

Trophy Shots: Early North American Photographs of Nonhuman Animals and the Display of Masculine Prowess

ABSTRACT

This essay examines the relationship between the display of non-human animal trophies and masculinity through an analysis of progressive-era American wildlife photography. In the 1890s, North American animal photographers began circulating their images in sporting journals and describing their practice as a form of hunting. These camera hunters exhibited their photographs as proof of sportsmanship, virility, and hunting prowess.

George Shiras III (1859-1942) published his first non-human animal photograph in the September 8 edition of *Forest and Stream* (Shiras, 1892, p. 203). The photograph, entitled *Doe*, was a roundel depicting a female deer crossing a stream. The doe's head is pointed toward the viewer, and her eyes are "riveted" upon the camera (Shiras). The ears of the deer are cocked toward the viewer, perhaps responding to the sound of the picture's being taken. The deer's instinctive response to a potential threat—freezing with her head up to evaluate—has composed her for the image. The lack of motion that makes the deer invisible to predators has made her visible to the camera. This pose, combined with the round frame,

gives the image the feeling of being taken through the scope of a rifle. This sense is not inappropriate; the image is an image of prey. In being photographed, this deer has been hunted.



Figure 1. *Doe*, George Shiras. (1892) Courtesy of Toronto Public Library

Shiras' image was taken near the beginning of one of the trajectories that leads to wildlife photography. However, it is not a wildlife photograph: It is an image of camera hunting—it preserves the moment of the animal's capture. These images were circulated and displayed as trophies. The photographs connected photographer and animal—figured here by the deer's acknowledgment of the camera—and stood as a monument to the photographer's prowess. Although the rhetoric around these images was focused almost entirely on what happened in the woods, the locus of camera hunting was sporting journals. The practice depended on a confluence of American attitudes to nature, technological development, and gender identities. Once this balance shifted, camera hunting ceased to be taken literally. It has become difficult for us to see these images as hunting trophies.

In the letter to the editor accompanying his image of the deer, Shiras (1892, p. 203) described his photographic practice as “still-hunting” and described himself as a “camera hunter.” Shiras wrote that he appreciated “*Forest and Stream’s* advocacy [of] the new field open to sportsmen by the use of the camera in photographing live game” (p. 203). He described himself as “one of the pioneers in this new sport.” Shiras’ attempts at photographing deer had begun 6 years earlier, but his success had increased with improvements in camera technology. He felt that live photography of big game would be beyond most sportsmen but that the photograph’s use as “an invaluable souvenir” of dead game made it an important addition to the sportsman’s outfit. He sharpened these claims in his later publications on the subject but continued to make the photograph’s use as a trophy the core of his promotion of camera hunting (Shiras, 1895, 1900). His major publications in the field occurred after 1906 when he became the first animal photographer in the *National Geographic Magazine* (Shiras, 1906, 1908, 1935).

Shiras’s (1892, p. 203) photograph was published as part of *Forest and Stream’s* first Amateur Photography Competition. The contest was inspired by the photographs readers had sent to the magazine and which recently had become technologically possible to reproduce cheaply. Economical half tone reproduction of photographs first became possible in the early 1890s.² The contest, which was announced on April 21, 1892, offered a series of prizes for images related to the magazine’s field of interest: “game and fish (alive or dead), shooting and fishing, the camp, campers and camp life, sportsman travel by land or water” (Anonymous, 1892, p. 369). There were three judges for the competition: the artist, Edward Bierstadt; the sportsman and public figure, Theodore Roosevelt; and the illustrator, Thomas Wilmot. Of the three it was Roosevelt who would continue to play a role in the development of camera hunting.

In seeing his photography as hunting, Shiras was following the lead of the editor of *Forest and Stream*, George Bird Grinnell (1849-1938).³ Grinnell developed the concept of camera hunting in a pair of editorials published in 1892. It was on May 5, 1892, that he first introduced the term, camera hunting (Grinnell, 1892a, p. 417). The editorial, “Hunting with a Camera” drew its

inspiration from an earlier article advocating “hunting without a gun.”⁴ Grinnell drew on this suggestion by positioning camera hunting as a midpoint between hunting with a gun and hunting without one.

