

AFRICAN INDABA

Volume 8, Issue No 2

eNewsletter

March 2009

Dedicated to the People and Wildlife of Africa

CITES Doha March 2010: And the winner is.....?

Rolf D. Baldus

The fifteenth Conference (CoP) of the Parties to the Convention in International Trade in Endangered Species of Fauna and Flora (CITES) came to a close on March 25th. If the delegates of the Doha CoP would have awarded an "Oscar" the Hollywood-like slogan might have sounded: "AND THE WINNER IS: THE NGO-ANTI USE COALITION!"

Trade-, conservation- and ecological footprints

Delegations from 144 of the 175 member states and 140 NGOs have been participating in the 15th CoP in Doha. It might be interesting to note in this context that the average Qatari is by far the biggest greenhouse gas producer worldwide; the well-organized global conservation meeting and the huge number of delegates in their air-conditioned luxury left behind not only a wildlife trade and conservation footprint, but also a huge ecological footprint.

68 agenda items and 42 proposals to list species were debated; among the proposals 14 came from Madagascar alone. The most prominent and controversial discussions centered on blue fin tuna, sharks, polar bears, corals and elephants. For these "flagship species" neither uplisting nor downlisting was approved.

CoP 15 has demonstrated again that it is extremely difficult to win the necessary two third majorities of votes. CITES operates with the "one country-one vote principle", which means that China has the same voting weight as Vanuatu. States with large, well managed populations of e. g. polar bear or elephant have no more say than those who ran their wildlife into the ground for a variety of reasons. Uplisting is normally easier than downlisting, because the public and even delegations follow the chimera that uplisting is always good for nature and that downlisting is a defeat for conservation. Years of propaganda by the anti-use NGOs and most media provide for good harvesting time during the CITES conferences. It is, very unfortunately for the species concerned, totally irrelevant in this context whether a certain species in a certain area has long since ceased to match the listing criteria and actually passed to a more secure status due to successful conservation measures.

For Africa (and the world for that matter), as always, the

elephant was in the centre of debates and decisions. Tanzania and Zambia had tabled downlisting and a one-off ivory sale. The counterproposal of Kenya and the Kenyan and the anti-use lobby sponsored Elephant Coalition was a moratorium of 20 years without any downlisting.

Ivory is better protected than elephants

Tanzania and Zambia could prove that their elephant populations do not fulfill the Annex I-criteria any more. Their respective statements were supported by the CITES panel of experts report. Consequently the debate centered on two other issues: (1) the effectiveness of elephant management in these countries and whether enforcement controls are in place and (2) the frenzied worry by some that a sale or even a mere downlisting would trigger a surge in poaching in all range states of the African elephant. According to the TRAFFIC-experts such a correlation is not supported by the statistics since the ivory trade ban in 1989.

While Zambia achieved at least a simple majority for its modified proposal, Tanzania's proposal was defeated by equal votes for and against. Tanzania simply had not done its home-

Continued on Page 2

African Indaba Volume 8, Number 2 March/April 2010	
CONTENTS	Page
CITES Doha March 2010: And the Winner is ...?	1
Giant Sable Update	3
Two Views of the Serengeti – One True, One Myth	5
Rebuilding the Wildlife Sector in a New Zimbabwe	8
SafariTalk	9
SafariTalk Interviews John F. Walker on Ivory	9
Kenya's Wildlife Debacle: The True Cost of Banning Hunting	13
The Status of Wildlife in Protected Areas Compared to Non-Protected Areas of Kenya	15
IN MEMORIAM: Professor Heribert Kalchreuter	15
Managing the Conflicts Between People and Lion	16
Breakthrough: CIC Coordinates Global Platform on Hunting Ammunition	16
African Wildlife Heritage Gala Dinner Auction List	17
OBITUARY: Brian Nicholson	18

For hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources.

The distribution of African Indaba is supported by the International Council for Wildlife Conservation CIC and Conservation Force

Continued from Page 1

CITES Doha March 2010: And the Winner is ...?

work. Poaching in the Selous Game Reserve, the country's principal elephant area, has increased again, mainly as result of a 75% drop in finance and a resulting breakdown of management. After a very successful German-aided support programme came to an end in 2005, the authorities withdrew the so-called "retention scheme", by which the Selous was allowed to retain half of its income. This income was mainly derived from safari hunting, but photographic tourism has recently greatly caught up. The Tanzanian authorities then transferred experienced staff and even failed to pay the game scouts regularly. Selous' finance was reduced from nearly 3 million US\$ to around 0.8, law enforcement efforts dropped, poaching of elephants increased. As a consequence lodge owners are complaining that elephants are now being killed within earshot of international tourists. Tanzania's elephant population had increased in recent years and is in the upper elephant carrying capacity set in the country's "Elephant Management Plan". Downlisting with a zero trade quota would have been a fair solution, since it would at least have facilitated or allowed the country to export hunting trophies to the USA. However, the homemade problems gave rise to enough concern that even some sustainable use supporters did not to back Tanzania's proposal. The outcome is probably to the detriment of the elephants in Tanzania. A positive vote with binding obligations for Tanzania to improve elephant conservation again, as the CIC had proposed, would have been a better option for elephants and rural livelihoods in the country.

The anti-use lobby ...

To me the most baffling aspect of the elephant debate was the power and the human and financial resources of the animal welfare lobbyists, cleverly used again to influence the delegates in their deliberations. The so called "African Elephant Coalition" has been organized and backed by the "Species Survival Network", a conglomerate of NGOs, most of them with more or less radical views on animal rights and welfare. Their immense financial power, fuelled by donations of well-meaning animal lovers, was put to good use in funding numerous invitations to African CITES authorities and conference delegates for the meetings of this coalition. The coalition provided office space in the Doha Sheraton for daily coalition meetings, for interpretation services and other goodies.

