

LETTER

Keeping hunting bans on target

The U.K. government has proposed an Animals Abroad Bill, which would ban the import of hunting trophies. However, this ban is not clearly based on any deontological moral position or system of virtue ethics (Bichel, 2021) because domestic trophy hunting and hunting trophy exports will still be allowed. Nevertheless, the U.K. Government claims its import ban will “disincentivize trophy hunting...and send a positive signal internationally.”

However, if disincentivizing trophy hunting does precipitate a decline in this industry, it may mean fewer jobs, less funding for conservation (antipoaching, etc.), and less local tolerance for wildlife (Naidoo et al., 2016; Parker et al., 2020), all of which would harm human and animal communities. This is why many argue from a consequentialist perspective that trophy hunting bans may inadvertently cause more animal suffering and imperil wildlife rather than save it (Di Minin et al., 2016; Dickman et al., 2019). Indeed, local communities have warned that the proposed ban threatens to “undermine successful community-based conservation in several African countries” (Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources et al., 2021).

Trophy hunting is not listed as a major threat to any species on the International Union for the Conservation of Nature Red List, although it has threatened some specific populations, particularly of lion (*Panthera leo*) and leopard (*Panthera pardus*). But even for these species, this threat is minor compared with threats, such as conflict, habitat loss, and poaching (Bauer et al., 2020; Lindsey, 2015). Indeed, well-managed hunting actively mitigates these other, greater threats, by protecting habitat and encouraging coexistence, and trophy hunting has demonstrably improved the conservation status of some flagship threatened species (IUCN, 2016; ‘t Sas-Rolfes et al., 2022).

Some of the community benefits derived from trophy hunting (e.g., meat provision) are also not easily replicated by potential alternatives. In fact, no practicable, scalable, alternative has yet been demonstrated that could similarly sustain the habitat and wildlife protected in hunting zones, while reliably maintaining equivalent community benefits.

Of course, trophy hunting is far from perfect. The industry still exhibits inequitable revenue sharing, occasionally inappropriate or poorly observed quotas, corruption, and inadequate regulation (Lindsey et al., 2007; Loveridge et al., 2007). Like

wider tourism, it could benefit from substantive reform. However, the U.K.’s proposed import ban promises to do little to address these problems, targeting good and bad operators alike, while alienating and impoverishing communities that currently generate revenue from sustainable hunting.

Importantly, much land managed for trophy hunting currently generates revenues where phototourism cannot (Lindsey et al., 2007). Hunting, therefore, plays a vital role in protecting less-favored areas from habitat loss and poaching—threats that pose far greater challenges to threatened species (IUCN, 2016).

The United Kingdom could better support international conservation by designing a smart trophy hunting import ban to incentivize good practice, amplify benefits of sustainable hunting, and encourage reform of remaining bad practice. Such a ban could prohibit import of trophies from canned hunting operations or from operators that fail to demonstrate an equitable sharing of hunting revenues with local communities or establish and monitor sustainable hunting quotas or otherwise fall short of established IUCN principles (IUCN, 2012).



The United States has a similar policy, dropping recently established bans on elephant (*Loxodonta africana*) and lion trophy imports in favor of a case-by-case approach that demands trophies originate from sustainable management programs. Similarly, the European Union requires hunting import permits guarantee the origin of a trophy is legal and sustainable.

Legislation aimed at restricting trophy hunting should be based on meaningful consultation with the affected state governments, Indigenous peoples, and local communities and should not undermine successful local conservation (IUCN, 2016). If bans are still deemed necessary, they should only be introduced “after identification and implementation of feasible, fully funded and sustainable alternatives to hunting that respect indigenous and local community rights and livelihoods and deliver equal or greater incentives for conservation” (IUCN, 2016).

The proposed U.K. ban does none of these things; most notably, it fails to provide sustainable or funded alternatives. By contrast, a smart ban focused on promoting sustainability and community rights could encourage improved regulation of the global hunting industry and support development goals and incentivize better conservation.

