Animal Welfare in a Changing World

Edited by **Andy Butterworth**

CABI

5 Trophy Hunting and Animal Welfare

Mark Jones and Chris Draper

> We should protect the most vulnerable and helpless in society, not destroy them – much less derive pleasure from doing so.
>
> Sir Roger Moore KBE 1927–2017

5.1 Introduction

The idea of trophy hunting may conjure up a picture of 'hunters' stalking individual 'big game' animals belonging to iconic species across often inhospitable terrain, sometimes for days, pitting their wits against often dangerous adversaries and enduring the discomforts and hardships of the bush for the chance of bagging an animal to display on a wall in a trophy room back home.

Whether or not this was ever a reality, trophy hunting has expanded in scale and scope and now encompasses a diverse range of activities, in large part driven by commercial interests. Many individuals or groups of animals belonging to a very large number of species, some threatened with extinction, are targeted. Some are hunted in their natural environment, although increasingly populations are managed, or in some cases bred specifically for hunting, and even hunted while in captivity, to provide trophies for paying clients.

Recent high-profile incidents have stimulated significant public debate over the ethics, conservation, and economic credentials of trophy hunting, and have been partly responsible for a tightening of international rules governing the conduct of sectors of the hunting industry (CITES, 2017). Some jurisdictions have also restricted imports of trophies from certain species (such as through the listing of species on the United States Endangered Species Act, or through restrictions on imports to the European Union (EU) of certain trophies derived from countries where the sustainability of hunting operations is in question). Public pressure has also resulted in a number of airlines and shipping companies restricting or banning the carriage of certain hunting trophies (*Economist*, 2015).

The justifications for these changes have largely centred on concerns over the conduct and sustainability of the trophy hunting industry, and in particular its conservation credentials. However, while the impacts of trophy hunting on animal welfare have featured prominently in some public forums, concern for animal welfare has not, thus far, been a significant driver for regulatory change.

This discussion focuses on the impacts of trophy hunting on the welfare of animals, and the need for society to fully account for animal welfare implications when contemplating the future of the hunting industry.

5.2 What is Trophy Hunting?

Understanding of the term trophy hunting may vary, and a comprehensive definition of trophy hunting is lacking. In its *Guiding Principles on Trophy Hunting as a Tool for Creating Conservation Incentives* (IUCN SSC, 2012), the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)'s Species Survival Commission (SSC) describes 'trophy hunting' as being:

> managed as part of a programme administered by a government, community-based organization, NGO [non-governmental organization], or other legitimate body; characterized by hunters paying a high fee to hunt an animal with specific 'trophy' characteristics (recognizing that hunters each have individual motivations); characterized by low off-take volume; and usually (but not necessarily) undertaken by hunters from outside the local area (often from countries other than where the hunt occurs).
>
> (IUCN SSC, 2012)

While this description is not necessarily a definition, it serves as a useful benchmark that encompasses most key aspects of trophy hunting.

While in some cases, parts of a hunted animal may be subsequently utilized for other purposes (e.g. the meat from some animals killed by trophy hunters may be offered to local people, once the

'trophy' has been removed), the definition above implies that the prime motivation of the hunter is some aspect of the individual animal's morphology, be it size, colouration, or adornment, and that he or she seeks to acquire an animal, or part thereof, as a 'trophy'.

This places trophy hunting in partial contrast with other forms of recreational hunting. For example, hunting foxes with dogs may result in parts of the hunted animal being removed and retained as tokens, but the hunted animal is not usually selected for its individual physical attributes. While trophy hunting can certainly contain a competitive element, the motivation for other 'competitive' forms of hunting may be the numbers of individuals killed or their combined body weight, for example in driven ground-bird shoots, coyote killing contests, or some kinds of sport fishing activity.

There are clearly similarities between these various types of recreational hunting, and all have significant animal welfare implications. While the discussions here focus on the hunting of individual 'high value' animals as per the IUCN description above, where appropriate, reference is also made to wider hunting activities.

5.2.1 Scope and scale

According to official figures submitted by governments,[1] in the decade to 2015 (2006–2015 inclusive), close to 350,000 trophy items derived from more than 300 animal species listed in the Appendices of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) were traded internationally. These trophies originated from 123 different countries, with South Africa, Canada, Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Namibia accounting for more than three-quarters of the total. They were imported by 166 other countries, with the USA accounting for almost two-thirds of imports, and EU member states for a further 15%. The most commonly exported trophies were derived from African elephants (*Loxodonta africana*: 76,000), American black bears (*Ursus americanus*: 59,000), Nile crocodiles (*Crocodylus niloticus*: 53,000), hippopotamus (*Hippopotamus amphibius*: 28,000), and African lions (*Panthera leo*: 14,500).