23 members make up the coalition, a large portion of the member countries have only few elephants left. The Status Report on the African Elephant of 2007 provides ample statistical background material on the ever-decreasing elephant numbers in the coalition countries. Only Kenya still has around 30 000 elephants, but even this number is less than one third of the Tanzanian population alone. Significantly the coalition members Mali, Niger, Cameroon, Congo, Ghana und Sierra Leone have been explicitly named in the ETIS report (ETIS: Elephant Trade Information System) to CITES as being totally inefficient in the enforcement of their wildlife laws on ivory and elephants: there are no seizures of elephant ivory inside the respective countries, but plenty abroad. These countries are exemplary non-

performers in elephant conservation! TRAFFIC suspects that in Mali, the appointed speaker of the coalition, ivory seizures nevertheless took place, but were deliberately not reported to TRAFFIC. Why? It seems that the seized tusks are sold illegally by the law enforcement agencies. Experienced elephant experts consider the vociferous engagement of Mali and some other countries in the elephant coalition therefore as being a mere cover up for their own shady activities. Strange bedfellows for alleged animal lovers! This may be construed as just another confirmation that not everybody in the elephant coalition does particularly have the conservation of elephants at heart, but draws on the elephant debate to further the common ideological objective of a total ban on the sustainable use of wildlife. Some may have some more sinister reasons! Alas, combined with the clever marketing strategies and the almost unlimited media resources of the non-governmental anti-use groups, this strange alliance serves the purpose to generate millions of US\$ and Euros in donations, the lifeblood of the animal rightist movement. Where does all this money go to?

The SADC-countries, ill prepared as they arrive in Doha, were completely outdone by the coalition propaganda and eloquence. In the past the SADC members presented a solid common position on sustainable use; at CoP 15 their stance and performance were at best mediocre. South Africa, usually a leading figure appeared strangely uninterested, Zimbabwe has lost its credibility, Tanzania and Zambia presented their positions emphatically, but clumsy. They were no counterweight to the combined force of the elephant coalition.

... is the winner

The African elephant coalition states and the NGOs supporting them can be rightly proud of preventing the two elephant proposals to go through; at least in as much as the successful outcomes of their orchestrated campaigns are concerned. These groups obviously do not consider that these very outcomes might harm the elephants in Zambia and Tanzania and blame the miserable failure of their own anti-poaching and law enforcement "efforts" on strictly controlled ivory sales like those done by the southern African countries last year. That the success of community conservation areas is threatened by the removal of tangible and intangible incentives for the local people, that there is now less money for incentive driven conservation does not concern the coalition states and their global animal rights allies in the least. There is ample media proof of their gloating in their perceived victory – elephants and people are their least concern, it seems!

Unity is strength

The leading international hunting organizations were also represented in Doha: CIC, FACE and Conservation Force threw their old battle horses into the fray, and SCI attended even with a delegation of ten people. They had done good preparatory work at home and at Brussels in the months leading up to the CoP. CIC had produced an excellent brochure "CITES – Facts and Science" which went to all delegates. The new definition of

Continued on Page 3

For hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources.

The distribution of African Indaba is supported by the International Council for Wildlife Conservation CIC and Conservation Force

Continued from Page 1
 CITES Doha March 2010: And the Winner is ...?

"hunting trophies", which now includes crafted items from parts of the animal hunted legally, sailed through, quite to the dislike of some parties and certain NGOs. Credit for this victory is mainly due to SCI and FACE. The uplisting of the polar bear was prevented. Trade and hunting pose no danger to these bears, irrespective of climate change; quite the opposite is true. As is so often the case, sustainable polar bear hunting supports the livelihood of the Inuit, maintains their cultural heritage and reinforces their commitment to conserve the wildlife.

Pro-use networking was not in vain, but had at best limited success. The hunting organizations must consider more promising strategies and stronger strategic cooperation in the years between the CoPs. Personal animosities and institutional competition has to be laid aside! What counts is a worldwide political advocacy for sustainable hunting.

Dr. Rolf D. Baldus is the President of the Tropical Game Commission of the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC)

Brian Nicholson 1930-2010



Obituary on page 18

Giant Sable Update

Pedro vaz Pinto

2009 ended on a positive note. It had been a year of great achievements, and the introduced bull in Cangandala seems to have adjusted extremely well to the new environment and, above all, to semi-captivity in the company of our 9 pure females! The removal of the nine dominant pure females caused initially some understandable disturbance on the behavior of the remaining herd (hybrids) as they dispersed, before ended up reuniting to form what is arguably one of the most bizarre group of mammals ever recorded! Without pure individuals, we have now a herd of at least seven first generation (F1) sterile hybrids including one dominant bull, three adult cows and several young of different ages. One would be tempted to see a nice healthy herd of... an undescribed new species of *Hippotragus*!!! Photos 18 to 25. However as a "breed" they constitute a dead end, doomed to grow old and disappear, one by one, without reproduction.



"The Bull Staring"

A totally unexpected but welcomed surprise, was recording one of the three young pure males that had dispersed and last photographed on Christmas Eve 2007, then at age 2.5. He had now turned into a nice 4.5 year adult bull and had lost the company of his half brothers... he is now solitary and possibly on the look out to establish his own territory. Somehow, it might not be a coincidence that he showed up only after we removed the pure females, as interestingly, the photographic record at the existing Salinas do suggested some changes on the pre-existing territories, herd movements and structure. Not only the now full hybrid group readjusted, but the roan herds seem to have done some changes, including one group that has now moved into the main core area. Of course this is very speculative, but these changes may have triggered a response on our not yet well established solitary bull.

For hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources.

The distribution of African Indaba is supported by the International Council for Wildlife Conservation CIC and Conservation Force

Continued from Page 3
Giant Sable Update



Cangandala From Above

It was a great joy to record in the park this now mature bull, following years of frustrations without any. It will be fantastic to keep him in the park, and have him establishing a territory. However, the role we expect from him, in terms of assisting the recovery of the Cangandala sable populations is very modest, or even null. The giant sable in Cangandala constitute an extreme population, that was reduced to less than a dozen breeding animals for quite a while and must therefore be severely inbred. Also because of this it was important to bring a giant sable bull from Luando, to restore the breeding vigor. This Cangandala male was fostered by one of the existing cows and by a related bull (we believe his father was a young male, also fostered by one of the old cows, themselves likely strongly related). So the inbreeding rate must be huge among these animals, and it would be foolish to allow this young bull now to have contact with the herd, as the reproductive success rate would almost surely suffer. Unless we come across an opportunity to bring some females from Luando (hardly justifiable at this point), this male will be destined to become a territorial bull without competition, or females. It will be interesting though, to see if he challenges the hybrid bulls for the company of the hybrid cows.

