



## Policy Briefing to inform the UK government's consideration of banning trophy hunting imports<sup>i</sup>

Dr Ross Harvey<sup>ii</sup>

Trophy hunting in sub-Saharan Africa undermines conservation and community empowerment

---

### *Policy Recommendations*

---

1. Ban all trophy hunting imports of all wild animal species into the United Kingdom indefinitely and immediately.
2. Encourage African governments to abandon 'consumptive use' conservation models in favour of more ecologically and economically sustainable models.
3. Integrate community empowerment into 'ecotourism for conservation' models as the driving imperative instead of a tick-box addition to profit-making.
4. Aim to ban all trophy hunting within the next five years while a transition to more appropriate conservation models occurs.

---

## Introduction

---

Trophy hunting is the killing of wild animals for recreation with the purpose of collecting trophies (secondary sexual characteristics) such as horns, antlers, skulls, skins, tusks or teeth for display.<sup>1</sup> The UK government is in the process of calling for evidence pertaining to the impact of trophy hunting on the global imperative to protect biodiversity. Its commitment in this respect is to ensure that domestic policy does not threaten the conservation of species abroad.<sup>2</sup> A number of options are available to the government in reviewing current controls on the import and export of hunting trophies, including a ban on imports. This policy briefing provides evidence in favour of this particular policy option.

The claim typically advanced against bans is that they can produce unintended negative consequences for biodiversity conservation.<sup>3</sup> Trophy hunting proponents are of the view that revenues generated by the practice support conservation and rural livelihoods in ways that are currently irreplaceable at the appropriate scale.<sup>4</sup> Those opposed to the practice tend to do so on ethical and conservation grounds. For instance, it is morally reprehensible to kill a wild animal for fun, especially those that are long-lived, intelligent and self-aware (like elephants).<sup>5</sup> Appropriate moral repugnance cannot be reconciled with the assertion that science supports the practice.<sup>6</sup> This is especially the case given the extensive evidence of poor governance in jurisdictions that allow and support trophy hunting.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, alternative conservation activities exist that eschew a colonial practice of extraction in favour of more ecologically sustainable and dignifying activities.<sup>8</sup> These can potentially be scaled but not without global policy support. Efforts by Safari Club International (SCI) to

---

<sup>1</sup> A Sheikh Pervaze and Bermejo F Lucas, "International Trophy Hunting," *Congressional Research Service* (Congressional Research Service, 2019), <https://crsreports.congress.gov>.

<sup>2</sup> See 'Call for Evidence on the scale and impacts of the import and export of hunting trophies' <https://consult.defra.gov.uk/wildlife-management/call-for-evidence-trophy-hunting/>, accessed 7 January 2019.

<sup>3</sup> Michael 't Sas-Rolfes, "African Wildlife Conservation and the Evolution of Hunting Institutions," *Environmental Research Letters* 12 (2017): 1–9, <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa854b>.

<sup>4</sup> Amy Dickman et al., "Trophy Hunting Bans Imperil Biodiversity," *Science* 365, no. 6456 (2019): 874–874, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaz0735>; Enrico Di Minin, Nigel Leader-Williams, and Corey J.A. Bradshaw, "Trophy Hunting Does and Will Support Biodiversity: A Reply to Ripple et Al.," *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 31, no. 7 (2016): 496–98, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2016.03.010>.

<sup>5</sup> G. A. Bradshaw and Allan N. Schore, "How Elephants Are Opening Doors: Developmental Neuroethology, Attachment and Social Context," *Ethology* 113, no. 5 (2007): 426–36, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0310.2007.01333.x>.

<sup>6</sup> Chelsea Batavia et al., "The Elephant (Head) in the Room: A Critical Look at Trophy Hunting," *Conservation Letters* 12, no. 1 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12565>; Muchazondida Mkono, "The Trophy Hunting Controversy," in *Positive Tourism in Africa*, ed. Muchazondida Mkono, 1st ed. (New York: Routledge, 2019), 211–29, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429428685-18>.