Grinnell appreciated the appeal of wandering the woods without a gun, and he believed gunless hunting allowed a closer communion with nature. However, he felt the pastime was too refined for ordinary men. Although hunting without a gun produced deeply graven memories, it left them inaccessible to others. Simply put, hunting without a gun produced no trophies. No one else could see, touch, or share in the experiences the gunless hunter brought back from the woods. Gunless hunting failed to address the center of activity for those sportsmen—whom Grinnell saw as the majority—concerned with bagging trophies. He looked for a means of enjoying the benefits of gunless hunting while producing “tangible” results. He found that means in the camera: Grinnell equated the labor of photography with that of hunting. Photography used all the skills of hunting and added still more demands—thus, its claim to be a sport.

Grinnell returned to the theme of camera hunting in October of 1892. In an editorial entitled “Shooting without a Gun” he sharpened the case for seeing animal photography as hunting (Grinnell, 1892, p. 287). He began by defining the essence of sportsmanship as woodcraft, not marksmanship. Without “knowledge of the habits of game,” he argued, “there cannot be completely successful sportsmanship, however skilled one may be in the use of the gun” (Grinnell, *Marksmanship*), which “may be acquired in great measure by practice at the fixed and flying target” was thus secondary to woodcraft as the true “test of sportsmanship” (Grinnell, p. 287).⁵

By defining sportsmanship Grinnell, (1892b) identified photography with hunting. Not only did photography require, “All the skill of woodcraft that goes to the making of the successful hunter with the gun,” the camera hunter needed more woodcraft, as he must draw “within closer range of his timid game than his brother of the gun need obtain” (p. 287). He transferred this suggestion of superior skill on the part of the camera hunter to the camera itself, and argued that the camera hunter’s weapon was superior to the gun. Despite leaving his prey intact, the camera hunter obtained trophies, which outshone those of the gun hunter.

His trophies the moth may not assail. His game touches a finer sense than the palate possesses, satisfies a noble appetite than the stomach's craving, and furnishes forth a feast that, ever spread, ever invites, and never palls upon the taste (Grinnell, 1892b, p. 287).

In arguing for the refinement of the camera's trophies, Grinnell associated gun hunting with the production of food. This association is significant for it strikes at one of the central concerns of the American sportsman: distinguishing his noble practice from that of other hunters. This move neatly complements Grinnell's initial definition of sportsmanship as skill because, as we shall see, it was through their adoption of the code of sportsmanship that elite nineteenth century hunters distinguished their practice from pothunters and market hunters.

Grinnell (1892b) emphasized the photograph's preservation of wildlife. Speaking of the camera hunter, he argued "The wild world is not made the poorer by one life for his shot, nor nature's peace disturbed, nor her nicely adjusted balance jarred" (p. 287). Rather than seeing the camera as a supplement to the sportsman's practice (in the earlier editorial he compared it to the sportsman's notebook) Grinnell now presented it as a superior substitute for the gun. Yet despite his arguments, early animal photography did not always mean a sparing of the animal. Many early photographs involved the death of the animal and often as an essential component of the image. The 18 November 1891 issue of *Forest and Stream* described a "Massachusetts man who had his Maine guide stall a big moose in the deep snow while he first photographed it and then deliberately shot it" (Anon., 1891, p. 344).

However, as an affront to the notion that photography automatically entails an escape from violence toward animals perhaps there is no better example than the photographic project of one "Pigarth." (Mr. Brelsford of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania) As Pigarth expressed it, his ambition was "to get a photograph of a bird in the air the moment it was struck by a charge of shot" (Pigarth, 1892, p. 92). To this end he invented a camera gun—a camera mounted on the end of a rifle-shaped stick. He aimed the camera like a rifle while his assistant shot the birds. Pigarth claimed to have wasted over "two hundred plates trying to get a picture of a bird the instant the shot struck it" (Pigarth,

p. 92). Concomitant with this wasting of photographic plates, of course, was the “wasting” of more than two hundred ducks. It seems that the difference between early animal photography as hunting and straightforward trophy photography was a matter of whether the image was taken before, during, or after the moment the animal was killed.