Aside the sable male, roan and hybrid herds, the trap camera record in Cangandala also provided us with plenty of other stuff including some featuring our Judas female hybrid, and the usual customers, duiker, bushbuck) and warthog.

The generous seasonal rains have made significantly more difficult to access Cangandala, but this has also allowed the vegetation to recover, and the park is now dominated by different shades of green. As the woodland presents itself lush and moist, there is plenty of food for our herd inside the 400ha sanctuary. The animals seem to graze happily, and not being forced to move much every day inside the fenced area. The nine females keep together as a group and always diligently led by the bull. Whenever we approach he will watch and stare at us (Photo 01), while the females stay relaxed. So far so good. It is a very good sign, that up until early March, no female has shown signs of advanced pregnancy or calving. If that was the case, it would have meant that they would produce a hybrid calf, as there wasn't enough time to blame it on the new bull! All we

have to do now is wait a bit longer, as before June we don't expect any calves. The herd's movements is also being remotely monitored, as our female n12 is equipped with a GPS/GSM collar, recording twice a day its coordinates which are sent by SMS through Unitel network (See Map attached).



Luando River

The present abundance of food could however lead us to a false sense of security. The ecosystem will change sharply after May, as the dry season steps in, as water will disappear, the grass will turn thick, dry and unpalatable, and the burnings will temporarily remove further vegetation, not to mention the trees starting to lose the leaves and canopy cover. It is a real concern that the 400 hectares enclosure can in fact be too small for the group in the dry season, which may then be subjected to sudden changes in food and water availability and by fire, in such a way that will affect the breeding success, or even the animals' survival - it is crucial to provide more space to the animals. Therefore we are planning to expand the current enclosure as soon as possible, but it will only be finished by the end of the dry season (a sponsorship by Statoil and Block 15). In the meantime, a few complementary measures need to be implemented. One of the measures is burning small patches of grass as soon they become combustible. These strategically located early burnings allow for the fresh regrowth to appear and develop at different stages inside the enclosure. Simultaneously they serve as safe zones and fire breaks, in case of uncontrolled and undesired burnings that could burn the whole area in one sweep and even corner the animals against the fence. A couple of unusually dry weeks in February, allowed us to burn a couple of hectares near the fence main gate.

In March we made an aerial survey with an *Alloutte*, on a joint operation with the FANA – the Military Air Force and who, as always, proved to be a reliable, competent and enthusiastic partner. An MI-8 previously took a few drums of jet fuel to a village in the reserve, where we then refueled the *Alloutte* in the following days. Although this time of the year is hardly the best to spot animals from the air, considering the long grass and thick canopies, it was important to try to locate some of the collared animals.

In Cangandala we located the collared female pacassa

Continued on Page 5

For hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources.

The distribution of African Indaba is supported by the International Council for Wildlife Conservation CIC and Conservation Force

Continued from Page 4
Giant Sable Update

(forest buffalo) in a thicket near a river, and she had moved out of the park, and more than 30km away from where it had been captured in August. Then we located and flew over the hybrid herd, confirming that the two collared hybrid cows stick together. In Luando we located the female and one bull collared, but we were unable to see them because of thick forest. They were relatively close to where they had been initially darted.

A huge surprise however, was finding an eland! It was an old cow, apparently alone, but this was totally unexpected. Eland were never common in the reserve, and were by now presumed extinct! It shows how resilient nature can be at times, but I doubt there are enough to constitute a viable population... we'll see. The people in the village benefited from the fuel spoils, and we were received by the elder (sobas – local chiefs), to whom we expressed our concerns about continuing poaching records. They in turn, mentioned that a lion had moved close to the village and could be heard every other night.



Chopper Refueling

The trap camera record in Luando was modest in number and quality of photos, but included some really exciting ones. We got a glimpse of one of the marked territorial bulls, in which it is just possible to see an ear tag. But the biggest surprise here, was recording an old female with a newborn calf (Photos 51, 52) on November 7th! Under normal circumstances, calving on sable should be pretty much finished by September, although very late calving is not unheard of. In any case, and even being a poor quality photo (Photos), it is our first photographed pure giant sable calf!

All photos by Pedro van Pinto

Editor's Note:

In African Indaba Vol. 7 No. 4 we published an article by Peter Flack on Giant Sable; we now received an account from Jeremy Anderson and co-authors Richard Estes, Joe Holmes, Peter Morkel, John Frederick Walker and Pierre van Heerden; the five-page article can be downloaded at <http://www.africanindaba.co.za/news.htm>

Two Views of the Serengeti – One True, One Myth

Charles E. Kay

Department of Political Science, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84322, USA E-mail: charles.kay@usu.edu

Editor's Note: Charles Kay reviews and comments two books on the Serengeti and comes to interesting and provocative conclusions. Kay's in-depth analysis is a must-read for all those who want to participate in the African conservation debate. This article was first published in *Conservation and Society*, Volume 7, Number 2, pages 145-148 and is republished in African Indaba with the kind permission of the author. The pdf files of two scientific papers of Charles Kay (see notes 11 and 12 in this section) to which the author makes extensive reference are obtainable from African Indaba. Please contact Gerhard@muskwa.co.za in case you are interested.

Serengeti III: Human Impacts on Ecosystem Dynamics. A. R. E. Sinclair, Craig Packer, Simon A. R. Mduma, and John M. Fryxell, (editors). University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, USA. 2008. x+ 522pp. ISBN-13: 978-0-226-76033-9 (hardcover); 13:978-0-226-76034-6 (paperback).

