm of ethical relativism. A case study involving a sample of Swedish hunters showed the principal areas in which ethics now changed, including new species, technology, demographic shift of hunters, cosmopolitanism, and commodification. Taboos were constituted in the clash between local traditions and global forces. The paper concluded by observing how wildlife values move from the individual to the holistic, and toward greater self-imposed standards of *how* to hunt in socially, aesthetically, and morally defensible ways. The case study raises the question of what role wildlife managers should give to changing and unstable cultural taboos in promoting conservation or animal welfare.

References

Arts, K., Fischer, A., & van der Wal, R. (2016). Boundaries of the Wolf and the Wild: A Conceptual Examination of the Relationship Between Rewilding and Animal Reintroduction. *Restoration Ecology, 24*(1), 27-34. doi:10.1111/rec.12309

Bogliogli, M. (2009). *A Matter of Life and Death: Hunting in Contemporary Vermont*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.

Bruskotter, J. T., Vucetich, J. A., Manfredo, M. J., Karns, G. R., Wolf, C., Ard, K., . . . Ripple, W. J. (2017). Modernization, Risk, and Conservation of the World's Largest Carnivores. *BioScience, 67*(7), 646-655. doi:10.1093/biosci/bix049

Callicott, J. B. (2004). Environmental Ethics: I. Overview. In S. G. Post (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of bioethics* (3rd ed. ed., Vol. 2, pp. 757–769). New York, USA: Macmillan Reference USA.

Cohen, J. A. (2003). Is Hunting a Sport? *International Journal of Applied Philosophy, 17*(2), 291-326.

Dickman, A., Johnson, P. J., van Kesteren, F., & Macdonald, D. W. (2015). The Moral Basis For Conservation: How Is It Affected By Culture? *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 13*(6), 325-331. doi:10.1890/140056

Dickman, A. J. (2010). Complexities of Conflict: The Importance of Considering Social Factors For Effectively Resolving Human–Wildlife Conflict. *Animal Conservation, 13*(5), 458-466. doi:10.1111/j.1469-1795.2010.00368.x

Dickman, A. J., & Hazzah, L. (2016). Money, Myths and Man-Eaters: Complexities of Human–Wildlife Conflict. In F. M. Angelici (Ed.), *Problematic Wildlife: A Cross-Disciplinary Approach* (pp. 339-356). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Dizard, J. E. (1999). *Going Wild: Hunting, Animal Rights, and the Contested Meaning of Nature*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachussetts Press

Dudgeon, R. (2008). *Common Ground: Eco-Holism and Native American Philosophy*. Raleigh, N.C.: Lulu.

Giddens, M. (1991). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Golden, C. D., & Comaroff, J. (2015). Effects of Social Change on Wildlife Consumption Taboos in Northeastern Madagascar. *Ecology and Society, 20*(2). doi:10.5751/ES-07589-200241

Grund, B. S. (2017). Behavioral Ecology, Technology, and the Organization of Labor: How a Shift from Spear Thrower to Self Bow Exacerbates Social Disparities. *American Anthropologist, 119*(1), 104-119. doi:10.1111/aman.12820

Gunnarsdotter, Y. (2005). *Från Arbetsgemenskap Till Fritidsgemenskap. Den Svenska Landsbygdens Omvandling Ur Locknevis Perspektiv.* (PhD Doctoral Thesis), Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala.

Hanna, E. (2006). Fair Chase: To Where Does It Lead? In J. Manore & D. G. Miner (Eds.), *The Culture of Hunting in Canada* (pp. 239-276). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Hansen, H. P., Peterson, M. N., & Jensen, C. (2012). Demographic Transition Among Hunters: A Temporal Analysis of Hunter Recruitment Dedication and Motives in Denmark. *Wildlife Research, 39*(5), 446-451. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/WR12028

Harris, C. E. (1999). *Towards a Theory of Moral Change.* Paper presented at the OEC International Conference on Ethics in Engineering and Computer Science.

Heley, J. (2010). The New Squirearchy And Emergent Cultures Of The New Middle Classes In Rural Areas. *Journal of Rural Studies, 26*(4), 321-331. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2010.03.002

Hendriksen, K., & Jørgensen, U. (2015). Hunting and Fishing Settlements in Upernavik District of Northern Greenland – Challenged by Climate, Centralization, and Globalization. *Polar Geography, 38*(2), 123-145. doi:10.1080/1088937X.2015.1034222

Hettinger, N. (1994). Valuing Predation in Rolston's Environmental Ethics: Bambi Lovers Versus Tree Huggers. *Environmental Ethics, 16*(1), 3-20.