The relationship between hunting and animal photography was driven in part by the difficulty of photographing animals. Given the state of photographic technology, and the close proximity required, hunting skill was needed to obtain these images (Brower, 2000). Yet, the leap to conceptualizing photography as hunting is not accounted for by this requirement. A contemporaneous animal photography team conceived of its initial work differently, even though its work revolved around the relationship between animal photographs and hunting.

Allen Grant Wallihan and Mary Wallihan: Early Animal Photography as Preservation

Allen Grant Wallihan (1859-1935) was a frontier postmaster who became a pioneering animal photographer and celebrated woodsman. His wife, Mary, assisted with the photography and was co-author of their first book. The Wallihans' 1894 *Hoofs, Claws and Antlers of the Rocky Mountains*, was the first book devoted to the photographing of animals in nature (Wallihan & Wallihan 1894/1902). (The second edition of the book, published in 1902, added an introduction by Buffalo Bill.) In the book, the Wallihans' showed images of freshly killed animals alongside images of live ones and described in detail how many of the live animals they photographed were shot shortly after filming. Mary described their photographs as an attempt to preserve “the game in photography for the world at large” (Wallihan & Wallihan, 1902, *n.p.*). Seeing the game as bound to disappear in the face of continued progress, they sought to document it for future generations.

Among the images included in the book was *Treed at Last*. The image shows a cougar looking down from the fork of a cedar tree. The Wallihans produced the image by running the cougar down with a pack of dogs. Thus, they used the cougar's attempt to escape the dogs to produce their photograph. Although this is a form of photographic hunting, it does not conform to Grinnell's

understanding of the ideal relationship between the photographers and their “prey.” After being photographed, the cougar was shot.



Figure 2. Allen Grant and Mary Wallihan, *Treed at Last*, (1894). Courtesy of George Eastman House

It was in an article published a year later that Wallihan (1895), first described his photography as camera hunting. The article gave Wallihan sole credit for the photographs and was illustrated largely with images from the book, reframing them in light of this new practice. Wallihan makes two moves in this article: He reconceives his practice as hunting, and he erases his wife’s contributions. These two moves are linked—to function as hunting trophies, the photographs must be seen as evidence of “manly” prowess. Central to both Shiras and Wallihan’s photographic practice is the use of animal photography and hunting as the production of masculinity. In their claims to

sportsmanship, the emphasis is on the man. The centrality of masculinity to camera hunting perhaps is articulated most clearly in Theodore Roosevelt's advocacy of the practice.

Theodore Roosevelt on Camera Hunting and the Strenuous Life

Inspired by the work of Wallihan, Roosevelt (1901) wrote on the importance of camera hunting. His advocacy of both hunting *and* conservation led Roosevelt to be an early and avid advocate of camera hunting even though it did not lead him to abandon his own hunting practices. His article puts into play the majority of the issues surrounding camera hunting and deserves close analysis. Roosevelt saw camera hunting as form of sport that preserved game in the face of its rapid decline. Roosevelt argued that Wallihan's photographs were not merely "records of a fascinating form of life that is passing away" (p. 1549). Instead, he felt that these photographs "should act as spurs to all of us to try to see that this life does not wholly vanish" (Roosevelt, p. 1549). For Roosevelt, these photographs addressed a national need. They encouraged conservation *and* engaged the populace in the strenuous life. As he explained,

A true democracy, really alive to its opportunities, will insist upon such game protection, for it is in the interest of our people as a whole. More and more, as it becomes necessary to preserve the game, let us hope that the camera will largely supplant the rifle. (Roosevelt, p. 1549)

He felt the importance of nature lay,

... in the physical hardihood for which the life calls, the sense of limitless freedom which it brings, and the remoteness of the wild charm and beauty of primitive nature. All of this we get exactly as much in hunting with the camera as in hunting with the rifle and of the two, the former is the kind of sport which calls for the higher degree of skill, patience, resolution, and knowledge of the life history of the animal sought. (Roosevelt, p. 1549)

Camera hunting produced the kind of virile citizenry that Roosevelt felt was essential to the health of the nation. Replacing the rifle with the camera

allowed the nation to continue to experience the stimulus of hunting without completely destroying the game. Camera hunting was offered as a solution to the problem that increased population and industrialization had created for American nature. Roosevelt thus situated it at the nexus of a number of issues engaging America at this time. His hope was that camera hunting might allow the continuing pursuit of sportsmanship in the face of modernity. In short, he hoped that it would occupy an intersection of attitudes toward nature, animals, hunting, and masculinity in a period of intense technological change. It allowed the continuing experience of “physical hardihood” so essential to the strenuous life.