Imagining Serengeti: A History of Landscape Memory in Tanzania from Earliest Times to the Present. Jan Bender Shetler. Ohio University Press, Athens, Ohio, USA. 2007. xiii+378pp. ISBN-13: 978-0-8214-1749-2 (hardcover); 13: 978-0-8214-1750-8 (paperback).

Serengeti: III is the third book that has come to print on the ecological studies conducted in the Serengeti ecosystem. The first book appeared in 1979, while the second was published in 1995¹. The first two books of the series dealt primarily with wildlife issues and if indigenous people were mentioned at all, it was in the pejorative as "poachers." Since this new volume is subtitled *Human Impacts on Ecosystem Dynamics*, I was expecting a more balanced presentation of human-wildlife conflicts, but that turned out not to be the case.

Serengeti: III contains 16 chapters by 57 authors, forty-one of which are from Western Europe or North America, primarily the United States. Of the 16 authors that list a Tanzania or Kenya address, a large number are either from the West or were trained in the West. Of the 16 senior authors, 15 are from the USA, Canada, or Western Europe, while the one with a Kenya address was born in the United States and educated in Britain. In addition, the authors fail to acknowledge, or even mention, many of the major works that historians, social scientists, and others have published on wildlife-human issues in Africa. The research by Brockington², Chatty and Colchester³, Duffy⁴, Gibson⁵, Igoe⁶, Leach and Mearns⁷, Neumann⁸, and Steinhart,⁹ among others, is not cited, let alone discussed by any of the authors. The same is true of Garland's¹⁰ excellent dissertation on wildlife management in Tanzania, as well as Shetler's histori-

Continued on Page 6

For hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources.

The distribution of African Indaba is supported by the International Council for Wildlife Conservation CIC and Conservation Force

Continued from Page 5

Two Views of the Serengeti – One True, One Myth

cal research in Tanzania. Two of Neumann's papers are cited on pages 376 and 493, but only in contexts that ignore his primary thesis. Needless to say, this biases the analyses and conclusions presented in *Serengeti III*.

The message of *Serengeti III* can be summarized in a few sentences. According to the authors, "*The Serengeti is one of the premier natural ecosystems in the world*" (p. 301), and "*The Serengeti is a large, mostly pristine ecosystem...[and] as such is one of the most positive examples of conservation in the world, and is a treasure for the entire planet*" (p. 434). That is to say, the book's fundamental premise is that the Serengeti is a wilderness without a human history of any importance. But according to the authors, this idyllic state of nature is threatened by indigenous peoples surrounding the park, who as the authors admit are some of the poorest people on Earth and who receive few benefits from western preservation. "*The main conclusion is that unless human population increase in areas surrounding protected areas is stopped, or even reversed, the future of conservation in both the community areas and the protected areas will be seriously compromised*" (p. 484). Judging by the general tone of *Serengeti III*, one wonders what ultimate solution the authors have in mind? Or if this is simply a call to expropriate additional indigenous lands to create even larger buffer zones around the park¹⁶? Having identified what they see as the problem, the authors offer no solution. It is a clear, though, from Norton-Griffiths' research (Chapter 13) that the reason the Maasai are opting for private ownership of land in the adjacent Mara region of Kenya is because private property is more difficult for the government to confiscate in the name of preserving wildlife for foreign tourists and other elites, than is communal property.

This view by western ecologists is in stark contrast to that presented by historian Jan Shetler in *Imagining Serengeti*, which is based on her ethnographic and oral history research with indigenous peoples presently living to the west of Serengeti National Park. According to historical documents, western Serengeti peoples, as well as the Maasai, were forcefully removed from the national park and surrounding conservation areas to create an imagined wilderness untouched by the hand of man¹⁶. This is a pattern that has been repeated throughout Africa and around the world¹⁶. In virtually every national park and wildlife reserve in eastern and southern Africa, indigenous people were forcefully removed, without compensation, to create elite pleasuring grounds². The reason western Serengeti peoples, in addition to virtually every other indigenous people in Africa are "poachers" is because colonial governments planted the flag and claimed all of Africa for king and country, thus depriving indigenous peoples of their land and wildlife birthrights⁸. Those who objected were subjugated by European force of arms.

Although indigenous disdain for colonial land and wildlife laws, in part, drove the African independence movement, black central governments have done little to correct this colonial injustice⁵. Instead, westernized black elites have continued to deprive indigenous people of their land and wildlife --- officially in the name of economic development, nation building, or preservation and unofficially in rent-seeking behavior; i.e. graft and corruption²⁹. It should come as no surprise that the black elites, who

control the present governments, are of different ethnic affiliations than the indigenous peoples displaced in the name of preservation¹⁶. For instance, Dr. Shetler tried to obtain permission from government officials to go into Serengeti National Park to document former human habitation sites but her request was denied (p.3).

According to Dr. Shetler, "*Although the park claims that western Serengeti peoples are recent immigrants, their ancestors have been part of this...landscape for a very long time and have helped create the 'natural' [ecosystem]...that tourists enjoy today... Serengeti is a profoundly humanized landscape*" (p.31). "*Ecological evidence demonstrates that humans have had a profound effect in both creating and maintaining the unique Serengeti ecosystem largely through the deliberate and controlled use of fire*" (p.33). For an example of how aboriginal-set fires created ecosystems heretofore thought to have been spawned by nature see Kay¹¹. "*None of this evidence necessarily means that western Serengeti peoples were natural conservationists who never had an adverse effect on the environment. Their purpose was to use the land's resources for their own benefit rather than for the sake of the land itself*" (p. 39).

Far from being a "natural" ecosystem, Serengeti is entirely an artifact of colonial processes. It began when the British government in Kenya forced the Maasai from their ancestral lands¹⁶. Some Maasai then moved south into Tanzania and forced the area's indigenous pastoral peoples west, who in turn put pressure on indigenous peoples in the western Serengeti. This ethnic conflict created a no-man's land or buffer zone in the Serengeti and led to an abnormal increase in wildlife --- for a discussion of aboriginal buffer zones between warring groups in North America see Kay¹², while Ford¹³ provides numerous examples of buffer zones in East Africa³⁰. At the same time European-introduced livestock diseases decimated local cattle herds, which led to the starvation of untold numbers of indigenous peoples, along with renewed violence between ethnic groups¹⁶. "*It was in this context of disaster, migration, and radical social transformation [all induced by colonial processes] that the Europeans observed a largely 'uninhabited,' but only recently abandoned, Serengeti at the beginning of the twentieth century*" (p. 165). "*...an empty wilderness...[had been] created where peoples had once lived*" (p.136).