These figures are limited to CITES-listed species, the international trade in which is regulated to ensure that it does not threaten the survival of these species, and the data are reported by governments to a central database. However, these are by no means the only species targeted by trophy hunters. US trophy hunters imported more than 1.26 million wildlife trophies into the USA in the decade to 2014, almost two-thirds of which were derived from Canada and South Africa (HSUS and HSI, 2016). Every year hunters also kill many millions of birds belonging to 350 or more species as they migrate through the Mediterranean region, using a variety of methods including shooting, poisoning, and trapping; BirdLife (www.birdlife.org) estimates that 11–36 million of these birds are illegally killed or taken, with even larger numbers being legally killed by hunters, often as 'trophies' (Brochet *et al*., 2016).

In South Africa, thousands of carnivores, particularly lions, are intensively bred in more than 200 captive breeding centres across the country, in order, in part at least, to meet a demand among time-pressed, predominantly foreign, paying trophy hunters for relatively 'constrained' animals which they can shoot in an enclosed area and 'bag' a guaranteed trophy. These animals are specifically 'bred for the gun' and live lives that are very far removed from those of their wild counterparts.

Wider hunting activities involve even greater numbers of animals. The breeding of animals for the purpose of recreational hunting may date back centuries. Game birds were probably introduced into the UK in Roman times, primarily as food, although pheasants, partridge, and ducks are now reared in very large numbers on game farms to supplement wild populations for commercial shoots. In the UK, where a substantial proportion of the countryside is managed for shooting, the British Association for Shooting and Conservation estimates that 35 million pheasants and red-legged partridge are bred for release onto shooting estates each year to be killed for 'sport' (BASC, 2015) (Fig. 5.1). Further, tens of thousands of brown hares, a priority species under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan and described as a 'minor shooting quarry' by the Game and Wildlife Conservation Trust (Aebischer *et al*., 2011), comprising between 28% and 69% of the national spring population, are shot by paying hunters annually (Stoate and Tapper, 1993).

If animal welfare impacts are measured as a function of the degree and duration of individual welfare compromise and the number of animals involved, which can be very large, then the potential welfare implications of these hunting activities are clearly very significant.

Fig. 5.1. An estimated 35 million pheasants and red-legged partridge are bred for release onto British shooting estates each year to be killed for 'sport'. (Image copyright: Elena Fedulova Dreamstime, used with permission.)

5.2.2 History and motivation

While the hunting and killing of iconic animals by wealthy individuals has been long practised, the emergence of 'commercial' trophy hunting is relatively recent. In 1892, London taxidermist Rowland Ward published *Horn Measurements and Weights of the Great Game of the World*, which, along with subsequent editions, was the first resource of its kind publishing information on where in the world trophy hunters could find sought-after animals. In 1930, the Boone and Crockett Club (founded by President Roosevelt some 43 years earlier) established its Trophy Scoring System for North American Mammals, and the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC) established its own trophy formula in 1930, providing a comparative analysis and achievements of the then newly fashionable practice of commercial trophy hunting (Damm, 2008). These recognition systems arguably stimulated the emergence of 'competitive' trophy hunting, which has culminated in hunters seeking recognition among their fellows in part through the pursuit of various 'awards' conferred by major hunting organizations (Safari Club International, 2016).

Anthropologists and others have explored the motivations behind modern trophy hunting, concluding that the high monetary costs of hunting, and the communication of these costs to others, may be significant factors (Darimont *et al.*, 2017). The hunting industry has perpetuated the often false perception that the 'bagging' of a trophy involves the conquering of dangerous animals and demonstrates the bravery or prowess of the hunter (Simon, 2017). The more recent emergence of 'canned hunting' mainly in South Africa, involving release of intensively bred lions and other predators into enclosed areas to be killed by a paying 'hunter', has divided hunting enthusiasts, and the IUCN has called for an end to the practice (IUCN, 2016a).

5.2.3 Legislation

International and national regulations concerning trophy hunting are predominantly focused on conserving threatened species rather than protecting the welfare of targeted animals. In 2016, CITES, which regulates international trade in specimens derived from species listed on its Appendices, adopted a resolution on the international trade in hunting trophies of listed species (CITES, 2017). This requires that: (i) trophies for export conform to relevant definitions; (ii) trophies for export are legally obtained in their country of origin; (iii) their export is not detrimental to the survival of the species concerned; and (iv) the trophy hunting operations are sustainably managed. However, there are no provisions relating to the welfare of the animal or animals from which the trophies are derived.

Animal welfare legislation in countries which allow trophy hunting may not apply to wild animals at all, or if it does it may be restricted to animals that are bred, raised, or maintained in captivity. South Africa's Threatened Or Protected Species Regulations (TOPS), and associated norms and standards and provincial regulations, provide some minimal requirements for predator breeding operations with regard to space and provision of veterinary services, although the welfare of the animals is not specifically referenced. The UK's Department

for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs published a *Code of Practice for the Welfare of Gamebirds Reared for Sporting Purposes* which apply to England[2], highlighting relevant legal requirements under the Animal Welfare Act of 2006, although these are restricted to periods while the birds are being raised in captivity (Defra, 2009).

