

Laura Tull
101

Revision

Paper 2
OCTOBER 9, 1998

Hunting: A Wimp Sport

A hunter prepares to battle nature. He places on his bright orange hat with elephant ears, olive green trousers with wide red suspenders, over a long sleeved khaki shirt, and over all a heavy down camouflage coat. He is armed for battle with a twenty- two rifle and a belt carrying bullets. Out he goes in boots up to his thigh into the marshes and the forests ready to kill the ferocious deer. This oldest of all recreational endeavors is neither fair to the deer, helpful to the ecology, or in turn helpful to man.

Is it fair to the deer? Are deer in fact so ferocious that we need to kill them with a rifle from fifty to one- hundred yards away? They are vegetarians; therefore, they will not devour us or our children as a raging bear might. True, they do have horns, but these are useless against man and his toy like machine, the rifle. Long gone are the days when men would arm themselves with spears and knives and kill with their bare hands. Now we are civilized.

Is this sport indeed effective to the ecology? Some would say that hunting helps lower the number of deer, and get rid of the sick and the weak. But a hunter does not go into the woods and pick out a sick deer. He wants a fine set of horns, a nice fur skin, and good meat. Also, rather than saving one species of animals, the hunters have in the past extinguished species, including some types of deer. Hunters are not a safe solution.

The problem of over abundance of deer is not the deers' fault. Man has over run their environment. Overzealous hunters are not going to help them survive by destroying health members of the species. There are quotas on the number of deer that can be killed, but man and his necessity to own, possess, and in the process destroy, nature is the true problem. Shooting deer to help control their number is like killing babies to lower the population of humanity.

Is this endeavor helpful to the people involved and to society as a whole? Riflery does improve hand to eye coordination, but so does an arcade game, or a game of basketball. At least on the court each has a chance to defend himself. Also a basketball is cheaper than a rifle and bullets. If the hunter hunts not only for a set of horns for a trophy, but also for the delicious venison deer provide, then the cost of hunting should be pointed out to them as a deterrent from the sport. It is much cheaper to buy a steak at the local Super Fresh. And if I want variety I can make a Sloppy Joe. The money hunters spend could be used in more beneficial ways. Suppose that the hunter spends two hundred and twenty dollars for a rifle and a box of twenty bullets. This could buy enough groceries for a family of four to last two or three weeks. Also, there are some hunters so engulfed with the need for a taste of blood that they do not care where they shoot, or what they shoot. In the process of their hunting these hyper hunters trespass on other people's property, and may end up mistaking some moving object, a tiny child dressed in brown overalls, or a tan and white dog, as a deer and shoot without realizing their mistake. Though the hunter wears that ridiculous orange hat, the non- hunters have better taste, and they usually do not keep track of when hunting season is so that

they will know not to go outdoors. Hunting is neither a true benefit to the hunter, or to the general population.

Hunting may be necessary, but I ask you are there not enough people roaming the earth with guns already? Rifles are not toys, though some men seem to treat them as such. Hunting is not the salvation to the deer, or safe for the society. The slaughter is certainly not as glorious and manly an endeavor as the hunter and the NRA glorifies it as.

Revision: A
Newgrade: (B⁺)