<sup>7</sup> Nigel Leader-Williams, Rolf D Baldus, and RJ Smith, "The Influence of Corruption on the Conduct of Recreational Hunting," in *Recreational Hunting, Conservation and Rural Livelihoods: Science and Practice*, ed. Barney Dickson, Jon Hutton, and B Adams (Blackwell Publishing, 2009), [http://www.wildlife-baldus.com/download/influence\\_of\\_corruption\\_on\\_hunting.pdf](http://www.wildlife-baldus.com/download/influence_of_corruption_on_hunting.pdf); Fred Nelson, Peter Lindsey, and Guy Balme, "Trophy Hunting and Lion Conservation: A Question of Governance?," *ORYX* 47, no. 4 (2013): 501–9, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S003060531200035X>.

<sup>8</sup> Katarzyna Nowak et al., "Trophy Hunting: Bans Create Opening for Change," *Science* 6464 (2019): 434–35, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaz4023>.

defend the right to hunt arguably impair such support and inappropriately skew weakly governed African countries' policy positions.<sup>9</sup> The UK's consideration of a trophy hunting import ban, however, may create the impetus for other countries to both follow its lead and provide funding and policy support to hunting alternatives that will produce better conservation outcomes.

This briefing aims to show that trophy hunting extraction in sub-Saharan Africa is unsustainable. In the context of the sixth extinction, policies that support the extraction of wildlife as a means of 'conservation' must be exposed for the contradictions that they are. Most importantly, the briefing shows that the jobs (rural livelihoods) purportedly supported by hunting could be more than compensated for by non-consumptive ecotourism, a fundamentally more ecologically sustainable practice that provides more jobs with higher quality and greater security. While it remains true that some areas currently allocated to trophy hunting may not be conducive to photographic tourism, this does not constitute an argument in favour of hunting. Rather, it constitutes a call for the rapid implementation of alternatives, including conservation subsidisation from international governments to ensure that entire ecosystems remain intact and functional. It is also critical to note that some areas previously considered 'marginal' and unamenable to photographic tourism have been remarkably successful with the latter.<sup>10</sup>

---

### *Current rates of extraction*

---

Seven African countries feature in the top 10 exporters of CITES-listed trophy items between 2008 and 2017. A total of 37,933 elephants were killed by trophy hunters in that decade, along with 14,008 lions and 8,307 leopards. The average elephant trophy fee in 2019 for an African elephant was \$45,013, while a male African lion sold for an average of \$33,747. In order of magnitude: South Africa, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Botswana (which only reintroduced hunting in 2018 after a 5-year suspension) and Tanzania.

Excessive recreational hunting during the colonial era rendered a number of species on the verge of extinction across the continent.<sup>11</sup> A public relations campaign, mostly conducted by SCI, has attempted to rebrand trophy hunting as a conservation tool. This view is hard to reconcile with the fact that over 100,000 African elephants were illegally killed between 2011 and 2013, mostly for their ivory.<sup>12</sup> A large portion of these elephants were slaughtered in the Selous ecosystem in Tanzania, the majority of which was allocated to hunting. Due to

---

<sup>9</sup> EMS Foundation, 'The long tentacles of Safari Club International undermine conservation efforts in Africa', <https://emsfoundation.org.za/the-long-tentacles-of-safari-club-international-sci-undermining-conservation-efforts-in-africa/>, accessed 7 January 2020.

<sup>10</sup> See <https://www.andbeyond.com/places-to-stay/africa/botswana/makgadikgadi-pans/jacks-camp/>, accessed 7 January 2020.

<sup>11</sup> PA Lindsey, PA Roulet, and SS Romañach, "Economic and Conservation Significance of the Trophy Hunting Industry in Sub-Saharan Africa," *Biological Conservation* 134, no. 4 (2007): 455–69, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2006.09.005>.

<sup>12</sup> G. Wittemyer et al., "Illegal Killing for Ivory Drives Global Decline in African Elephants," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111, no. 36 (2014): 13117–21, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1403984111>.

habitat fragmentation, destruction and prey base depletion, African lions are also dwindling in number – an estimated 32,000 remain in the wild. Poaching for body parts is emerging as a new threat.<sup>13</sup> Hunting, far from providing counter-poaching presence, appears to have additive negative effects on population survival probability, especially among endangered species that cannot be bred for reintroduction to the wild (elephants and lions in particular).