The moral benefits of nature underlay Roosevelt’s (1900) advocacy of the strenuous life. Sporting contact with nature enabled the development of a virile, “masculine” citizenry. As Gerstle (1999) has described, “Roosevelt conceived of his personal life as a crusade against the enervating effects of excessive civilization. He was determined to excel at hunting and ranching, to develop the qualities that made the Scotch-Irish backwoodsmen such a vigorous race.” (p. 1285)

Roosevelt became the model for a new form of American masculinity based on a “sporting” relationship to nature. In the words of one contemporary observer,

As an apostle of the “strenuous life,” as an enthusiastic explorer and hunter, as a fearless leader of men in war and peace, and as a close observer and truthful writer on many subjects, especially sporting subjects, President Roosevelt has done noble service in behalf of the army of American boys who, when their turn comes, may be called upon to duplicate some of his greatest feats. (Sandys, 1901/2000, online)

In his speeches and writings Roosevelt (1900) railed against feminizing effects of over-civilization. He was concerned that the prosperity of America’s cities was ruining American men and, hence, the nation. Roosevelt’s concerns reflected the massive changes that had occurred in American society during the nineteenth century. As Filene (1985) has argued, “Amid such ‘progress,’ men yearned desperately for tangible proofs of manly character” (p. 345).

By the end of the nineteenth century, America had become an urban nation through migration from the country to the city and through steady immigration from Europe. The new social situation of the city broke down traditional ways of understanding and behaving. In an environment where few knew the people they met in their daily lives it was difficult to know your proper place (Kasson, 1990). This social uncertainty undermined, among other things, gender roles leading to the need for a revision in the understanding of the nature of manhood.

The 1890s saw “a widespread cultural concern about effeminacy, overcivilization, and racial decadence” (Bederman, 1995, p. 185). During the latter half of the nineteenth century, the dominant term for cultural maleness shifted from manliness to masculinity. Bederman identifies in this linguistic shift evidence of a broader cultural change in the ideality of maleness.

“Manliness,” in short, was precisely the sort of middle-class Victorian cultural formation that grew shaky in the late nineteenth century. Thereafter, when men wished to invoke a different sort of male power, they would increasingly use the words “masculine” and “masculinity.” (p. 18)

Middle-class manliness gave way to a less reserved performance of virility that was mapped onto the comparatively neutral term masculinity.

“Masculine” thus existed as a relatively empty, fluid adjective—devoid of moral or emotional meaning—when the cultural changes of the 1890s undermined the power of “manliness.” This very fluidity and emotional neutrality made the word “masculine” attractive to people casting about to synthesize new explanations and descriptions of male power. (Bederman, 1995, pp. 18-19)

Roosevelt epitomized this shift from manliness to masculinity (Bederman, 1995, pp. 170-216). Originally mocked as an over-refined “Jane-Dandy” sissy in Albany, he transformed himself into a figure of unquestioned virility. Moreover, his movement from an East Coast effete to a virile frontiersman took place through the medium of hunting. Roosevelt’s published accounts of his life as a rancher recreated him as “a modern Western hero” in the eyes of the public (Bederman, pp. 176-177; Clark, 1999). By celebrating his accomplishments as a hunter, he was able to shed the over-refined veneer of Harvard

and become the prototypical man's man of his age. Roosevelt was conscious of the site and nature of his transformation and throughout his life advocated the preservation of the woods as necessary for the production of virile citizenry (Nemerov, 1997; Lutts, 1990).

Animal Trophies and the Display of Masculine Prowess

Roosevelt linked the use of nature to produce virile men with the production of hunting trophies.⁶ Trophies can be divided into two types:

1. those in which the trophy is indexically related to the endeavor; and
2. those in which the trophy is an external symbol of accomplishment.

