The Controversial Case of Trophy Hunting

What is the issue?

\n\n

- Trump administration recently proposed the lifting of import bans for elephants
- This is expected to ease the entry of trophy imports from countries such as Zimbabwe and Zambia.
- This has brought trophy hunting into the international limelight and the conservationists are divided in their opinions.

\n\n

What are the conflicting opinions on Trophy hunting?

\n\n

- Trophy hunting is the legal practice of selectively hunting wild game animals.
- The taxidermied parts of such animal such as the head or carcass are usually taken back home for display as a "trophy,"
- **Negative opinion –** Some fear that trophy hunting can endanger lion populations.
- Animal activists also advocate the ethical angle, where killing as a sport is argued as reprehensive.
- **Positive Opinion -** Countries like Namibia have shown that well-managed hunting programs can help conservation.
- Usually, in these hunts, select individuals, often old & infirm, are sacrificed, but the species wins due increased funds for its upkeep.

\n\n

How effective has hunting bans been?

\n\n

\n
- **Hunting Bans –** Simply banning hunting hasn’t lead to an automatic increase in populations of endangered species.
\n
- In Kenya and India hunting bans exist since the 1970s.
\n
- But the wildlife populations do not seem better than in territories were hunting isn’t banned.
\n
- **Commersialising wildlife -** South Africa and Namibia, where wildlife has been commoditised are doing better in conservation.
\n
- Commoditisation of wildlife means “trophy hunting, wildlife tourism, commercial meat production and local consumption”.
\n
- This has also benefited the local communities by emerging as a employment and business opportunity.
\n

\n\n

What makes the case for Trophy hunting?

\n\n

\n
- Trophy hunting has in the past, helped recover species such as the black rhino and the straight-horned markhor (wild goat).
\n
- While it could risk some populations, there is limited evidence to show that it has substantial negative implications at a bigger level.
\n
- **Conservation Funds -** Financial incentives that trophy hunting provides for maintainance of lion habitats is significant.
\n
- If not for this, there is a risk of wildlife parks getting taken over for other uses due to the ever increasing need for land and resources.
\n

\n\n

\n
- **Challenges in Eco-tourism -** Ecotourism is usually favoured to generate revenue for conservation.

\n
- But it might not always be viable due to the difficulties of terrain.
\n
- Moreover, some experts claim that compared to ecotourism, high-value trophy hunting has a lower ecological footprint.
\n

\n\n

What are the challenges Ahead?

\n\n

\n
- **Improper Implementation -** Lack of proper hunting regulations & corruption can derail the conservation initiative.
\n
- Trophy hunting also has the inherent risk of promoting illegal hunting that may have serious negative consequences.
\n
- **Subsistence Angle -** The existing confusion about subsistence hunting with sport hunting also distorts the debate.
\n
- While the former is the preserve of the poor who take to hunting for survival, the later is a hobby for rich well off tourists.
\n
- These are embedded in different cultural contexts, and need to be evaluated through separate socio-political and economic frames.
\n
- **Sensationalism –** The debate on trophy hunting is taking away the focus from more serious issues such as man-animal conflict and widespread habitat loss & degradation.
\n
- **Elitist Politics -** The real impact of policy debates in the urban spaces of rich countries is felt in rural Africa where animals and people live in close proximity.
\n
- Significantly, those directly affected by outcomes have literally no say, which is more or less reminiscent of the colonial era.
\n
- Hence, local voices need to be recognised and accommodated.
\n

\n\n

\n\n

Source: The Hindu

\n

