



This is a peer-reviewed, final published version of the following document, © 2023 The Authors. Conservation Letters published by Wiley Periodicals LLC. This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. and is licensed under Creative Commons: Attribution 4.0 license:

Clark, Douglas A, Brehony, Peadar, Dickman, Amy, Foote, Lee, Hart, Adam G ORCID logoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4795-9986>, Jonga, Charles, Mbiza, Moreangels M, Roe, Dilys and Sandbrook, Chris (2023) Hunting trophy import bans proposed by the UK may be ineffective and inequitable as conservation policies in multiple social-ecological contexts. Conservation Letters, 16 (2). e12935. doi:10.1111/conl.12935

Official URL: <http://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12935>
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/conl.12935>
EPrint URI: <https://eprints.glos.ac.uk/id/eprint/12304>

Disclaimer

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT.

PERSPECTIVE

Hunting trophy import bans proposed by the UK may be ineffective and inequitable as conservation policies in multiple social-ecological contexts

Douglas A. Clark¹ | Peadar Brehony^{2,3}  | Amy Dickman⁴ | Lee Foote⁵ | Adam G. Hart⁶ | Charles Jonga⁷ | Moreangels M. Mbiza⁸ | Dilys Roe⁹  | Chris Sandbrook¹⁰ 

¹School of Environment and Sustainability, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada

²Department of Geography, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

³Descot Ltd, Nairobi, Kenya

⁴Wildlife Conservation Research Unit, Department of Zoology, Reanati-Kaplan Centre, University of Oxford, Abingdon, UK

⁵Renewable Resources Department, Faculty of Agricultural, Life and Environmental Science, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

⁶Department of Natural and Social Science, University of Gloucestershire, Cheltenham, UK

⁷CAMPFIRE Association, Harare, Zimbabwe

⁸Sustainability Research Unit, Nelson Mandela University, George, South Africa

⁹IUCN Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group and International Institute for Environment and Development, London, UK

¹⁰Department of Geography, University of Cambridge, Downing Place, Cambridge, UK

Correspondence

Amy Dickman, Wildlife Conservation Research Unit, Department of Zoology, Reanati-Kaplan Centre, University of Oxford, Tubney House, Abingdon, UK.
Email: amy.dickman@zoo.ox.ac.uk

Abstract

The UK government is considering legislation to prohibit the importation of hunting trophies. We examine documented social, ecological, and political outcomes of two previous such bans. We find that the UK government's proposal shares the shortcomings of existing bans that have (1) failed to address, or have even amplified, key threats to hunted species, (2) imposed costs on citizens of other countries, and (3) delegitimized the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES). Trophy import bans are blunt policy instruments that can cause more problems than they solve.

KEYWORDS

bans, CBNRM, CITES, legislation, sustainable use, trophy hunting

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.

© 2023 The Authors. Conservation Letters published by Wiley Periodicals LLC.

1 | INTRODUCTION

The UK government has a long-standing commitment to ban the importation of some hunting trophies in response to mounting public pressure. The species that would be restricted, and the means by which this would be achieved, remain unclear, and a number of Parliamentary Bills have been associated with the proposal over the past few years. At the point of writing, it is the Hunting Trophies (Import Prohibition) Bill that is progressing through the UK Parliament. The Bill states that it is “to make provision prohibiting the import of hunting trophies into Great Britain,” although the Bill is still being drafted and no further details are currently available. Domestic trophy hunting in the UK, which includes client hunting and exportation of trophies from six species of deer (red *Cervus elaphus*, fallow *Dama dama*, roe *Capreolus capreolus*, sika *Cervus nippon*, Reeves muntjac *Muntiacus reevesi*, and Chinese water deer *Hydropotes inermis*), wild boar (*Sus scrofa*), and various game birds, is not included in any of the proposed bans either as an activity or in terms of proposed export bans.