Inglehart, R., & Norris, P. (2016). *Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism: Economic Have-Nots and Cultural Backlash*. John F. Kennedy School of Government Faculty Research Working Paper Series. HKS Working Paper No. RWP16-026

Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jones, J. P. G., Andriamarovololona, M. M., & Hockley, N. (2008). The Importance of Taboos and Social Norms to Conservation in Madagascar. *Conservation Biology, 22*(4), 976-986. doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2008.00970.x

Kaltenborn, B. P., Andersen, O., & Linnell, J. D. C. (2013). Predators, Stewards, or Sportsmen – How Do Norwegian Hunters Perceive Their Role in Carnivore Management? *International Journal of Biodiversity Science, Ecosystem Services & Management, 9*(3), 239-248. doi:10.1080/21513732.2013.818060

Knezevic, I. (2009). Hunting and Environmentalism: Conflict or Misperceptions. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife, 14*(1), 12-20. doi:10.1080/10871200802562372

Komppula, R., & Gartner, W. C. (2013). Hunting as a Travel Experience: An Auto-Ethnographic Study Of Hunting Tourism in Finland And The USA. *Tourism Management, 35*, 168-180. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2012.06.014

Kuentzel, W. F. (1994). Skybusting and the Slob Hunter Myth. *Wildlife Society Bulletin (1973-2006), 22*(2), 331-336. doi:10.2307/3783265

Kuentzel, W. F., & Heberleln, T. A. (1998). Why Do Hunters Skybust? Personal Disposition or Social Influence. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife, 3*(1), 1-15. doi:10.1080/10871209809359111

Kuperan, K., & Sutinen, J. (1998). Blue Water Crime: Deterrence, Legitimacy, and Compliance in Fisheries. *Law & Society Review, 32*(2), 309-338. doi:10.2307/827765

Leopold, A. (1946). *A Sand County Almanac*: Oxford University Press.

Liu, F., McShea, W. J., Garshelis, D. L., Zhu, X., Wang, D., & Shao, L. (2011). Human-Wildlife Conflicts Influence Attitudes But Not Necessarily Behaviors: Factors Driving the Poaching of Bears In China. *Biological Conservation, 144*(1), 538-547. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2010.10.009

Lovelock, B. (2008). *Tourism and the Consumption of Wildlife: Hunting, Shooting and Sport Fishing*. New York Routledge.

Luke, B. (1997). A Critical Analysis of Hunters' Ethics. *Environmental Ethics, 19*(1), 25-44.

MacDonald, K. I. (2005). Global Hunting Grounds: Power, Scale and Ecology in The Negotiation of Conservation. *Cultural Geographies, 12*(3), 259-291. doi:10.1191/1474474005eu330oa

Manfredo, M. J., Teel, T. L., & Dietsch, A. M. (2016). Implications of Human Value Shift and Persistence for Biodiversity Conservation. *Conservation Biology, 30*(2), 287-296. doi:10.1111/cobi.12619

Manfredo, M. J., Teel, T. L., & Henry, K. L. (2009). Linking Society and Environment: A Multilevel Model of Shifting Wildlife Value Orientations in the Western United States*. *Social Science Quarterly, 90*(2), 407-427. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6237.2009.00624.x

Manning, R. (1993). *Hunters and Poachers: A Social and Cultural History of Unlawful Hunting in England 1485–1640*: Oxford University Press.

Martínez-Jauregui, M., Linares, O., Carranza, J., & Soliño, M. (2017). Dealing with Conflicts Between People and Colonizing Native Predator Species. *Biological Conservation, 209*, 239-244. doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2017.02.034

Marvin, G. (2006). Wild Killing: Contesting the Animal in Hunting. In *The Animal Studies Group* (pp. 10-29): University of Illinois Press.

Marvin, G. (2007). English Foxhunting: A Prohibited Practice. *International Journal of Cultural Property, 14*(03), 339-360. doi:doi:10.1017/S0940739107070221

Marvin, G. (2013). Challenging Animals – Project and Process in Hunting. In PilgrimS & J. N. Pretty (Eds.), *Nature and Culture: Rebuilding Lost Connections* (pp. 145-160): Routledge.

Meyerson, L. A., & Mooney, H. A. (2007). Invasive Alien Species in an Era of Globalization. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 5*, 199–208.

Moro, M., Fischer, A., Czajkowski, M., Brennan, D., Lowassa, A., Naiman, L. C., & Hanley, N. (2013). An Investigation Using the Choice Experiment Method into Options for

Reducing Illegal Bushmeat Hunting in Western Serengeti. *Conservation Letters, 6*(1), 37-45. doi:10.1111/j.1755-263X.2012.00284.x

Morris, S. P. (2010). *On Hunting: A Philosophical Case Study in Animal Sports.* The Ohio State University, Retrieved from http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=osu1281447236

Nielsen, M. R., Jacobsen, J. B., & Thorsen, B. J. (2014). Factors Determining the Choice of Hunting and Trading Bushmeat in the Kilombero Valley, Tanzania. *Conservation Biology, 28*(2), 382-391. doi:10.1111/cobi.12197

Norton, B. G. (1991). *Toward Unity Among Environmentalists* (Vol. 23): Oxford University Press.