Hunting⁷ trophies are the result of the activity of the hunter; they have an indexical relationship to the activity they represent. Only by killing or capturing the animal is there a trophy. In contrast, sporting trophies are cultural symbols. Although there is a mythic relationship in sport, linking laurel leaves to accomplishment, they are not produced in or through sporting competition. As trophies, animal bodies figure indexically the success of the hunter, and in a synecdochic relationship certain prized animal parts come to stand in for the whole. Thus, antlers, heads, and tusks can come to stand in for the whole of the animal in symbolizing the kill. However, certain other animal parts float free from this trophy relation: Elk teeth, watch fobs, feathers on hats, and fur coats all function separately from any indexical connection to the hunter and become objects of conspicuous consumption.⁸ What separates the animal trophy from status display is its separation from a monetary economy. A trophy must be earned, not bought.

Although animal trophies are indexically linked to the practice of hunting, the trophy still needs to be produced. Dead animals decay or are cooked and eaten and disappear. When the animal body disappears, the trophy disappears along with it. For this reason, animals often are represented by parts such as antlers that are easier to produce in the field and more easily brought back from it. Nineteenth-century hunters learned taxidermy from books on preparing natural history specimens. Taxidermy required preparation of the kill in the field. The animal had to be dressed and the skin treated and preserved. The connection between natural history and hunting was strong.

Collecting was a central component of natural history until the early twentieth century. Many naturalists were avid hunters. As the nineteenth century wore on and conservation became an issue, scientific collecting became a cover that allowed individuals to continue hunting without facing social opprobrium or legal sanction.

Trophies are connected to economies of display. Although trophies are connected to performance within the arena in which they are obtained, their function—as objects of display—often participates in broader economies. While the hunting trophy displays evidence of the hunter's kill, it also provides evidence of other values. Ryan (2000) argues that in the British colonial context trophies (and trophy photographs) functioned as evidence of imperial power. In North America, however, hunting trophies were connected to nationalism through their symbolization of masculinity. They provided evidence of the virile masculinity, which was believed to result from contact with the frontier, and indicated their owner's rightful possession of the continent as a true American Native (Herman, 2001). This difference in function results from a difference in hunting culture.

The American hunting tradition differed markedly from the aristocratic tradition of England. Hunting was, at least ideally, a generalized pastime in the New World (Lund, 1976). The ability of the general populace to hunt was promoted as a symbol of American liberty in opposition to English tyranny. In practice, while hunting was available to all, other endeavors generally were more profitable (Tober, 1981). Only those without other prospects devoted themselves to hunting as a full time occupation. By the nineteenth century, this caste of professional hunters had become an industry. Vast quantities of game were brought to the markets of New York and Boston. Nineteenth-century Americans enjoyed a far richer variety of meat than seems possible today. With the development of the railroad game from out west became part of menu as well.

There was little recreational hunting in America prior to the 1850s (Tober, 1981). As the country urbanized, however, incomes and leisure time rose. Upper class Americans became disconnected from nature and sought to reconnect through hunting, and camera hunting emerged in the context of this broader shift in North American hunting practice. The status of hunters within

American culture had risen considerably by the end of the nineteenth century. Previously, farmers were at the center of the American self-image (Herman, 2001). Now the hunter's encounter with the wilderness was seen as the forging of American identity (Turner, 1935).

With the development of recreational hunting, the aristocratic ideal entered the American hunting scene in the figure of the sportsman, which had its origins in British hunting practice (Reiger, 1992). However, the meaning of sportsmanship changed radically over the latter half of the nineteenth century. As game populations dwindled, the criterion for success as a hunter underwent a transformation. Massive kills were no longer considered the epitome of the sportsman's prowess. Instead, an etiquette of the kill developed that emphasized elegance and fairness in hunting. This etiquette was promulgated by the newly established national periodicals devoted to hunting and outdoor sport (Reiger). The new sportsman engaged in a contest with the animal; only those kills in which the animal was given a "sporting" chance counted. This sense of contest became the crux of the new sportsman's ideology, displacing both quantity of kill *and* more pragmatic concerns such as supplying food from the proper purview of the hunter. Both subsistence and market hunters, the majority of hunters, were placed outside the purview of the sportsman's code. Those who hunted out of necessity or for profit never could obtain the aesthetic detachment necessary to be considered sportsmen (Cartmill, 1993).