Similar import bans have occurred elsewhere: for example, the US 2008 *Endangered Species Act* listing of polar bears (*Ursus maritimus*) led to a ban on importation of polar bear trophies, while some trophy import bans have recently been enacted in France, Australia, and the Netherlands. Here, we examine the documented outcomes of previous such bans to assess the likely effect of the UK Government's effort. To clarify our standpoint as authors, we believe in seeking effective conservation solutions that also deliver tangible benefits to, and bolster self-determination of, affected local inhabitants. We are a group of conservation scientists, scholars, and practitioners, with experience working in conservation in North American and African contexts. Our shared interest is in discovering ways to achieve justifiable conservation objectives without depriving affected people of their due measures of human dignity (Mattson & Clark, 2011).

2 | OUTCOMES OF TROPHY IMPORT BANS

Here, we argue that trophy import bans are blunt policy instruments that can cause myriad negative social and ecological impacts (Dickman et al. 2019). Their consequences for rural and Indigenous people can functionally manifest as neo-colonial injustices (e.g., Clark et al., 2013). The effects of such imposed approaches to conservation have been well documented, but care must be taken to both recognize the nuances that differentiate such situations and to

respect the legitimate agency that affected local communities can exercise in ways that do not necessarily align with external conservation interests (Peluso, 1993; Taylor, 2012; Witter & Satterfield, 2019).

For example, the US 2008 polar bear import ban made no numerical difference to polar bear harvest in Canada, where most polar bear trophy imports had originated (Weber et al., 2015). However, that ban economically harmed Canadian Inuit communities that had previously benefited from regulated polar bear trophy hunting, undermining the legitimacy and efficacy of the Indigenous-State co-management system responsible for two-thirds of the world's polar bears (Lokken et al., 2019; Meek, 2018). This case illustrates how international trophy bans can even work to the detriment of domestic conservation policy processes themselves. Such perverse effects are not unique to this case either: 't Sas-rolfes et al. (2022) found such international campaigns to have similar adverse effects on rhino conservation.

Bans can have adverse effects on ecosystems as well, creating cascades of ecological and social changes that can make conservation harder. Import restrictions of lion trophies to the United States has apparently already contributed to the abandonment of hunting blocks, resulting in increased habitat loss often through conversion to agriculture: a far greater threat to species like lions than trophy hunting (Bauer et al. 2022; Johnson et al., 2017; Strampelli et al., 2022). Domestic hunting bans can have similar effects. For example, negative livelihood and conservation impacts were documented in Botswana when a hunting ban led to reduced local income, food insecurity, worsened attitudes toward wildlife conservation, and increased poaching (Mbaiwa, 2018).

3 | POLITICAL CONTEXT OF TROPHY IMPORT BANS

Both the UK's current proposal and the US 2008 *Endangered Species Act* listing of polar bears (which led to a ban on importation of polar bear trophies) were initiated and promoted by domestically based environmental organizations, involved governments with relatively few political vulnerabilities at those times (George W. Bush at the end of his second term as US President, Republican party, and Boris Johnson as the then UK Prime Minister with a large Conservative party parliamentary majority), and enabled governments to claim environmental respectability with bipartisan support, celebrity endorsement, and minimal risk of domestic political costs (Roe et al., 2020; Tyrrell & Clark, 2014). Each of these bans imposed costs on citizens of other countries rather than banning

trophy hunting domestically (Chaukura, 2020; Clark et al., 2013). In this important way trophy import bans differ from hunting bans enacted within a country where the species in question is found, though those can have similar local effects on conservation efforts and peoples' livelihoods. Trophy bans are not a politically partisan tactic: the previous Democratic party regime in the United States banned lion (*Panthera leo*) trophy imports (Bauer et al. 2017). Furthermore, animal welfare and environmental organizations can, and have, manipulated wildlife trade data to bolster public support for trophy import bans (Tyrrell & Clark, 2014), while misinformation on the topic is rife in the media (Hart et al., 2020).