---

### *Ecological costs of business as usual*

---

Trophy hunting, like poaching, artificially selects the biggest and strongest animals (largest tusks and thickest manes), weakening populations' genetic health and variation.<sup>14</sup> Therefore, while revenue may be forthcoming in the short term from such extraction, the longer-term effects are that population growth dynamics are negatively affected. Moreover, some elephants are now being born without tusks, a destructive genetic adaptation.<sup>15</sup> Elephants, too, are increasingly reproductively successful with age, with older bulls suppressing musth<sup>16</sup> onset in younger bulls and preventing delinquent behaviour associated with early musth onset.<sup>17</sup> When trophy hunters eliminate these older bulls, they destroy elephant family integrity (through trauma and removal of the discipline and knowledge transfer functions executed by patriarchs) and force matriarchs to mate with younger bulls they would otherwise not have selected, thereby skewing reproduction patterns.<sup>18</sup> Elephants are also irreplaceable ecosystem engineers; their removal negatively impacts ecosystem integrity and biodiversity preservation.<sup>19</sup> The idea that trophy hunters only eliminate 'surplus' animals is patently untrue. Repeatedly in southern Africa, the biggest and

---

<sup>13</sup> K. T. Everatt, R. Kokes, and C. Lopez Pereira, "Evidence of a Further Emerging Threat to Lion Conservation; Targeted Poaching for Body Parts," *Biodiversity and Conservation* 28, no. 14 (2019): 4099–4114, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-019-01866-w>.

<sup>14</sup> Patrick I. Chiyo, Vincent Obanda, and David K. Korir, "Illegal Tusk Harvest and the Decline of Tusk Size in the African Elephant," *Ecology and Evolution* 5, no. 22 (2015): 5216–29, <https://doi.org/10.1002/ece3.1769>; Tim Coulson et al., "Predicting the Evolutionary Consequences of Trophy Hunting on a Quantitative Trait," *Journal of Wildlife Management* 82, no. 1 (2018): 46–56, <https://doi.org/10.1002/jwmg.21261>.

<sup>15</sup> Chiyo, Obanda, and Korir, "Illegal Tusk Harvest and the Decline of Tusk Size in the African Elephant."

<sup>16</sup> 'Musth is a physiological and behavioural condition exclusive to elephants, which is manifested by bouts of elevated testosterone and aggression and heightened sexual activity'; see Julie A Hollister-Smith et al., "Age, Musth and Paternity Success in Wild Male African Elephants, *Loxodonta Africana*," *Animal Behaviour* 74, no. 2 (2007): 287–96, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2006.12.008>.

<sup>17</sup> Lucy A. Taylor et al., "Movement Reveals Reproductive Tactics in Male Elephants," *Journal of Animal Ecology*, no. September 2018 (2019): 1–11, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.13035>; R. Slotow and G. Van Dyk, "Role of Delinquent Young 'Orphan' Male Elephants in High Mortality of White Rhinoceros in Pilanesberg National Park, South Africa," *Koedoe* 44, no. 1 (2001): 85–94, <https://doi.org/10.4102/koedoe.v44i1.188>.

<sup>18</sup> H B Rasmussen et al., "Age- and Tactic-Related Paternity Success in Male African Elephants," *Behavioral Ecology* 19, no. 1 (2008): 9–15, <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arm093>; G. A. Bradshaw et al., "Elephant Breakdown," *Nature* 433, no. 7028 (2005): 807–807, <https://doi.org/10.1038/433807a>.