Imagining Serengeti then explains how white colonial game departments and elite sport hunters, "*evoking a racist orientation...*" (p.108), went on to maintain the "wilderness" image prior to the establishment of the national park⁹. More importantly, "*these new landscapes of 'planned wilderness' created by Britain's hunting elite in fact became the image [of Africa] itself in European paintings and literature*" (p.181), an image that dominates western ecological thinking to this day¹⁶.

So we have two views of the Serengeti. One true, one not, but which is which? Based on archaeological and genetic data, there can be no denying that hominids evolved in Africa, as did our species, *Homo sapiens*, approximately 100,000 years before present. Thus, what is more unnatural than an African ecosystem without hominid hunters and fire-starters? Unless, of course, one does not believe in evolution. That being said, a case could be made that *Serengeti III* is akin to theology since

Continued on Page 7

For hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources.

The distribution of African Indaba is supported by the International Council for Wildlife Conservation CIC and Conservation Force

Continued from Page 6

Two Views of the Serengeti – One True, One Myth

its fundamental premises are based on something other than fact. *Imagining Serengeti*, on the other hand, chronicles yet again the "Myth of Wild Africa"¹⁴, a lesson western ecological science has still to comprehend¹⁶. Personally, I was trained as a wildlife ecologist – range scientist but, unlike others, I have learned that much of what passes for mainstream environmental "science" is actually myth^{15,17,22}.

According to *Serengeti III*, historically there were few indigenous people in Africa and today's population density and growth are unprecedented. But is this too another myth? In the Americas, it is becoming increasingly evident that there were tens of millions of aboriginal peoples before European-introduced diseases, such as smallpox, decimated indigenous populations often 150 years or more before actual white contact^{18,19,20,21}. Could a similar situation have occurred in Africa? I see little biological reason why that could not have been the case. But if it did, it happened much earlier because Arabic traders plied African's east coast for at least 800 years before Europeans arrived. It would not surprise me if smallpox and other introduced diseases made it to the Cape prior to Dutch landfall. *Serengeti III* documents the devastating impact human-introduced diseases have had and are having on the park's wildlife. There is no reason to think that Arabic or European-introduced diseases did not have a similar negative effect on indigenous human populations. If that is in fact what happened, than today's human population densities may not be outside the historical norm.

Reviewers suggested that the last paragraph is speculative and I concur, but it is informed speculation based on what happened in the Americas. In South America, for instance, after Pizarro sacked the Inca Empire he ordered Captain Orellana to explore the Amazon River from its Peruvian headwaters to the Atlantic Ocean in the never-ending Spanish quest for gold. Friar Gaspar de Carvajal accompanied Orellana and left a detailed account of the 1541-1542 expedition; the first Europeans to enter the Amazon Basin²³. Until recently, the good Friar was considered a teller of tall tales, or worse, for he reported dense populations of native people throughout the entire downstream voyage. Untold numbers of people and descriptions of huge settlements where later explorers found only scattered hunter-gatherers or low-density, slash and burn agriculturalists.

In the last few years, however, exceedingly fertile black and brown earths have come to light in the Amazon.²⁴ Soils that were CREATED by humans and which could support sustained agriculture and correspondingly large human populations. Preliminary calculations suggest that the Amazon's anthropogenic soils cover an area the size of Spain and France combined. Similarly, as the "virgin" rain forest has been stripped from the upper Amazon and turned into cattle pastures, massive human-made earthworks over immense areas have been discovered fueling accounts of "lost civilizations"²⁵. It is becoming increasingly clear that millions and millions of aboriginal people were lost to European-introduced disease after Friar Carvajal left his eyewitness account. Needless to say, everything most people think they know about the Amazon must be revised, especially

notions of "wilderness." Depopulation estimates run to 90% or more, as they do in North America where similar things occurred^{18,19,20,21}.

Based on archaeological data, the Limpopo Valley in southern Africa too was once densely populated but that Iron Age civilization vanished around 1150 A.D. for reasons which are still unknown^{26,27}. Interestingly, non-native black rats (*Rattus rattus*), a human commensal, appear in Botswana and South African archaeological sites by the middle of the 8th century^{26,27}. According to Plug and Voigt²⁶, "*The presence of Rattus rattus combined with [known] east [African] coast [trade] lines, would have opened the way for the transmissions of virulent epidemics such as those which swept through Europe in the 12th century*"¹¹ - this reference is to the Black Death, or bubonic plague, which is spread to humans by fleas carried by black rats. If introduced black rats made it as far as South Africa by 800 A.D., so could a host of foreign pathogens. Historians and anthropologists have focused on the impact the slave, ivory, and gold trades had on indigenous people in southern and East Africa when a more disruptive force likely was the transmission of introduced disease from indigenous group to indigenous group well before Arabic or European overland penetration. Christie²⁸ documented how cholera was transmitted from the Far East to East Africa by trade routes during early British rule, yet those same trade routes had been in use for several hundred years. In North America, as introduced diseases decimated Native Americans, who were THE keystone predator, wildlife numbers erupted to unnatural levels^{15,22}. Logic and biology would suggest that the same thing happened in Africa, confounding ecological interpretations about the original state of nature, such as those assumed in *Serengeti III*.

Continued on Page 8

African Indaba eNewsletter

Editor & Publisher: Gerhard R Damm
Postal Address: PO Box 411, Rivonia 2128, South Africa
Email: gerhard@muskwa.co.za
Phone +27-(0)11-883-2299, Fax +27-(0)11-784-2074

WEB: <http://www.africanindaba.co.za/>

Opinions expressed in African Indaba are not necessarily those of the publisher and editor. Whilst every care is taken in the preparation of this newsletter, we cannot accept any responsibility for errors.