While some hunting organizations may operate codes of practice or provide guidance to members, laws regulating the method by which trophy animals are killed, or requiring the hunter to undertake training or demonstrate competence, are lacking.

5.3 Conservation and Management

The value of trophy hunting to the conservation and management of animal populations has been the subject of intense and often acrimonious debate. Studies and reports have increasingly questioned the economic, conservation, and societal values of trophy hunting activities, and its sustainability (Economists at Large, 2013; Grijalva, 2016). With money to be made, animal populations are often manipulated and quotas set to maximize profits, recommended age-based and area-based limitations are frequently ignored, and hunting levels often exceed quotas (Creel *et al*., 2016; IUCN, 2016b). The amount of money generated by trophy hunting is relatively small compared with non-consumptive wildlife tourism, and evidence suggests that in the majority of cases very little of the money generated by trophy hunting ever reaches local communities or is used to benefit wider wildlife conservation (Economists at Large, 2013).

Far from removing surplus or undesirable animals, trophy hunters often covet the largest trophies with the most impressive traits (Fig. 5.2). Also, because hunters value rarity, threatened species may be disproportionately targeted, potentially pushing them further towards extinction (Palazy *et al*., 2011). Examination of hunts advertised and awards conferred by major hunting organizations reveals a clear focus on the size and traits of trophies, with little evidence of any effort to encourage hunters to restrict themselves to identified problem animals. Parts of the trophy hunting industry have been associated with accusations of corruption (Leader-Williams *et al*., 2009), and with the trafficking of wildlife through so-called 'pseudo-hunting', where trophy hunting has been used as a front to facilitate the acquisition and export of valuable parts of protected animals for illegal commercial trade (Traffic, 2012). Such associations further damage the credibility of the trophy hunting industry.

5.4 Animal Welfare Implications

The impacts of human activities on the welfare of wild animals are notoriously difficult to objectively assess or reliably quantify. There have been a number of studies that have attempted to evaluate the direct welfare impacts of open-field shooting of mammal species, including deer (Bradshaw and Bateson, 2000) and badgers (Independent Expert Panel, 2014), and some indirect welfare impacts associated with the shooting of hares (Butterworth *et al*., 2017). However, academic studies of trophy hunting have predominantly focused on issues concerning sustainability, population and species conservation, and ethics; objective evaluations of the welfare impacts of trophy hunting are lacking.

The killing of Cecil the lion in Zimbabwe in July 2015 by a wealthy American trophy hunter generated intense public interest, which in turn has resulted in a greater focus on animal welfare implications. Cecil was a particularly impressive black-maned 13-year-old male lion who had sired numerous litters of cubs and at the time of his killing controlled two prides of females and cubs alongside another male. Researchers from the University of Oxford had collared the lion as part of an ongoing research project in Zimbabwe's Hwange National Park (WildCRU, 2017). Cecil was reportedly lured out of the park into an adjacent area where hunting was permitted, and initially shot with a bow and arrow. Reports also suggested that the first shot was not fatal, and that the wounded lion was subsequently tracked and only finally killed some hours later.

Associated media stories reached nearly 12,000 per day, and social media mentions peaked at nearly 90,000 (Macdonald *et al*., 2016). The reasons for the intense public and media reaction to this particular incident are the subject of speculation and analysis, particularly given that the killing of a lion by a trophy hunter is not in itself an unusual event. Researchers have suggested that animal welfare concerns may have played a significant role. The circumstances of Cecil's death, and the public and media response to it, certainly highlighted a number of animal welfare-related issues, which can by extension be considered in the context of wider trophy hunting activities.

Fig. 5.2. The economic, conservation, and societal values of trophy hunting activities, and its sustainability have been questioned in recent years. (Image copyright: Farek Dreamstim, used with permission.)

5.4.1 Point of death and method of killing

When considering the welfare implications of lethal animal interventions, the point of death of the target animal is often the primary consideration. In most circumstances in which the deliberate killing of animals takes place, convention demands that the methods used should minimize negative welfare impacts. For example, the *Terrestrial Animal Health Code*, published by the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE), recognizes the need to ensure the welfare of food animals during pre-slaughter and slaughter processes; it also recommends that, when killing animals for disease control purposes, methods used should result in immediate death or immediate loss of consciousness lasting until death, and that anxiety, pain, distress, or suffering in animals should be avoided (OIE, 2016).