<sup>19</sup> Katherine Bunney, William J. Bond, and Michelle Henley, "Seed Dispersal Kernel of the Largest Surviving Megaherbivore—the African Savanna Elephant," *Biotropica* 49, no. 3 (May 1, 2017): 395–401, <https://doi.org/10.1111/btp.12423>; Michelle D Henley and Robert Cook, "The Management Dilemma: Removing Elephants to Save Large Trees," *Koedoe*, 2019, 1–12.

strongest male lions (in their reproductive prime) are shot.<sup>20</sup> Younger lions entering the pride often execute infanticide on their predecessor's cubs, thus reducing numbers and further weakening the gene pool.<sup>21</sup>

Clearly, the incentives that drive trophy hunting (selecting the strongest) are fundamentally at odds with the conservation imperative (preserving the strongest). Beyond the negative ecological effects, the practice remains rooted in colonial modes of extraction.<sup>22</sup> In exchange for repatriating an African trophy, wealthy (mostly white western males) hunters pay large sums of cash to wealthy tour operators. In the process, especially in open ecological systems (Botswana and Tanzania in particular), hunters are extracting the very same creatures that photographic tourists are paying to see. In the long run, sustainable photographic tourism, a major employer in otherwise slow-growing and non-labour-absorptive economies (most of sub-Saharan Africa), will be undermined by the continuation of trophy hunting.

---

### *Economic opportunity costs of business as usual*

---

A major concern of the British government is that the imposition of a trophy hunting import ban could undermine rural livelihoods in predominantly African countries that currently rely on trophy hunting revenue to sustain them. This has been the argument behind the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)'s Sustainable Livelihoods (SULi)'s support for trophy hunting.<sup>23</sup> A comprehensive rebuttal of those arguments is made in a separate submission. Lindsey and others show that a minimum of 1,394,000km<sup>2</sup> is set aside for hunting in sub-Saharan Africa, exceeding the land encompassed by national parks. They note, nonetheless, that there are a number of problems associated with the industry that limit its conservation benefits.<sup>24</sup> These are almost entirely governance related. Setting appropriate scientific quotas – and enforcing them – invariably does not happen in sub-Saharan African countries. Almost every academic paper that supports trophy hunting as a potential conservation tool provides the caveat that it can only work if it is well governed.<sup>25</sup> The caveat is hardly ever fulfilled, which suggests that the fundamental nature of this extractive industry is incongruent with good conservation governance.

---

<sup>20</sup> Mucha Mkono, "Neo-Colonialism and Greed: Africans' Views on Trophy Hunting in Social Media," *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 27, no. 5 (2019): 689–704, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1604719>.

<sup>21</sup> T M Caro et al., "Animal Breeding Systems and Big Game Hunting: Models and Application," *Biological Conservation* 142, no. 4 (2009): 909–29, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2008.12.018>.

<sup>22</sup> Batavia et al., "The Elephant (Head) in the Room: A Critical Look at Trophy Hunting"; Mkono, "Neo-Colonialism and Greed: Africans' Views on Trophy Hunting in Social Media."

<sup>23</sup> D Challender and R Cooney, "Informing Decisions on Trophy Hunting," *IUCN Briefing Paper*, 2016, [https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/iucn\\_sept\\_briefing\\_paper\\_-\\_informingdecisionstrophyhunting.pdf](https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/iucn_sept_briefing_paper_-_informingdecisionstrophyhunting.pdf).

<sup>24</sup> P. A. Lindsey, P. A. Roulet, and S. S. Romañach, "Economic and Conservation Significance of the Trophy Hunting Industry in Sub-Saharan Africa," *Biological Conservation*, 2007, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2006.09.005>.

<sup>25</sup> See, for instance: Nelson, Lindsey, and Balme, "Trophy Hunting and Lion Conservation: A Question of Governance?"

Economically, the problem with simply demonstrating that trophy hunting provides large revenues, many jobs, and protects land that might otherwise be converted to a worse ecological use (such as crop production or livestock grazing) is that it fails to convey the hidden costs (ecological, social and economic) of trophy hunting.

Lindsey and others, in 2007, estimated that trophy hunting supported 16,000 jobs in sub-Saharan Africa.<sup>26</sup> A study by van der Merwe and others in 2014 attributed 31,436 jobs in South Africa to hunting through the multiplier effect – other industry jobs that are sustained through hunting such as agriculture, manufacturing and so forth.<sup>27</sup> They claim that these jobs would not otherwise exist. A 2018 study estimated that trophy hunters contribute \$341 million per year to the South African economy and support more than 17,000 employment opportunities.<sup>28</sup> The authors also reference a study by Safari Club International (SCI) from 2015 that estimates that 53,400 jobs are supported through trophy hunting in southern Africa (across eight countries, with South Africa boasting 12,742).