In the late nineteenth century, the sporting community thus constituted itself by declaring that only certain aristocratic hunters were "real hunters." On the basis of this distinction, sportsmen mobilized against other forms of hunting, successfully enacting statutes against them (Reiger, 1975, pp. 51-77). Game laws were enacted, in part to preserve game for sportsmen at the expense of other hunters. They maintained a space for sportsmen to prove their virility.

The changes in hunting law were supported by a shift in the general attitudes toward animals, reflected in the rise of animal protection societies and an increasing public interest in conservation (Mighetto, 1986). However this support for conservation also led to conflict with the hunters (Cartmill, 1993). Animals began to be seen as beings endowed with intrinsic value. Although the initial focus of animal protection societies was on domestic animals, wild ones soon entered into their consideration (Lutts, 1990). However, the moral

biases of the animal protectionists held sway, and predators were condemned alongside human hunters, although both hunters and protectionists were united in their condemnation of predators as “varmints” (Lutts).

The cultivation of American attitudes toward wildlife was part of a broader change in the American outlook on nature. Lutts (1990) wrote the following: “Americans were in the midst of a complex process of assimilating a new perspective on their relationships with the natural world” (p. 71). Industrialization made nature both more accessible and less proximate. Although Americans were moving to cities, decreased transportation costs allowed them easier access to nature (Lutts).

Americans began to experience nature through the mediation of technology and began to use nature itself as a form of technology. Access to nature, conceived as a source of national health and hygiene, was seen as a solution to urban degeneracy. As Mitman (1999) put it, nature was seen as the place, “where the trappings of civilization might be shed, the purity of God’s hand felt, and the real self found” (p. 13).

Hunting trophies symbolized the hunter’s grounding in nature and asserted his identity as a true American Native (Herman, 2001). However, as Roosevelt (1901) notes in his discussion of Wallihan’s photography, there is a potential problem with the display of trophies. Roosevelt blamed the decline of game on market hunters, who he argued, had “no excuse of any kind” for the wanton slaughter of animals (p. 1549).

They kill the animal for the hide and for the flesh. Moreover, the horns are strikingly ornamental and are purchased freely by a certain class of wealthy people who wholly lack the skill and hardihood necessary to those who would themselves be hunters and who have not the good sense to see that antlers have their chief value as trophies.

Nothing adds more to a hall or a room than fine antlers when their owner has been shot by the hunter-displayer, but always there is an element of the absurd in a room furnished with trophies of the chase that the displayer has acquired by purchase. Even less defensible is it either to kill or to put a premium on the killing of these noble and beautiful animals for the sake of their teeth. Yet, the habit of wearing elk’s teeth on watch chains and the like has been responsible for no small amount of slaughter.

The Audubon Societies have done useful work in trying to prevent the destruction of song-birds and waders for millinery purposes. It would be well if some similar society would wage war against the senseless wearing of elk's teeth when the wearer has not shot the animal; such fashion simply becomes one cause of extermination (Roosevelt, 1901, p. 1549).

Roosevelt (1901) linked conservation with the rightful use of trophies; the problem facing animals was their inappropriate use as fashion and decoration. His argument dissociated store-bought antlers from real trophies, associating them instead with women's fashion. He thus stresses that real trophies are about manhood and that those who buy antlers lack "hardihood." Roosevelt may have sought to preserve game for the elite but only for those among them who possessed the necessary virtues to hunt for themselves. For Roosevelt, camera hunting brought together conservation, manliness, and trophies; yet false trophies, indistinguishable in appearance, threatened to undermine both manliness and conservation.