4 | DISCUSSION

The commitments underpinning the proposed UK ban mean that this legislation seems likely to have many of the attributes of previous trophy bans. It is therefore likely to produce similar negative effects for conservation and human livelihoods outside the UK. To be clear, this does not mean that trophy import bans cannot achieve conservation gains while (at least) not creating or exacerbating local injustices. Rather, we are simply saying that their empirical track record in different contexts means that positive outcomes cannot be assumed either in the current UK case or more generally. Attention to specific context, history, and sufficiently diverse voices—as well as determining who legitimately has standing in specific situations (and who decides that)—are all necessary to reduce the likelihood of the sorts of destructive outcomes documented above (Adhikari et al., 2021; Chan et al., 2020; Madzwamuse et al., 2020;). None of that was done for the UK proposal, which solicited input in ways that encouraged acontextual, generalized, and selective assessments of both science and policy options (e.g., DEFRA, 2021). The recent joint position statement on trophy hunting by multiple nongovernmental organizations further exemplifies those tendencies (Born Free Foundation, 2022).

The cases we examine here differ in specific ways. First, the 2018 ESA listing of polar bears triggered a *Marine Mammal Protection Act* clause preventing trophy imports to the United States, whereas the 2013 listing of lions under the same act did not make such a blanket prohibition. Second, polar bears are only legally sport-hunted in Canada, whereas multiple species and multiple African countries would be affected by the pending UK legislation. Third, different hunting management approaches across Africa make accurate generalizations difficult (Lindsey et al., 2007). Even taken together these contextual details do not give grounds to expect materially different outcomes from the current UK proposal.

Trophy import bans are inherently political and the weight of conservation evidence has so far failed to penetrate dominant societal narratives, stop misinformation, or substantially influence policy in either African cases or the polar bear case (Hart et al., 2020). While trophy species have long been politically symbolic, trophy bans now appear to reinforce pre-existing identity politics: support or opposition to the ban becomes a way for an individual to signal and maintain membership in a specific societal group (Fukuyama, 2017). Those affected by such bans are often recast as “others” and dehumanized, their interests delegitimized (Hiller & McMillan, 2021). Such factionalization encourages divisive, winner-take-all political strategies at the expense of inclusion, dialogue, and human dignity (Mounck, 2018).

Reducing such political contests between nation-states is clearly in the global common interest and can also help advance conservation and human dignity at local levels. In the absence of demonstrable conservation gains, the key beneficiaries from such bans appear to be domestic political regimes and the organizations who lobbied for them. Viewed in the context of the Bush and Johnson governments' platforms and actions, it is hard to interpret these bans as anything other than greenwashing: placating citizens' genuine concerns about wildlife at the expense of economic and cultural effects on people, and adverse effects on wildlife conservation in other countries. Many Africans have strongly expressed their wish to manage their own wildlife: in a recent debate in Dickman et al. (2019), representatives of over 100,000 community members from four countries said that ignoring their views was tantamount to human rights abuse (Chaukura, 2020). Perhaps, the curated responses to Dickman et al. (2019) were largely written by western academics while Chaukura's (2020) response was relegated to an e-letter.


Rather than repeat previous—and ineffective—calls for evidence-based decisions about such charged conservation issues, we recommend emphasizing greater transparency about standpoints and values in what must be recognized as essentially political decisions, not scientific ones. Decisions by national governments are themselves also subject to an international regulatory regime, and international trade in polar bears and African trophy species has long been regulated under the *Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species* (CITES). While there are compelling calls for CITES' decision-making to be improved (e.g., Cooney et al., 2021), it nevertheless remains the authoritative multilateral instrument for allocating and exercising control over cross-border trade in listed species. Indeed, a renewed commitment to international deliberation through CITES would be a constructive step toward democratizing global conservation efforts.