A 2009 IUCN report concurs with an estimated total of 15,000 hunting jobs across the eight biggest hunting jurisdictions in Africa, but concluded that ‘the hunting sector uses up a lot of space without generating corresponding socio-economic benefits.’<sup>29</sup> A 2019 paper by Chardonnet – also published by the IUCN – notes that Tanzania’s vast hunting landscapes (100,000km<sup>2</sup>) only account for 4,300 jobs – ‘the vast surface areas of hunting reserves do not have a significant socio-economic impact.’<sup>30</sup>

The problem with simplistic analyses supporting hunting is that they ignore the ecological costs of wildlife ranching and fail to recognise that trophy hunting and non-consumptive ecotourism are increasingly mutually exclusive. They also tend to ignore the poor quality of jobs on hunting establishments and how this perpetuates a colonial and apartheid-era master-slave dynamic.

One of the ironies associated with the increase in private game ranching in South Africa is that game rancher tolerance towards free-ranging wildlife has significantly decreased – there is a conflict of interest between wealth and wildlife conservation, and game ranching comes at a significant cost to conservation.<sup>31</sup> For instance, the ‘propensity to erect predator-proof fencing in response to conflict raises further concerns, as it can fragment habitat and significantly alter interactions between species, leading to detrimental impacts on

---

<sup>26</sup> Lindsey, Roulet, and Romañach, “Economic and Conservation Significance of the Trophy Hunting Industry in Sub-Saharan Africa,” 2007, 459.

<sup>27</sup> Petrus van der Merwe, Melville Saayman, and Riaan Rossouw, “The Economic Impact of Hunting: A Regional Approach,” *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences* 17, no. 4 (2014): 379–95, <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v17i4.439>.

<sup>28</sup> Melville Saayman, Petrus van der Merwe, and Andrea Saayman, “The Economic Impact of Trophy Hunting in the South African Wildlife Industry,” *Global Ecology and Conservation* 16 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2018.e00510>.

<sup>29</sup> IUCN report, <https://portals.iucn.org/library/efiles/documents/2009-074-En.pdf>, accessed 9 January 2020.

<sup>30</sup> Bertrand Chardonnet, “Africa Is Changing: Should Its Protected Areas Evolve? Reconfiguring the Protected Areas in Africa,” *IUCN*, 2019, <https://portals.iucn.org/library/efiles/documents/2019-074-En.pdf>.

<sup>31</sup> Ross T. Pitman et al., “The Conservation Costs of Game Ranching,” *Conservation Letters* 10, no. 4 (2017): 402–12, <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12276>.

ecosystem functions.<sup>32</sup> The majority of trophy hunting in South Africa takes place on private ranches. One estimate suggests that there are in the region of 9,000 of these ranches, covering an area of some 21 million hectares.<sup>33</sup> Fragmented private pockets of wildlife ranches do not contribute to intact ecological functionality. For defenders of the status quo, increased wildlife numbers are cited as a conservation success story. But numbers mean relatively little if what they represent is ultimately harming ecological sustainability instead of promoting it.

Regarding employment, trophy hunting fails to provide high quality jobs and perpetuates negative historical socio-economic relationships that sub-Saharan African countries are trying to shed. Job security, for instance, has evidentially diminished in South Africa's evolution of conversion from other forms of agriculture to wildlife ranching. 'Trophy-hunting farms can be seen as non-state spaces where farmers re-assert their authority and sovereignty over land and natural resources... State making through enclosure and settlement is a violent process, and privatisation of wildlife intensifies this violence as it concentrates power in the hands of land and wildlife owners'<sup>34</sup>, the very opposite of the transformation agenda articulated when South Africa entered democracy in 1994. Further wealth concentration in the hands of the already privileged entrenches inequality and simultaneously contributes to local communities' negative attitude towards wildlife, as it can symbolise oppression associated with white privilege.