While these principles were developed to guide the international community in relation to domestic livestock, they can equally be considered in, and applied to, other circumstances in which animals are deliberately killed. Most societies implement such principles by specifying permitted slaughter methodologies that usually include the need for pre-slaughter stunning to render animals insensible prior to killing, for operatives to undertake appropriate training, and for oversight inspections to ensure requirements are being adhered to. However, hunted animals enjoy no such protections.

Some hunting organizations acknowledge that trophy hunters have a responsibility to avoid inflicting undue suffering, and to aim to make quick and humane kills (Boone and Crockett Club, 2014). However, several trophy hunting organizations offer awards for methods of killing a trophy animal which might include the use of bows and arrows, handguns, or 'traditional' weapons such as muzzle loaders (Safari Club International, 2018), and clearly do not prioritize the welfare of the target animal. Cecil the lion was a case in point, having initially been targeted with a bow. Studies show that the use of bows may result in a 50% wounding rate (animal shot but not recovered) in targeted white-tailed deer, suggesting this method of killing is far from guaranteed to result in a clean kill (Ditchkoff *et al*., 1998).

Since at least part of the motivation of the paying trophy hunter is to procure a good quality 'trophy', there is clearly an incentive to avoid damaging specific parts of the animal that will subsequently be displayed. If, as is often the case, the head of the animal forms an integral part of the trophy, then use of a method that will damage the head may be disincentivized, resulting in areas of the body being targeted for reasons other than minimizing welfare harms. The circumstances in which trophy animals are targeted, the fact that many trophy hunters are not necessarily expert shots, and the promotion of methods of killing that are clearly not primarily

aimed at achieving an instantaneous death, mean that trophy-hunted animals do not enjoy the protection from harmful welfare impacts at the point of death that would be expected for other types of animals that are deliberately killed. This anomaly raises substantial animal welfare concerns.

5.4.2 The impact of the chase

The welfare of targeted animals may also be compromised by the extent to which the animal is stalked or chased before a kill is attempted or achieved. Target animals may be pursued for considerable periods of time (in some cases days) during hunts. Individuals may be separated from family groups or populations, which may result in considerable distress. In some cases, target animals may be deliberately lured into areas in which they may also experience distress because of the presence of potential predators or competitors.

Prey animals such as deer and antelope may run when chased to the point of exhaustion, and studies have demonstrated elevated levels of stress hormones (including endorphins and cortisol) in hunted deer compared with those that are 'cleanly shot' without a prolonged chase, suggesting they suffer significant stress (Bateson and Bradshaw, 1997). In the case of Cecil the lion, reports suggest he was lured out of the National Park in which he was protected, in order that he could be targeted in an area where hunting is permitted. The failure of the hunter to exact a 'clean kill' at the first time of asking also resulted in the injured lion being tracked for a number of hours before finally being killed.

Hunting proponents frequently speak of the concept of 'fair chase' where the hunter does not have an 'improper advantage' over the hunted animal, and the animal has a 'fair' chance of escaping the hunter (Boone and Crockett Club, 2017). However, the failure of a trophy hunter to exact a kill cannot be taken to imply that there has been no impact on the welfare of the hunted animal.

5.4.3 Non-target animals

Trophy hunting also has wider implications for the welfare of non-target animals. As noted above, separating a 'trophy animal' from a social group or population may cause considerable stress to the individual concerned. The removal of that animal can also have significant consequences for the remaining animals in the group.

Animal societies can be complex, with individuals having specific roles within, or knowledge valuable to, the group. Trophy hunters will usually seek animals with certain traits, and these are often the larger, older or more 'impressive' animals within a group or population. Depending on the species, mature male animals may be preferentially targeted, and hunting proponents often claim that the targeting of such animals limits the wider population impacts because they are past peak breeding age and no longer contribute to the genetic diversity of future populations. In some cases, for example black rhinos, hunting proponents claim that removing 'surplus' males helps stimulate wider population growth by reducing competition between animals confined to restricted areas (Leader-Williams *et al*., 2005).

However, research indicates that removing particular animals on the basis of specified individual traits may have a disproportionate impact on the remaining animals in the group. The targeting of 'tusker' bull elephants by trophy hunters has resulted in a serious decline in the number of such animals, with the consequent loss of vitally important accumulated social and ecological experience from which younger animals learn (Bale, 2015). There is also research suggesting that older bull elephants 'control' younger males, who become more volatile when the older bulls are removed, with the potential for increased aggressive interactions and associated injuries (Slotow *et al*., 2000). In the case of lions, the removal of older males who control prides may result in the influx of younger male animals and a consequent rise in infanticide, which may have serious welfare impacts for cubs and the adult females who care for them, and may severely disrupt social cohesion and population stability (Loveridge *et al*., 2016).

Where female animals of breeding age are targeted, any dependent young might suffer starvation or predation, with serious consequences for their welfare. This issue has been identified as a significant risk during hare shoots in England and Wales that take place in the early part of the breeding season for brown hares (Butterworth *et al*., 2017).