This threat is inherent in the trophy. As Strycharz (1993) puts it, "The trophy is nothing without the man; but the man, allegedly autonomous, cannot make the trophy mean 'manhood' in a theater where roles are assigned communally" (p. 43). The display of trophies requires the audience's approval. This approval is threatened by the display of false trophies and by the display of more impressive, "genuine" trophies. In short, the trophy leaves the hunters in the same situation in which they started: faced with appearing as a man in a social situation, which threatens their sense of self. Thus, the camera hunters' claims that photographs were superior as trophies because they lasted longer than animal bodies was misguided: Instability is inherent in trophies.

Conclusion: Camera Hunting and Wildlife Photography

The confluence of changing American attitudes toward hunting, nature, and masculinity allowed the photographing of animals to function as hunting and produce trophies. However this confluence was not stable. Continued changes in technology and attitudes to nature made recreational hunting unfashionable: Ironically, sport hunters' advocacy of conservation was too successful and pot hunting came to be seen as the only acceptable form of

hunting. These developments changed the social understanding of both hunting and trophies. Alongside these changes within hunting culture, the increased circulation of animal photographs in scientific and other contexts obscured the connection between the photographer and the animal essential to reading the image as a trophy. Although the concept of camera hunting continues to circulate, as in camera safaris, it no longer can be read literally and instead is taken as metaphorical evidence of nostalgia, irony, and loss. Sontag (1977) wrote,

Guns have metamorphosed into cameras in this earnest comedy, the ecology safari, because nature has ceased to be what it had always been—what people needed protection from. Now nature—tamed, endangered, mortal—needs to be protected from people. When we are afraid, we shoot. But when we are nostalgic, we take pictures. (p. 15)

Remembering that the metaphor once functioned literally can help us to read animal photographs against the grain. Although technology may have made capturing animals easier the animals captured are no less real.

Notes

¹ Correspondence should be sent to Matthew Brower, Visual and Cultural Studies, 424 Morey Hall, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY, 14627. E-mail: brwr@mail.rochester.edu

I want to acknowledge the generous support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and The Susan B. Anthony Institute for Gender and Women's Studies.

² While Shiras' image is a halftone reproduction, it appears to be a reproduction of an image made from, or after, the photograph rather than a reproduction of the photograph itself.

³ Roosevelt was a friend of Grinnell's and was nationally known as an expert woodsman. Besides co-founding the Boone and Crockett Club, Roosevelt and Grinnell published several books together including the book *American Big Game Hunting* later that same year (Roosevelt & Grinnell, 1893).

⁴ I have yet to locate this article. However, Robinson, 1889 mentions it obliquely in "Hunting with Camera." "The charms of 'hunting without a gun' have been dilated

on in *Forest and Stream* by one of the most graceful of American writers." The article was not published in the year preceding his reference.

- ⁵ Interestingly, if the logic of this argument were extended it would imply that the local guides were the true sportsmen and not the wealthy easterners who came west to hunt big game.
- ⁶ The original trophies were Greek war memorials erected on the field to commemorate a victory in battle. This sometime led to each side's erecting its own trophy in an attempt to claim victory.
- ⁷ I owe this insight to David Toews.
- ⁸ Interestingly, one of the strategies employed against the use of animal parts in fashion has been to reassert the indexical link between the displayed body part and a dead animal. This strategy was used successfully in the Audubon society's late nineteenth-century campaign against millinery feathers and continues to be deployed in PETA's current campaign against fur. Animal bodies and parts also circulate within ritual economies. A contemporary example would be the use of eagle feathers in Native American ceremonies., In ritual circulation, however, the animal parts participate more in what Benjamin calls "cult value" than they do in economies of display (Benjamin, 1969).

References

- Anonymous. (1891, November 18). Snap shots. *Forest and Stream*, 344.
- Anonymous. (1892, April 21). Rod and gun and camera. *Forest and Stream*, 369.
- Anonymous. (1997). *100 years ago in Field and Stream: Our sportsman president, by Edwyn Sandys*, December 1901. Field and Stream online. http://www.fieldandstream.com/looking_back/19971104.html. Accessed June 20, 2000.
- Bederman, G. (1995). *Manliness and civilization: A cultural history of gender and race in the United States, 1880-1917*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Benjamin, W. (1969). The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction. In H. Arendt (Ed.), *Illuminations* (pp. 217-251). H. Zohn (Trans.), New York: Schocken Books.
- Brower, M. (2000). Hunting with a Camera: Gendering early North American wildlife photography. *Millennial animals: Theorizing and understanding the importance of animals*, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, England. July 29-30, 2000.