Nuno, A., & St. John, F. A. V. (2015). How to Ask Sensitive Questions In Conservation: A Review of Specialized Questioning Techniques. *Biological Conservation, 189*, 5-15. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2014.09.047

Nurse, A. (2017). Criminalising the Right to Hunt: European Law Perspectives on Anti-Hunting Legislation. Crime, Law and Social Change, 67(4), 383-399. doi:10.1007/s10611-016-9669-8Palmer, C. (2010). *Animal Ethics in Context*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Pauley, J. A. (2003). The Value of Hunting. *Journal of Value Inquiry, 37*(2), 233-244.

Paulson, N. (2012). The Place of Hunters in Global Conservation Advocacy. *Conservation & Society, 10*(1), 53-62. doi:10.4103/0972-4923.92195

Peterson, M. N. (2004). An Approach for Demonstrating The Social Legitimacy Of Hunting. *Wildlife Society Bulletin, 32*(2), 310-321. doi:10.2193/0091-7648(2004)32[310:AAFDTS]2.0.CO;2

Pohja-Mykrä, M., & Kurki, S. (2014). Strong Community Support For Illegal Killing Challenges Wolf Management. *European Journal of Wildlife Research, 60*(5), 759-770. doi:10.1007/s10344-014-0845-9

Pooley, S., Barua, M., Beinart, W., Dickman, A., Holmes, G., Lorimer, J., . . . Milner-Gulland, E. J. (2016). An Interdisciplinary Review of Current and Future Approaches to Improving Human-Predator Relations. *Conserv Biol*. doi:10.1111/cobi.12859

Posewitz, J. (1994). *Beyond Fair Chase : The Ethic and Tradition of Hunting*: Falcon.

Regan, T. (1983). *The Case for Animal Rights*. Berkeley, CA.: University of California.

Regan, T. (2003). *Animal Rights, Human Wrongs: An Introduction to Moral Philosophy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Scott, J. C. (1985). *Weapons of The Weak: Everyday Forms of Resistance*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Scruton, R. (2000). *Animal Rights and Wrongs*: Claridge Press.

Scruton, R. (2010). The Sacred Pursuit: Reflections on the Literature of Hunting. In N. Kowalski (Ed.), *Hunting Philosophy for Everyone: In Search of the Wildlide* (pp. 187-197). Chichester, UK: Blackwell-Wiley.

Seitz, B. (2010). Hunting for Meaning: A Glimpse of the Game. In N. Kowalski (Ed.), *Hunting Philosophy for Everyone: In Search of the Wild Life* (pp. 69-79). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Sodikoff, G. M. (2011). Totem and Taboo Reconsidered: Endangered Species and Moral Practice in Madagascar. In G. M. Sodikoff (Ed.), *The Anthropology of Extinction* (pp. 67-86). Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Thomsen, D. A., & Davies, J. (2007). Rules, Norms and Strategies of Kangaroo Harvest. *Australasian Journal of Environmental Management, 14*(2), 123-130. doi:10.1080/14486563.2007.9725158

Wade, M. L. (1990). Animal Liberationism, Ecocentrism, and the Morality of Sport Hunting. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport, 17*(1), 15-27. doi:10.1080/00948705.1990.9714475

Wall, T., & McClanahan, B. (2015). Weaponizing Conservation in the 'Heart of Darkness': The War on Poachers and the Neocolonial Hunt. In A. Brisman, R. White, & N. South (Eds.), *Environmental Crime and Social Conflict Contemporary and Emerging Issues*: Ashgate.

Wallace, J. (1996). *Ethical Norms, Particular Cases*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Wallach, A. D., Bekoff, M., Nelson, M. P., & Ramp, D. (2015). Promoting Predators and Compassionate Conservation. *Conservation Biology, 29*(5), 1481-1484. doi:10.1111/cobi.12525

van Hooft, S. (2009). *Cosmopolitanism: A Philosophy for Global Ethics*: Acumen.

von Essen, E. (2015). Whose Discourse is it Anyway? Understanding Resistance through the Rise of 'Barstool Biology' in Nature Conservation. *Environmental Communication*. doi:10.1080/17524032.2015.1042986

von Essen, E. (2016). *In the Gap Between Legality and Legitimacy: Illegal Hunting in Sweden as a Crime of Dissent.* (Doctoral thesis), Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala.

von Essen, E. (2017). Därför Tar Vissa Jägare Lagen I Egna Händer. *Svensk Jakt*.

von Essen, E., & Allen, M. (2016). The Republican Zoopolis: Towards a New Legitimation Framework for Relational Animal Ethics *Ethics and the Environment, 21*(1), 61-88.

von Essen, E., & Allen, M. (2017). A Reluctant Right-Wing Social Movement: On the 'good sense' of Swedish Hunters. *Journal of Rural Studies, 50*, 139-147. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2017.01.007

von Essen, E., & Allen, M. P. (2016). A Rabble in the Zoopolis? Considering Responsibilities for Wildlife Hybrids. *Journal of Social Philosophy, 47*(2), 171-187. doi:10.1111/josp.12150

von Essen, E., & Allen, M. P. (2017). Taking Prejudice Seriously: Burkean Reflections on the Rural Past and Present. *Sociologia Ruralis, 50*, 139-147. doi:10.1111/soru.12183