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2022 The Authors. *Conservation Biology* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of Society for Conservation Biology.

Hugh Webster¹ 
 Amy Dickman²
 Adam Hart³ 
 Dilys Roe⁴

¹Mill Cottage, Kirkmichael, UK

²Wildlife Conservation Research Unit, Department of Zoology,
 Recanati-Kaplan Centre, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

³Department of Natural and Social Sciences, University of
 Gloucestershire, Gloucestershire, UK

⁴IUCN Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group, London,
 UK

Correspondence

Hugh Webster, Kirkmichael, Blairgowrie PH10 7NB, UK.

Email: hughwebster1@gmail.com

Article Impact statement: Blanket hunting bans threaten to undermine the conservation and community benefits of sport hunting.

ORCID

Hugh Webster  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8542-5854>

Adam Hart  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4795-9986>

REFERENCES

- Bauer, H., Dickman, A., Chapron, G., Cotterill, A. O., Nicholson, S. K., Sillero-Zubiri, C., Hunter, L., Lindsey, P., & Macdonald, D. W. (2020). Threat analysis for more effective lion conservation. *Oryx*, *56*, 108–115.
- Bichel, N. (2021). *Comprehending trophy hunting – Hunting, hunters, trophies and antis*. PhD dissertation. University of Hong Kong. HKU Scholars Hub.
- Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources, Ngamiland Council of Non-Governmental Organisations, Zambian Community Resources Boards Association, Kasungu Wildlife Conservation for Community Development Association, Community Wildlife Management Areas Consortium, Resource Africa, and Wildlife and Environmental Society of Malawi (2021). Written evidence submitted by Community Leaders Network of Southern Africa, Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organisation, Resource Africa United Kingdom (AAB0010). UK Parliamentary evidence Animals Abroad Bill. <https://committees.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/38445/pdf/>
- Dickman, A., Cooney, R., Johnson, P. J., Louis, M. P., & Roe, D. (2019). Trophy hunting bans imperil biodiversity. *Science*, *365*, 874.
- Di Minin, E., Leader-Williams, N., & Bradshaw, C. J. A. (2016). Banning trophy hunting will exacerbate biodiversity loss. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, *31*, 99–102.
- IUCN. (2016). *Informing decisions on trophy hunting*. Gland: International Union for Conservation of Nature.
- IUCN. (2012). *IUCN SSC guiding principles on trophy hunting as a tool for creating conservation incentives*. Gland: International Union for Conservation of Nature.
- Lindsey, P. A., Roulet, P. A., & Romañach, S. S. (2007). Economic and conservation significance of the trophy hunting industry in sub-Saharan Africa. *Biological Conservation*, *134*, 455–469.
- Lindsey, P. A. (2015). Bushmeat, wildlife-based economies, food security and conservation: Insights into the ecological and social impacts of the bushmeat trade in African savannahs. Report. Harare: FAO.
- Loveridge, A. J., Searle, A. W., Murindagomo, F., & Macdonald, D. W. (2007). The impact of sport-hunting on the population dynamics of an African lion population in a protected area. *Biological Conservation*, *134*, 548–558.
- Naidoo, R., Weaver, L. C., Diggle, R. W., Matongo, G., Stuart-Hill, G., & Thouless, C. (2016). Complementary benefits of tourism and hunting to communal conservancies in Namibia. *Conservation Biology*, *30*, 628–638.
- Parker, K., De Vos, A., Clements, H. S., Biggs, D., & Biggs, R. (2020). Impacts of a trophy hunting ban on private land conservation in South African biodiversity hotspots. *Conservation Science and Practice*, *2*(7), e214. <https://doi.org/10.1111/csp2.214>
- † Sas-Rolfes, M., Emslie, R., Adcock, K., & Knight, M. (2022). Legal hunting for conservation of highly threatened species: The case of African rhinos. *Conservation Letters*, e12877. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12877>