5.5 Breeding for the Gun and Wildlife Management

While the targeting of free-living wild animals by trophy hunters raises concerns relating to the welfare of target and non-target animals at the time of the hunt, the commercial nature of trophy hunting

has resulted in the emergence of wildlife management practices designed specifically to generate animals for the purposes of trophy hunting. Such practices have potential implications for the welfare of affected animals throughout their lives. The most extreme form of such management practices is the intensive breeding of animals for so-called 'canned hunting'.

South Africa's Biodiversity Management Plan for African Lion estimates that there were, at the time of its publication, as many as 6000 lions held in over 200 captive predator breeding facilities in the country (DEA, 2015). The makers of the film *Blood Lions*, which exposed the practice of 'canned hunting', suggested the number of predators in breeding facilities could be as high as 8000 with the majority being lions (Young and Chevallier, 2015).

The conditions in which these animals are bred and reared raise serious welfare concerns in addition to those associated with the point at which they are pursued and killed. These captive-bred animals are typically hand reared from a very young age, in order to expedite the return of their mothers to breeding condition. As they grow, they are exploited for commercial gain through a number of mechanisms, including by attracting paying 'volunteers' to help with their rearing on the usually mistaken understanding that they are destined for release into the wild as part of a conservation programme, and advertising various 'experiences' for tourists such as lion petting (Fig. 5.3) and walking with lions (Hunter *et al*., 2013). According to *Blood Lions*, between 800 and 1000 of these animals are subsequently released each year into enclosed areas to be shot by paying clients in so called 'canned hunts'.

South Africa's National Council of Societies for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals states that canned hunting, as well as being unethical, is directly linked to animal abuse that is unacceptable to society at large, and that in the context of professional and recreational hunting the humane treatment of animals cannot be ensured without including the breeding, transportation, and holding standards of wildlife in the related game industry (NSPCA, 2017). Some sport hunting organizations, including Safari Club International and the Dallas Safari Club, have issued statements denouncing 'canned hunting' (https://www.safariclub.org/detail/news/2018/02/02/sci-adopts-policy-on-captive-bred-lions; http://dsc-newscenter.org/2018/01/dsc-position-on-captive-bred-lion-hunting/), and disagreements over the issue resulted in a serious split among members of the

Fig. 5.3. Intensive lion breeding operations advertise various 'experiences' for tourists such as lion petting and walking with lions. (Image copyright: Beth Jennings, used with permission.)

Professional Hunters Association of South Africa (https://conservationaction.co.za/media-articles/uproar-among-professional-hunters-continue-embrace-canned-lion-hunting/).

The practice of breeding other types of animals specifically for hunting purposes also raises serious welfare concerns. According to the British Association for Shooting and Conservation, each year an estimated 35 million or more pheasants and red-legged partridge, most of which are captive reared, are released onto shooting estates in the UK for the purposes of sport hunting (BASC, 2015). During rearing, these birds do not benefit from the minimum European legal standards that exist for the protection of birds bred or kept for food production, because of an exemption for 'animals intended for use in competitions, shows, cultural or sporting events or activities'. The welfare of game birds during transport, following release, and during shoots when many may be injured but not retrieved, is also an issue of serious concern (Bicknell *et al.*, 2010), as are practices employed by shooting estates to prevent predation of game birds by natural predators, including mammals and birds of prey (League Against Cruel Sports, 2015).

5.6 Ethical Considerations

While many conservationists argue that trophy hunting is acceptable if it can be shown to benefit wildlife conservation, ethical and 'emotive' arguments should not be dismissed (Nelson *et al.*, 2016). Given the potentially high risk to animals' welfare and the lack of clarity over the claimed conservation benefits, arguments for or against trophy hunting involve complex ethical questions that are not solely utilitarian. It may not be as simple as positioning animal welfare against conservation: questions regarding the motivations for hunting seem to play a large part in ethical considerations and public concerns. Many of the ethical defences of subsistence hunting lack read-across in the context of trophy hunting, since the primary objective is not to kill the animal for food, but apparently for prestige and enjoyment of the act of killing. An increasing public distaste for killing animals may, for example, permit killing animals for necessity but not for pleasure or leisure. Even within the hunting industry, ethical considerations vary, with some considering the use of certain methods more ethical than others: for example, using a rifle to kill an American black bear might be considered by some as acceptable, whereas using a spear may not (Summers, 2016).

5.7 So Where Do We Go From Here?

Trophy hunting is a contentious practice, which generates strong and often emotive opinions. In policy terms, the discussion centres on the sustainability of the practice, and its claimed role in support of population (and by extension species) conservation. The animal welfare implications are rarely given significant consideration in the policy context. However, because of the scale of trophy hunting, its highly commercial nature, and the motivation of and methods used by paying hunters, the impacts of the activity on animal welfare are clearly highly significant and deserve far greater consideration. In most other policy contexts where animals are deliberately killed, the welfare of the animals affected both directly and indirectly by the activity would be given a high priority.