African Indaba eNewsletter is published every two months as a free service to the sustainable use community. Please share it with others who may be interested in the topics covered by African Indaba.

We would like to remind you that archived copies of African Indaba eNewsletter are available from our website.

Subscription requests, comments or article submissions should be sent to: gerhard@muskwa.co.za please include your name, full address, e-mail address and organization

For hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources.

The distribution of African Indaba is supported by the International Council for Wildlife Conservation CIC and Conservation Force

Continued from Page 7

Two Views of the Serengeti – One True, One Myth

Notes

Sinclair, A. R. E., and M. Norton - Griffiths, editors. 1979. *Serengeti: Dynamics of an Ecosystem*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, USA.

Sinclair, A. R. E., and Peter Arcese, editors. 1995. *Serengeti II: Dynamics, Management, and Conservation of an Ecosystem*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, USA.

Brockington, D. 2002. *Fortress Conservation: The Preservation of the Mkomazi Game Reserve, Tanzania*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington, Indiana, USA.

Chatty, D., and M. Colchester, editors. 2002. *Conservation and Mobile Indigenous Peoples: Displacement, Forced Settlement, and Sustainable Development*. Berghahn Books, New York, New York, USA.

Duffy, R. 2000. *Killing for Conservation: Wildlife Policy in Zimbabwe*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington, Indiana, USA

Gibson, C.C. 1999. *Politicians and Poachers: The Political Economy of Wildlife Policy in Africa*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Igoe, J. 2004. *Conservation and Globalization: A Study of National Parks and Indigenous Communities from East Africa to South Dakota*. Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, Belmont, California, USA.

Igoe, J., and T. Kelsall, editors. 2005. *Between a Rock and A Hard Place: African NGO's, Donors and the State*. Carolina Academic Press, Durham, North Carolina, USA.

Leach, M., and R. Mearns. 1996. *The Lie of the Land: Challenging Received Wisdom on the African Environment*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington, Indiana, USA.

Neumann, R. P. 1998. *Imposing Wilderness: Struggles over Livelihood and Nature Preservation in Africa*. University of California Press, Berkeley, California, USA.

Steinhart, E.I. 2006. *Black Poachers White Hunters: A Social History of Hunting in Colonial Kenya*. James Currey Ltd., Oxford, UK.

Garland, E. 2006. *State of Nature: Colonial Power, Neoliberal Capital, and Wildlife Management in Tanzania*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, USA.

Kay, C. E. 2007. Are Lightning Fires Unnatural? A Comparison of Aboriginal and Lightning Ignition Rates in the United States. *Tall Timbers Fire Ecology Conference* 23:16-28. In this paper, I presented data on known lightning-ignition rates for every national forest in the U.S. I then compared those data with potential aboriginal-ignition rates based on estimates of the number of fires started per person per year and estimates of Native American population densities prior to 1492. Those data indicate that aboriginal-set fires were 270 to 35,000 times more frequent than known lightning ignitions. Finally, I presented several examples of vegetation communities created and maintained by aboriginal burning.

Rebuilding the Wildlife Sector in a New Zimbabwe

Dr. Rolf D. Baldus and Dr. Graham Child

A Pre-Feasibility Study And Proposals For Action By Donors And Ngos

Introductory Note: It is with great concern that we have observed the wanton destruction of wildlife and wildlife areas in Zimbabwe over the last decade. However, we are positive that the present political nightmare will come to an end and that the people of Zimbabwe will be allowed to rebuild their country. It should not be forgotten which important role wildlife has played in the economy of the country and the potential wildlife can have again in the future. "People and Wildlife e.V." has commissioned a study which should assist donors from the international, Governmental and private sectors to identify the potential and plan future assistance for the reconstruction of the wildlife sector. The study was written by Graham Child, now a consultant, and formerly Director of the Department of National Parks and Wildlife Management in Zimbabwe, and Rolf D. Baldus, a German economist with many years experience in wildlife management in Africa. Both have written the paper in their personal and private capacity only.

Executive Summary

A decade ago Zimbabwe was one of the leading countries in wildlife conservation and management. The sector earned over US\$ 300 million per year through conservation generated by protected areas belonging to the state, rural community run wildlife management areas and private game ranches and reserves. Sadly most of this has been destroyed or severely damaged within a few years of political lawlessness and corruption led by the Mugabe regime.

Wildlife however, has a great ability to recover within a relatively short period of time, provided the natural habitats remain intact, sound protection and wise management can be reintroduced. The formerly thriving wildlife sector can be restored, but to achieve this, a newly established democracy will need the assistance of bilateral and international donors and "hands-on" conservation NGOs.

The future political decision-makers of Zimbabwe as well as donor institutions must not overlook the conservation and sustainable use of wildlife once a new start is possible. Reconstruction of Zimbabwe will certainly draw substantial international support. Wildlife conservation is not a luxury that may be taken up at a later stage after the most urgent tasks of rehabilitation have been achieved. Zimbabwe's wildlife heritage is the draw card of the country's tourist industry, which is a sector that can quickly be turned around and play an important role in the reconstruction of the country.

For the recovery of the wildlife sector, it must be incorporated in economic development and poverty reduction strategies from the start of the reconstruction effort. Many tracts of land formerly devoted to wildlife are now occupied or resettled. Appropriate action is needed fast or the remaining wildlife in these areas will be lost forever. Past experience shows that these areas are unsuited to conventional agriculture, and that wildlife production

Continued on Page 9

For hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources.

The distribution of African Indaba is supported by the International Council for Wildlife Conservation CIC and Conservation Force

Continued from Page 8

Rebuilding the Wildlife Sector in a New Zimbabwe

is the most appropriate form of land use. It is therefore sensible to restore the wildlife populations for the benefit of community-based and/or private management regimes. As is shown, these wildlife-based land use systems mutually benefit one another and are not exclusive.

Furthermore, the sustainable use of wildlife is in line with the Convention on Biodiversity and the ruling principles of the World Conservation Union (IUCN), of which Zimbabwe is a member.