Legitimate questions remain about whether nation-states ought to be the sole locus of authority for conservation decisions. There are abundant arguments, for example, for recognition of Indigenous peoples' inherent authority and conservation achievements worldwide (e.g., Artelle et al., 2019; Corrigan et al., 2018). Regardless of how these larger issues evolve, unilateral and acontextual decisions by individual countries are unlikely to advance conservation on an interconnected planet. We may well see more "fig leaf" environmental policies like trophy import bans that can externalize costs onto other countries and peoples, may well exacerbate social injustices with no environmental gain (or even harm), and could undermine international institutions. To prevent further undesirable outcomes, conservationists must confront such heavy-handed initiatives, even domestically popular ones. We must question and debate the human costs of conservation policies as well as their biological effects: an enduring but necessary tension within our field. Finally, we must support multilateral conservation institutions and ensure national governments uphold their commitments to those institutions and the rights of local and Indigenous communities under international law.

ORCID

Peadar Brehony  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1315-7683>

Dilys Roe  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6547-6427>

Chris Sandbrook  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9938-4934>

REFERENCES

- Adhikari, L., Khan, B., Joshi, S., Ruijun, L., Ali, G., Shah, G. M., Ismail, M., Bano, K., Ali, R., Khan, G., Pasakhala, B., & Ali, A. (2021). Community-based trophy hunting programs secure biodiversity and livelihoods: Learnings from Asia's high mountain communities and landscapes. *Environmental Challenges*, 4, 100175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envc.2021.100175>
- Artelle, K. A., Zurba, M., Bhattacharya, J. M., Chan, K., Brown, D. A., Housty, J., & Moola, F. (2019). Supporting resurgent Indigenous governance: A nascent mechanism for just and effective conservation. *Biological Conservation*, 240, 108284.
- Bauer, H., Dickman, A., Chapron, G., Oriol-Cotterill, A., Nicholson, S. K., Sillero-Zubiri, C., & Macdonald, D. W. (2022). Threat analysis for more effective lion conservation. *Oryx*, 56(1), 108–115.
- Born Free Foundation. (2022). [https://www.bornfree.org.uk/storage/media/content/files/Joint%20NGO%20position%20on%20trophy%20hunting_final%20\(Logos\).pdf](https://www.bornfree.org.uk/storage/media/content/files/Joint%20NGO%20position%20on%20trophy%20hunting_final%20(Logos).pdf)
- Chan, K. M., Boyd, D. R., Gould, R. K., Jetzkowitz, J., Liu, J., Muraca, B., Naidoo, R., Olmsted, P., Satterfield, T., Selomane, O., Singh, G. G., Sumaila, R., Ngo, H. T., Boedihartono, A. K., Agard, J., de Aguiar, A. P. D., Armenteras, D., Balint, L., Barrington-Leigh, C., ... Brondizio, E. S. (2020). Levers and leverage points for pathways to sustainability. *People and Nature*, 2(3), 693–717.
- Chaukura, I. (2020). Science e-letters. <https://science.sciencemag.org/content/366/6464/434/tab-e-letters>
- Clark, D. A., Meek, C., Cheechoo, J., Clark, S. G., Foote, A. L., Lee, G., & York, G. (2013). Polar bears and CITES: A rejoinder to Parsons and Cornick. *Marine Policy*, 38, 365–368.
- Cooney, R., Challender, D. W., Broad, S., Roe, D., & Natusch, D. J. (2021). Think before you act: Improving the conservation outcomes of CITES listing decisions. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution*, 9, 236.
- Corrigan, C., Bingham, H., Shi, Y., Lewis, E., Chauvenet, A., & Kingston, N. (2018). Quantifying the contribution to biodiversity conservation of protected areas governed by indigenous peoples and local communities. *Biological Conservation*, 227, 403–412.