Albeit focused on the welfare of livestock, the so-called 'five freedoms' first formulated in the Brambell Report of 1965 and published by the then Farm Animal Welfare Council in the UK (FAWC, 1979), alongside subsequent refinements and developments (Mellor, 2016), continue to form the basis for many animal welfare assessments. Elements of these principles, coupled with modern approaches towards wild animal interventions such as the International Principles for Ethical Wildlife Control (Dubois *et al.*, 2017), can be helpful in developing a framework for evaluating the welfare implications of trophy hunting.

Public concerns and pressure relating to the sustainability of trophy hunting and its claimed conservation benefits continue to result in increased international regulation, restrictions on the imports of trophies by some countries, and increasing numbers of airlines and other transport companies that refuse to ship trophies internationally. The impacts of trophy hunting on the welfare of both target and non-target animals are coming into the spotlight, adding significantly to calls for further review of trophy hunting practices.

While there remain people willing to pay large amounts of money for the 'privilege' of killing a wild animal, it seems likely the practice of trophy hunting will continue to persist in one form or another. However, as our knowledge of animal sentience and the implications of human activities on individual animals and their societies expands, the animal welfare implications should be given far greater prominence in the ongoing debate on the rights and wrongs of trophy hunting.

Notes

[1] CITES trade statistics derived from the CITES Trade Database (no date), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Cambridge, UK. Search conducted in June 2017 for declared exports associated with Purpose Code 'H' (Hunting Trophy), for the period 2006–2015 inclusive.

[2] Administrations in Scotland and Wales have adopted similar codes of practice.

References

Aebischer, N.J., Davey, P.D. and Kingdon, N.G. (2011) National Gamebag Census: Mammal Trends to 2009. Game & Wildlife Conservation Trust, Fordingbridge. Available at: http://www.gwct.org.uk/ngcmammals (accessed 23 June 2017).

Bale, R. (2015) Why Killing a Bull Elephant With Big Tusks Hurts the Herd. Available at: http://news.nationalgeographic.com/2015/10/151017-zimbabwe-elephant-tusker-trophy-hunting-poaching-conservation-africa-ivory-trade/ (accessed 23 June 2017).

BASC (2015) British Association for Shooting and Conservation (BASC) Statement on Game Bird Release Numbers. Available at: https://basc.org.uk/blog/press-releases/latest-news/basc-statement-on-game-bird-release-numbers/ (accessed 23 June 2017).

Bateson, P. and Bradshaw, E.L. (1997) Physiological effects of hunting red deer (*Cervus elaphus*). *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 264(1389). DOI: 10.1098/rspb.1997.0237

Bicknell, J., Smart, J., Hoccom, D., Amar, A., Evans, A. *et al*. (2010) Impacts of non-native gamebird release in the UK: a review. *RSPB Research Report* Number 40. Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), Sandy, Bedfordshire, UK.

Boone and Crockett Club (2014) Boone and Crockett Club Position Statement: Long Range Shooting. Available at: https://www.boone-crockett.org/about/LRS.asp?area=about&ID=6B455080&se=1&te=1 (accessed 23 June 2017).

Boone and Crockett Club (2017) Fair Chase Statement. Available at: https://www.boone-crockett.org/huntingEthics/ethics_fairchase.asp?area=huntingEthics (accessed 23 June 2017).

Bradshaw, E. and Bateson, P. (2000) Welfare implications of culling red deer (*Cervus elaphus*). *Animal Welfare* 9, 3–24.

Brochet, A.-L., Van den Bossche, W., Jbour, S., Ndang'ang'a, P.K., Jones, V.R. *et al*. (2016) Preliminary assessment of the scope and scale of illegal killing and taking of birds in the Mediterranean. *Bird Conservation International* 26, 1–28. Available at: http://www.seo.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Illegal-killing-and-taking-of-birds-Mediterraneo.pdf (accessed 23 June 2017).

Butterworth, A., Turner, K.M.E. and Jennings, N. (2017) Minimising orphaning in the brown hare (*Lepus europaeus*) in England and Wales: should a close season be introduced? *Wildlife Biology* wlb.00279. DOI: 10.2981/wlb.00279

CITES (2017) Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) Resolution Conference 17.9: Trade in hunting trophies of species listed in Appendix I or II. Available at: https://cites.org/sites/default/files/document/E-Res-17-09.pdf (accessed 23 June 2017).

CITES Trade Database (no date) Available at: https://trade.cites.org/ (accessed 21 June 2017).