This paper takes a firm stand of zero cooperation with the current Government of Zimbabwe, which is responsible for country's current state of affairs. Also this paper is not a detailed analysis of that current state of affairs. Instead, this paper puts forward a range of ideas, but not project proposals in the fields of: Wildlife policy, organizational and administrative reform Rehabilitation of the estate, capacity building and strengthening of the field force Community based natural resources management (CBNRM) locally referred to as CAMPFIRE Private commercial game ranches and conservancies.

This paper is intended as a pre-feasibility study from where a future democratic Government and interested donors may initiate their own more detailed planning.

Download the study by Dr. Rolf D. Baldus and Dr. Graham Child

● [Rebuilding the Wildlife Sector in a New Zimbabwe](#)

SafariTalk

www.safaritalk.net is an initiative highlighting wildlife conservation, environmental protection and community initiatives in Africa. Founded, funded and run by Matthew Wilkinson, its main audience is safari and wildlife enthusiasts who interact in a forum which encourages balanced, informed and respectful discussion and debate which may surround such issues, where every member has the right to voice his/her opinion, and such views are respected and listened to.

Matthew says - "Aside from promoting responsible tourism practices, my enduring hope is that the forum brings conservationists working in the field into direct contact with members of the public who have a passion for Africa. For me it is important that there is an exchange of ideas and views, especially surrounding emotive issues. Safaritalk must be a middle ground where people can have direct involvement in protecting the wildlife of Africa, no longer should there be separate camps working against each other whilst all the time there is a continued threat to the delicate ecosystems which we travel to Africa to be a part of."

Safaritalk is not a commercial concern, features no advertising or publicity and is not backed by any travel organization or agency. It generates no revenue but encourages members to make donations to small grass roots NGOs working on the ground – to date it has raised around \$12,000 for such projects.

SafariTalk Interviews John F. Walker on Ivory

Editor's Note: John F Walker and SafariTalk gave permission for African Indaba to reprint this interview – none of Walker's reasoning would probably have convinced the concrete African block lead by a Kenyan Government with a very "successful" track record of taking care of its own wildlife to change its stance, we nevertheless feel that our readers deserve to get the unbiased and unemotional view of an author of such high international standing.

Please spare a few minutes and visit SafariTalk's website at www.safaritalk.net – we are happy to cooperate with these good people in order to reach an even wider audience and stimulate reasoned and civilized debate.

John Frederick Walker has been traveling to Africa and reporting on the continent since 1986. His latest book is *Ivory's Ghosts: The White Gold of History and the Fate of Elephants*, which famed field biologist George Schaller called "superb...essential reading for anyone concerned with conservation." It's now available in paperback and ebook editions. He is also the author of the highly praised *A Certain Curve of Horn: The Hundred-Year Quest for the Giant Sable Antelope of Angola*, a narrative of his search for an endangered species in war-torn Africa. Walker's writings have appeared in *The New York Times*, *National Geographic Traveler*, *Africa Geographic*, *Wildlife Conservation*, and numerous other publications, and have been short-listed for a Reuters-IUCN Media Award for Excellence in Environmental Reporting. He developed the Ivory Project at the African Wildlife Foundation to examine the impact of ivory on elephant management and frequently lectures on conservation at zoos and natural history museums across the US. Visit his website at: www.johnfrederickwalker.com



John Frederick Walker in Cangandala NP, Angola

Continued on Page 10

For hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources.

The distribution of African Indaba is supported by the International Council for Wildlife Conservation CIC and Conservation Force

Continued from Page 9

SafariTalk Interviews John F. Walker on Ivory

SafariTalk (ST): *Should countries be allowed to sell stockpiled ivory in order to help to fund conservation in that country?*

John Frederick Walker (JFW): My view is that no country with elephants inside its borders should be allowed to sell its stockpiled ivory unless their elephant population is stable in numbers and well-protected. However, if an African country meets that standard, then I think they should be allowed to sell off stockpiled ivory to raise funds specifically for elephant conservation, including anti-poaching efforts.

ST: *In your opinion, what is best – total ban on the sale of ivory, one off sales, such as has happened previously, and as Zambia and Tanzania are applying for now, or a regular series of sales of smaller quantities, thus not to release all the stockpiled ivory in one hit, in which countries alternate? (Please give pros and cons for each.*

JFW: The ivory ban was supposed to put an end to elephant poaching. It's been in effect for two decades, but it hasn't worked—illegal killings of elephants are once again at alarming levels. We can never return to an unregulated ivory trade, but it's clearly time for some fresh thinking on how the ban could be revised.

Ivory has been a revered commodity for thousands of years, and frankly it's unrealistic to think that interest in it will fade away. Besides, it's not necessary to kill elephants to obtain ivory—they leave their tusks behind when they die. That's why some African countries who are doing a good job by their elephants feel they have a right to sell off their ivory stockpiles to raise money for elephant conservation.

But these "one-off" sales are a poor way to go about it. Ivory traders in the countries that are allowed to buy ivory for domestic consumption (currently, Japan and China) can't rely on a steady inflow of tusks—decisions on whether or not to allow these sales are made at each CITES meeting. This has the unfortunate effect of keeping the black market alive. It would make far more sense to set up a strict mechanism for regular auctions of a small amount of ivory from states with demonstrably well-managed herds. (It should be noted that Tanzania and Zambia may fail to make their case.) It's been estimated that natural deaths in the current African elephant population could yield a 100 tons of legal ivory a year, enough to supply the legitimate Asian market. That would undercut the black market.

ST: *The sale of ivory is an emotive subject, but in your opinion, who is best placed to decide if African countries can sell their ivory stockpiles?*

JFW: Because there are political as well as biological dimensions to the sale of ivory, it's a conservation issue that can only be decided at an appropriate international forum—inevitably,

that's CITES.