A classic example of entrenched white privilege is the Associated Private Nature Reserves (APNR) in South Africa, bordering the world-renowned Kruger National Park (KNP). The six private reserves each comprise a number of different private owners and farms. By 1996, these reserves had almost no elephants left as they had been hunted to near extinction. The fences were dropped in 1993 – before the end of apartheid – on the premise of creating 'ecological unity' between the APNR and the KNP itself. Commercial hunting, in the 1996 agreement, was not mentioned at all. Animals under public custodianship (KNP) now move freely between the APNR and the KNP. Far from creating ecological unity, however, they are treated as *res nullius* (nobody's property) in the APNR and are hunted. South African National Parks (SANParks) has never addressed this problem.<sup>35</sup> In 2019, the APNR approved the commercial trophy hunting of 47 elephant bulls. These animals are part of the country's national heritage but are permitted to be shot by foreign trophy hunters for the benefit of a small number of wealthy white landowners. Tellingly, governance breaches in the APNR abound. How much money actually accrues to local communities remains unknown due to a lack of transparency in the industry.

Let us now grant, for the sake of the argument, that trophy hunting in South Africa supports 17,000 employment opportunities. Across 21 million hectares of private ranching land, that amounts to a labour absorption figure of 0.00080952 per hectare. To the contrary, non-

---

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 409.

<sup>33</sup> Saayman, van der Merwe, and Saayman, "The Economic Impact of Trophy Hunting in the South African Wildlife Industry."

<sup>34</sup> Femke Brandt, "Power Battles on South African Trophy-Hunting Farms: Farm Workers, Resistance and Mobility in the Karoo," *Journal of Contemporary African Studies* 34, no. 1 (2016): 178–79, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02589001.2016.1200244>.

<sup>35</sup> Michele Pickover, "Hunting in South Africa: A Bloody Mess," *Africa* (Johannesburg, 2010).

consumptive ecotourism generates superior revenue to other land use activities such as hunting and game sales.<sup>36</sup> According to a 2019 study, 90,000 jobs are estimated to be currently attributable to non-consumptive use of biodiversity in South Africa.<sup>37</sup> It is not clear what the labour absorption rate per hectare is, however. If we assume that this is derived predominantly from protected areas (no hunting), then the labour absorption figure is 0,009221311 per hectare (from 9.76 million hectares of terrestrial protected area total). If the 21 million hectares currently allocated towards consumptive trophy hunting were re-allocated towards non-consumptive tourism (assuming uniformity for the sake of the calculation), approximately 193,647 jobs could be created.<sup>38</sup> That is approximately 11.39 times more than what trophy hunting currently supports. Applying the same calculation to Tanzania, 92,213 jobs could be created through converting hunting landscapes (10 million ha) to ecotourism. Ecotourism has the additional benefit of 'equitable wealth distribution, community upliftment, sustainable land use and biodiversity conservation.'<sup>39</sup> Even if the median labour absorption figure for ranching and hunting (related but also distinct) is closer to 0.0038, as suggested by Taylor and others<sup>40</sup>, non-consumptive tourism is still 2.43 times more effective at creating jobs.

A further and final consideration is that the long-term economic potential of photographic tourism depends on ecological sustainability and intact landscapes, therefore providing an inherent conservation incentive that is largely absent from the trophy hunting model. A trophy male lion might fetch \$33,000 but its lifetime value to photographic tourism may be as high as \$2 million.<sup>41</sup> Moreover, trophy hunting and photographic tourism are increasingly mutually exclusive. Photographers have, on occasion, witnessed wild animals being shot by trophy hunters.<sup>42</sup> Even the knowledge that hunting occurs in the same vicinity is sufficient to deter many tourists with non-consumptive preferences from visiting countries that practice trophy hunting.<sup>43</sup> The fact that South Africa still supports the hunting of captive-bred lions, for instance, may end up costing the economy up to R54 billion over the next decade in foregone tourism revenue due to reputation damage and negative potential impacts on wild lion populations.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> WA Taylor, PA Lindsay, and HT Davies-Mostert, "An Assessment of the Economic, Social and Conservation Value of the Wildlife Ranching Industry and Its Potential to Support the Green Economy in South Africa," *Research and Policy Development to Advance a Green Economy in South Africa* (Johannesburg, 2016), [http://www.the-eis.com/data/literature/Taylor et al 2016 An assessment of the economic social and conservation value of the wildlife ranching industry and its potential to support the green e.pdf](http://www.the-eis.com/data/literature/Taylor%20et%20al%202016%20An%20assessment%20of%20the%20economic%20social%20and%20conservation%20value%20of%20the%20wildlife%20ranching%20industry%20and%20its%20potential%20to%20support%20the%20green%20e.pdf).