Creel, S., M'soka, J., Dröge, E., Rosenblatt, E., Becker, M.S. *et al*. (2016) Assessing the sustainability of African lion trophy hunting, with recommendations for policy. *Ecological Applications* 26(7). DOI: 10.1002/eap.1377

Damm, G.R. (2008) Recreational trophy hunting: 'What do we know and what should we do?'. In: Baldus, R.D., Damm, G.R. and Wollscheid, K. (eds) *Best Practices in Sustainable Hunting – A Guide to Best Practices from Around the World*. The International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation, Budakeszi, Hungary, pp. 5–11.

Darimont, C.T., Codding, B.F. and Hawkes, K. (2017) Why men trophy hunt. *Biology Letters* 13, 20160909. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2016.0909 (accessed 23 June 2017).

DEA (2015) National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act, 2004 (act no. 10 of 2004) Biodiversity Management Plan for African Lion (*Panthera leo*). Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), South Africa. Available at: https://www.environment.gov.za/sites/default/files/gazetted_notices/nemba_africanlion_managementplan_gn351g38706.pdf (accessed 23 June 2017).

Defra (2009) *Code of Practice for the Welfare of Gamebirds Reared for Sporting Purposes*. Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra), UK. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69379/pb13356-game-birds-100720.pdf (accessed 23 June 2017).

Ditchkoff, S.S., Welch, E.R. Jr, Lochmiller, R.L., Masters, R.E., Starry, W.R. and Dinkines, W.C. (1998) Wounding rates of white-tailed deer with traditional archery equipment. *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Southeast Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies* 52, 244–248.

Dubois, S., Fenwick, N., Ryan, E.A., Baker, L., Baker, S.E. *et al*. (2017) International consensus principles for ethical wildlife control. *Conservation Biology* 31(4), 753–760. DOI: 10.1111/cobi.12896

Economist (2015) Carriers Lighten their Load With a Hunting Trophy Ban. Available at: http://www.economist.com/blogs/gulliver/2015/08/airlines-and-public-opinion (accessed 23 June 2017).

Economists at Large (2013) The $200 million question: how much does trophy hunting really contribute to African communities? A report for the African Lion Coalition, prepared by Economists at Large, Melbourne, Australia. Available at: http://www.ecolarge.com/work/the-200-million-question-how-much-does-trophy-hunting-really-contribute-to-african-communities/ (accessed 23 June 2017).

FAWC (1979) Farm Animal Welfare Council (FAWC) Press Statement. Available at: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20121007104210/http:/www.fawc.org.uk/pdf/fivefreedoms1979.pdf (accessed 23 June 2017).

Grijalva, R.M. (2016) Missing the mark: African trophy hunting fails to show consistent conservation benefits. A Report by the Democratic Staff of the House Committee on Natural Resources. Available at: http://democrats-naturalresources.house.gov/imo/media/doc/Missing%20the%20Mark.pdf (accessed 23 June 2017).

HSUS and HSI (2016) Trophy Hunting by the Numbers – the United States' Role in Global Trophy Hunting. The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) and Humane Society International (HSI). Available at: http://www.hsi.org/assets/pdfs/report_trophy_hunting_by_the.pdf (accessed 23 June 2017).

Hunter, L.T.B., White, P., Henschel, P., Frank, L., Burton, C., Loveridge, A. *et al*. (2013) Walking with lions: why there is no role for captive-origin lions (*Panthera leo*) in species restoration. *Oryx* 47, 19–24.

Independent Expert Panel (2014) Pilot Badger Culls in Somerset and Gloucestershire: Report by the Independent Expert Panel. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/300382/independent-expert-panel-report.pdf (accessed 23 June 2017).

IUCN (2016a) World Conservation Congress (WCC) Resolution 013. Terminating the Hunting of Captive-bred Lions (*Panthera leo*) and Other Predators and Captive Breeding for Commercial, Non-conservation Purposes. International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). Available at: https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/resrecfiles/WCC_2016_RES_013_EN.pdf (accessed 23 June 2017).

IUCN (2016b) Informing Decisions on Trophy Hunting. A Briefing Paper for European Union Decision-makers Regarding Potential Plans for Restriction of Imports of Hunting Trophies. International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). Available at: http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/iucn_informingdecisionsontrophyhuntingv1.pdf (accessed 23 June 2017).

IUCN SSC (2012) *Guiding Principles on Trophy Hunting as a Tool for Creating Conservation Incentives*, Version 1.0. International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Species Survival Commission (SSC), Gland, Switzerland. Available at: https://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/iucn_ssc_guiding_principles_on_trophy_hunting_ver1_09aug2012.pdf (accessed 23 June 2017).