- Cartmill, M. (1993). *A view to a death in the morning: Hunting and nature through history*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Clark, S. (1999). Roosevelt and Hemingway: Natural history, manliness, and the rhetoric of the strenuous life. In R. E. Fleming (Ed.), *Hemingway and the natural world* (pp. 55-67). Moscow, ID: University of Idaho Press.
- Filene, P. (1985). Between a rock and a soft place: A century of American manhood. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 84 (4), 339-355.
- Gerstle, G. (1999). Theodore Roosevelt and the divided character of American nationalism. *The Journal of American History*, 86 (3), 1280-1307.
- Grinnell, G. B. (1892a, May 5). Hunting with a camera. *Forest and Stream*, 417
- (1892b, October 6). Shooting without a gun. *Forest and Stream*, 287.
- Herman, D. J. (20001). *Hunting and the American imagination*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Kasson, J. F. (1990). *Rudeness and civility*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Lund, T. A. (1976). Early American wildlife law. *New York University Law Review*, 51, (5), 703-730.
- Lutts, R. H. (1990). *The Nature fakers: Wildlife, science and sentiment*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing.
- Mighetto, L. (1986). *Wild animals in American thought and culture, 1870s-1930s*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle.
- Mitman, G. (1999). *Reel nature: America's romance with wildlife on film*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Nemerov, A. (1997). Vanishing Americans: Abbot Thayer, Theodore Roosevelt and the attraction of camouflage. *American Art*, 11 (2), 50-81.
- Pigarth (1892, August 4). A gun camera. *Forest and Stream*, 92.
- Reiger, J. (1975). *American sportsmen and the origins of conservation*. New York: Winchester Press.
- (1992). The merging of sport, art, and conservation in late nineteenth-century America. In V. Mealy, & P. Friederici (Eds.), *Value in American wildlife art* (pp. 44-51). Jamestown, NY: Roger Tory Peterson Institute of Natural History.
- Robinson, R. (1889, August 22). Hunting without a gun. *Forest and Stream*, 82, 3.

- Roosevelt, T., & Grinnell, G. B. (1893). *American big game hunting*. New York: Forest and Stream.
- Roosevelt, T. (1900). *The strenuous life*. New York: Nelson.
- (1901, December). Camera shots at wild animals: The extraordinary photographs by Mr. A. G. Wallihan of cougars, deer and other western game in their native haunts. *World's Work*, 1545-1549.
- Ryan, J. R. (2000). Hunting with the camera: Photography, wildlife and colonialism in Africa. In C. Wilbert & C. Philo (Eds.), *Animal spaces, beastly places* (pp. 203-221). London: Routledge.
- Shiras, G. (1892, September 8). Still-hunting with a camera. *Forest and Stream*, 203.
- (1895, August 25). Hunting with a camera. *New York Sun*, p. 12.
- (1900, June 7). Hunting with a camera. *Independent*, 52, 1364-1368.
- (1906). Photographing wild game with flashlight and camera. *National Geographic*, 17, July, 366-423.
- (1908). One season's gamebag with the camera. *National Geographic*, 19, July, 387-446.
- (1935). *Hunting wildlife with camera and flashlight: A record of sixty-five years' visits to the woods and waters of North America*. Washington, DC: National Geographic Society.
- Sontag, S. (1977). *On photography*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Strycharz, T. (1993). Trophy-hunting as a trope of manhood in Ernest Hemingway's "Green hills of Africa." *The Hemingway Review*, 13 (1), 36-47.
- Tober, J. A. (1981). *Who owns the wildlife: the political economy of conservation in nineteenth-century America*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Turner, F. J. (1935). *The frontier in American history*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Wallihan A. G., & Wallihan, M. (1902). *Hoofs, claws and antlers of the Rocky Mountains, by the camera; photographic representations from life*. Denver: F. S. Thayer. Wallihan, A. G. (1895). New sport in the Rocky Mountains: Photographing big game. *The Cosmopolitan*, XIX (4), 373-385.