- DEFRA. (2021). Importing of hunting trophies banned to protect world's threatened species. Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs, The Rt Hon Lord Goldsmith. <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/importing-of-hunting-trophies-banned-to-protect-worlds-threatened-species>
- Dickman, A., Cooney, R., Johnson, P. J., baLouis, M. P., Roe, D., & 128 signatories. (2019). Trophy hunting bans imperil biodiversity. *Science*, 365(6456), 874.
- Fukuyama, F. (2017). *Identity: The demand for dignity and the politics of resentment*. Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.
- Hart, A. G., Cooney, R., Dickman, A., Hare, D., Jonga, C., Johnson, P., & Somerville, K. (2020). Threats posed to conservation by media misinformation. *Conservation Biology*, 34(6), 1333–1334.
- Hiller, C., & MacMillan, D. C. (2021). How worldview and personal values can shape conservation conflict—The case of captive-bred lions. *Biological Conservation*, 258, 109151.
- Johnson, P. J., Dickman, A. J. A., & MacDonald, D. W. (2017). Photo-tourism and trophy hunting of lions: A sideways look at consistency in conservation. *Conservation Biology*, 32(3), 744–746.
- Lindsey, P. A., Roulet, P. A., & Romanach, S. S. (2007). Economic and conservation significance of the trophy hunting industry in sub-Saharan Africa. *Biological Conservation*, 134(4), 455–469.
- Lokken, N. A., Clark, D. A., Broderstad, E. G., & Hausner, V. H. (2019). Inuit attitudes towards Co-managing wildlife in three communities in the Kivalliq region of Nunavut, Canada. *Arctic*, 72(1), 58–70.
- Madzwamuse, M., Rihoy, E., & Louis, M. (2020). Contested conservation: Implications for rights, democratization, and citizenship in southern Africa. *Development (Cambridge, England)*, 63, 67–73.
- Mattson, D. J., & Clark, S. G. (2011). Human dignity in concept and practice. *Policy Sciences*, 44(4), 303–319.
- Mbaiwa, J. E. (2018). Effects of the safari hunting tourism ban on rural livelihoods and wildlife conservation in northern Botswana. *South African Geographical Journal (Suid-Afrikaanse Geografiese Tydskrif)*, 100(1), 41–61.
- Meek, C. L. (2018). Putting the US polar bear debate into context: The disconnect between old policy and new problems. *Marine Policy*, 35, 430–439.
- Mounk, Y. (2018). *The people vs. democracy*. Harvard University Press.
- Peluso, N. L. (1993). Coercing conservation? The politics of state resource control. *Global Environmental Change*, 3(2), 199–217.
- Roe, D., Dickman, A., Kock, R., Milner-Gulland, E. J., & Rihoy, E. (2020). Beyond banning wildlife trade: COVID-19, conservation and development. *World Development*, 136, 105121.
- Strampelli, P., Henschel, P., Searle, C. E., Macdonald, D. W., & Dickman, A. J. (2022). Habitat use of and threats to African large carnivores in a mixed-use landscape. *Conservation Biology*, 36, e13943.

- Taylor, J. J. (2012). *Naming the land: San identity and community conservation in Namibia's west Caprivi*. Basler Afrika Bibliographien.
- 't 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*, 15(3), e12877. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12877>
- Tyrrell, M., & Clark, D. A. (2014). What happened to climate change? CITES and the reconfiguration of polar bear conservation discourse. *Global Environmental Change*, 24, 363–372.
- Weber, D. S., Mandler, T., Dyck, M., De Groot, P. J. V. C., Lee, D. S., & Clark, D. A. (2015). Unexpected and undesired conservation outcomes of wildlife trade bans—An emerging problem for stakeholders? *Global Ecology and Conservation*, 3, 389–400.
- Witter, R., & Satterfield, T. (2019). The ebb and flow of indigenous rights recognitions in conservation policy. *Development and Change*, 50(4), 1083–1108.

How to cite this article: Clark, D. A., Brehony, P., Dickman, A., Foote, L., Hart, A. G., Jonga, C., Mbiza, M. M., Roe, D., & Sandbrook, C. (2022). Hunting trophy import bans proposed by the UK may be ineffective and inequitable as conservation policies in multiple social-ecological contexts. *Conservation Letters*, e12935. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12935>