Leader-Williams, N., Milledge, S., Adcock, K., Brooks, M., Conway, A. *et al*. (2005) Trophy hunting of black rhino *Diceros bicornis*: proposals to ensure its future sustainability. *Journal of International Wildlife Law and Policy* 8, 1–11. Available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13880290590913705 (accessed 23 June 2017).

Leader-Williams, N., Baldus, R.D. and Smith, R.J. (2009) The influence of corruption on the conduct of recreational hunting. In: Dickson, B., Hutton, J. and Adams, W.M. (eds) *Recreational Hunting, Conservation and Rural Livelihoods: Science and Practice*. Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford. DOI: 10.1002/9781444303179.ch18

League Against Cruel Sports (2015) Pheasant and Partridge Shooting. Available at: www.league.org.uk/cruelgame (accessed 23 June 2017).

Loveridge, A.J., Valeix, M., Chapron, G., Davidson, Z., Mtare, G. and Macdonald, D.W. (2016) Conservation of large predator populations: demographic and spatial responses of African lions to the intensity of trophy hunting. *Biological Conservation* 204(B), 247–254. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.10.024 (accessed 23 June 2017).

Macdonald, D.W., Jacobsen, K.S., Burnham, D., Johnson, P.J. and Loveridge, A.J. (2016) Cecil: a moment or a movement? Analysis of media coverage of the death of a lion, *Panthera leo*. *Animals* 6, 26.

Mellor, D.J. (2016) Updating animal welfare thinking: moving beyond the 'Five Freedoms' towards 'A Life Worth Living'. *Animals* 6, 21.

Moore, R. (2015) Available at: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/africaandindianocean/zimbabwe/11771713/Cecil-the-lion-Sir-Roger-Moore-says-hunting-is-a-cowards-pastime.html (accessed 19 February 2018).

Nelson, M.P., Bruskotter, J.T., Vucetich, J.A. and Chapron, G. (2016) Emotions and the ethics of consequence in conservation decisions: lessons from Cecil the lion. *Conservation Letters* 9, 302–306. Available at: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/conl.12232/full (accessed 23 June 2017).

NSPCA (2017) Canned Hunting. National Council of Societies for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (NSPCA), South Africa. Available at: www.nspca.co.za/canned-hunting/ (accessed 23 June 2017).

OIE (2016) *Terrestrial Animal Health Code*. World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE). Available at: http://www.oie.int/standard-setting/terrestrial-code/access-online/ (accessed 23 June 2017).

Palazy, L., Bonenfant, C., Gaillard, J.-M. and Courchamp, F. (2011) Cat dilemma: too protected to escape trophy hunting? *PLOS One* 6(7), e22424. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0022424

Safari Club International (2016) World Hunting Awards. Available at: https://www.safariclub.org/what-we-do/record-book/world-hunting-awards (accessed 23 June 2018).

Safari Club International (2018) World Hunting Award Field Journal. Available at: https://www.safariclub.org/docs/default-source/default-document-library/wha-breakdowns-field-journal-2018.pdf?sfvrsn=0 (accessed 23 June 2018).

Simon, A. (2017) The competitive consumption and fetishism of wildlife trophies. *Journal of Consumer Culture* February, 1–18. DOI: 10.1177/1469540517690571

Slotow, R., van Dyk, G., Poole, J., Page, B. and Klocke, A. (2000) Older bull elephants control young males. *Nature* 408, 425–426.

Stoate, C. and Tapper, S.C. (1993) The impact of three hunting methods on brown hare (*Lepus europaeus*) populations in Britain. *Gibier Faune Sauvage* 10, 229–240.

Summers, C. (2016) Wife of hunter who killed bear with a 7ft homemade spear is fired by her Under Armour sponsors over horrifying video. *Daily Mail* 19 August 2016. Available at: http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3748486/Wife-hunter-killed-bear-7ft-homemade-spear-fired-Armour-sponsors-horrifying-video.html#ixzz4jJPLhbg0 (accessed 23 June 2017).

Traffic (2012) The South Africa–Viet Nam Rhino Horn Trade Nexus: A deadly combination of institutional lapses, corrupt wildlife industry professionals and Asian crime syndicates. Available at: http://www.traffic.org/species-reports/traffic_species_mammals66.pdf (accessed 23 June 2017).

Ward, R. (1892) *Horn Measurements and Weights of the Great Game of the World: Being a Record for the Use of Sportsmen and Naturalists*. Biodiversity Heritage Library, London. DOI: 10.5962/bhl.title.15203

WildCRU (2017) Cecil and the conservation of lions. Wildlife Conservation Research Unit (WildCRU), Department of Zoology, University of Oxford. Available at: https://www.wildcru.org/cecil-home/ (accessed 23 June 2017).

Young, B. and Chevallier, N. (directors) (2015) *Blood Lions*. Film directed by Bruce Young and Nick Chevallier. Available at: http://www.bloodlions.org/ (accessed 23 June 2017).