<sup>37</sup> Driver A, Mukhadi F and E Botts, 'An Initial Assessment of Biodiversity-Related Employment in South Africa', [http://www.dpru.uct.ac.za/sites/default/files/image\\_tool/images/36/Publications/Working\\_Papers/DPRU%20WP201902.pdf](http://www.dpru.uct.ac.za/sites/default/files/image_tool/images/36/Publications/Working_Papers/DPRU%20WP201902.pdf), accessed 7 January 2020.

<sup>38</sup> This is contested. Proponents of hunting typically argue that hunting occupies 'marginal' land that is aesthetically unamenable to photographic tourism. However, it is difficult to see how this argument holds in South Africa, as many hunting ranches boast extraordinary scenery.

<sup>39</sup> Taylor, Lindsay, and Davies-Mostert, "An Assessment of the Economic, Social and Conservation Value of the Wildlife Ranching Industry and Its Potential to Support the Green Economy in South Africa," 47.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 3.

<sup>41</sup> See <https://africageographic.com/blog/dereck-joubert-responds-to-a-hunter-on-the-economics-of-hunting/>, accessed 7 January 2020.

<sup>42</sup> See [https://www.eturbonews.com/239650/young-balule-elephant-shot-13-times-before-horrified-visitors/?utm\\_source=dlvr.it&utm\\_medium=gplus](https://www.eturbonews.com/239650/young-balule-elephant-shot-13-times-before-horrified-visitors/?utm_source=dlvr.it&utm_medium=gplus), accessed 7 January 2020.

<sup>43</sup> Pickover, "Hunting in South Africa: A Bloody Mess."

<sup>44</sup> Ross Harvey, "The Economics of Captive Predator Breeding in South Africa" (Cape Town, 2018), [https://saiia.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Harvey\\_180818\\_WorkingPaper\\_PredatorBreedingSA.pdf](https://saiia.org.za/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Harvey_180818_WorkingPaper_PredatorBreedingSA.pdf).

---

## Conclusion

---

Trophy hunting is a morally repugnant activity that cannot be reconciled with science. Contrary to the view that banning trophy hunting imports would have negative socio-ecological consequences, it seems clear that such a ban will open an overdue conversation on the importance of implementing and scaling up alternative activities. The data is also unequivocal that hunting supports relatively few jobs per hectare when compared with non-consumptive ecotourism. The labour absorption figure for the latter is likely five times larger than that of trophy hunting. For South Africa alone, this means that land currently allocated to hunting could provide 193,000 jobs instead of only 17,000 (excluding multiplier effects). Moreover, the quality of hunting jobs is highly questionable, and the evidence suggests that South Africa's conversion of agricultural land to game ranching has worsened job security and deepened inequalities. This is the very opposite of community empowerment, which non-consumptive tourism is better able to accomplish.<sup>45</sup> Therefore, the United Kingdom now has an excellent opportunity to enact a stringent ban on trophy hunting imports, especially in the context of a human-induced sixth extinction – an outcome produced by the very same extractive mentality that animates trophy hunting. In doing so, it will contribute to the protection of scarce remaining biodiversity, a global heritage so evidently at risk.

---

<sup>i</sup> This briefing was written to inform the UK government's policy consultation on the proposal to ban trophy hunting imports into the UK. It was commissioned by the EMS Foundation: PO Box 3018, Honeydew, 2040, South Africa. Email: [info@emsfoundation](mailto:info@emsfoundation)

<sup>ii</sup> Dr Harvey obtained his PhD in Economics from the University of Cape Town in 2019. His research interests are in natural resource governance.

---

<sup>45</sup> Mucha Mkono et al., "Diversifying Approaches to Conserving Nature," *The Conversation*, January 7, 2020, <https://theconversation.com/diversifying-approaches-to-conserving-nature-126526>.