ST: *"One off ivory sales will lead to increased and unsustainable levels of elephant poaching." Right or wrong? What is your assessment of such a statement?*

JFW: Kenya and other countries opposed to any ivory trade argue that any legal ivory sales stimulate poaching. But TRAFFIC, the joint IUCN/WWF wildlife trade monitoring network, says there was no hard evidence for that following the 1999 one-off sale to Japan. In fact, illicit trade in ivory declined for five years. Following the 2008 sale, the trend isn't definitive yet, though there was a strong upsurge in illegal trade in 2009. There are a number of factors that drive the illegal market in ivory—among them, poverty and human desperation, not just the existence of legal sales.

ST: *To the best of your knowledge, how does the 23 member African Elephants Coalition function, and is this the right way forward in managing the elephant question and associated issues such as sale of ivory?*

JFW: The African Elephant Coalition is facilitated by IFAW and reflects its anti-ivory stance. It does not represent the views of every African elephant range state.

ST: *If ivory sales do go ahead, how can the proceeds be directly channeled into wildlife / elephant conservation in the respective countries? What controls are there in country to ensure that the money is spent correctly, and not misappropriated?*

JFW: According to CITES, any revenues from the sale of ivory stockpiles must be managed through conservation trust funds and go toward enhancing elephant conservation, monitoring and community development in elephant ranges. The revenues don't just disappear into government coffers. Some \$15 million was raised in the 2008 sales. I agree that more transparency on what happened to these funds would be desirable.

ST: *To where/whom can blame be apportioned for the high levels of elephant poaching in African countries. (In country, as opposed to those fuelling demand).*

JFW: It's not a coincidence that those African countries plagued with ivory poaching are also countries that are either at war, or suffering from drought or awash with displaced peoples, and often riddled with corruption or simply lacking effective conservation and enforcement. By contrast, stable countries in southern Africa, such as Namibia, Botswana and South Africa are able to keep poaching to a minimum. In fact, they have too many elephants for the habitat available to them.

ST: *Use of military force has been advocated in order to protect elephant and rhino populations, and indeed, the army has recently been deployed in Kruger for this purpose. (Source – San Parks) Is this the answer? How would different countries put this*

Continued on Page 11

For hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources.

The distribution of African Indaba is supported by the International Council for Wildlife Conservation CIC and Conservation Force

Continued from Page 11

SafariTalk Interviews John F. Walker on Ivory

into practice, and would use of such force further alienate local communities who are often disenfranchised from their traditional lands due to national parks and reserves?

JFW: I'm not comfortable with "shoot on sight" anti-poaching policies in African parks. If it's not a policy that would be tolerated in European and North American parks to combat poaching, then why should it be considered appropriate for African countries? To my mind, using military forces for wildlife enforcement is over-kill, and just reinforces the belief among many rural Africans that their governments care more about their elephants than their own people.

ST: *How is it that China, being a CITES member, (despite its poor track record in terms of illicit trade in endangered species / animal parts), and being the largest marketplace for ivory, can play an active role in any decision whether to permit the sale of ivory?*

JFW: China is one of 175 nations that are parties to CITES and its conventions. Because of its size, and its historic interest in ivory, it is vital that ways be found for it to play a positive role in an evolving global ivory policy. China took strong steps to regulate its domestic ivory trade, which helped it get CITES approval as a buyer of legal ivory. However, it is not doing enough to police its nationals working in Africa, far too many of whom are engaging in ivory trafficking, which fuels poaching.

ST: *Animal rights advocates, (Not conservation NGOs working in the field) - well intentioned they may be, but in your opinion do they complicate the issue, especially if they operate from outside of Africa itself? Should they be able to have influence on any political decisions taken with regard to ivory sales and issues such as trophy hunting / culling?*

JFW: It's a positive thing when animal rights advocates focus attention on animal abuse and wildlife trafficking. It's a negative thing when they advocate agendas which are divorced from biological realities. To be good stewards of the planet, it's vital for us to protect biodiversity. That means tough decisions have to be made—like ridding ecosystems of invasive species that are destroying them.

It's also negative when these groups completely dismiss the need for people in developing countries to benefit from the wildlife they live with. The amount of influence some of these animal groups have in African countries is wildly inappropriate. Would the US tolerate Nigeria telling it what should be done with grizzly bears in Yellowstone? African countries should be able to manage their own wildlife free of foreigners buying influence over conservation policy or threatening tourist boycotts if they don't get their way.

ST: *Aside from the ivory trade, what other threats exist to the elephants in Africa, and what steps are being taken / should be taken to address these problems?*

JFW: Human-elephant conflict. It's almost completely ignored in the media, but rural Africans living in or next to elephant habitat suffer when these giants raid their crops, and sadly, sometimes even lose their lives. A country like Kenya, with a growing human population, is rapidly losing elephant habitat. The Kenya Wildlife Service doesn't discuss it, but it has to shoot several hundred problem elephants a year on control work.

ST: *Why are some countries so successful in managing their elephants populations, i.e. Botswana and South Africa to name but two, when others seem to be struggling?*

JFW: Botswana and South Africa are functioning democracies, with well-run wildlife and parks departments and excellent anti-poaching units.

ST: *Is culling the best way to control elephant populations, especially in fenced reserves such as Kruger? If so, why? What are the alternatives, and have any been proven to be successful in managing large numbers?*

JFW: I wrote about this complex issue in detail in Ivory's Ghosts. You can use birth-control or translocate herds to keep elephant numbers down in very small parks, but these methods are simply unworkable in a park the size of Kruger. That leaves culling as the only practical method of population control—short of letting elephants denude their habitat and waiting for a mass die-off, something that would be far more cruel.

ST: *What should those African countries, who have successfully managed their elephant populations, do to help other nations who have a poor track record? Indeed, should they help, financially, or with expert assistance, or would the effort be better spent on protecting their own elephant populations? Should there be greater cross border co-operation between countries, and how could this work?*

JFW: I think African countries with successful elephant management policies could certainly share their expertise, but the countries that need the advice often lack the infrastructure and political will to implement workable policies of their own. A huge problem is the failure of many Africa countries to police their own domestic markets where all too often ivory carvings are openly sold. These serve as headquarters for illegal ivory trafficking and must be shut down.

ST: *If a country's infrastructure is recovering from the ravages of previous civil war, e.g. Mozambique, should large scale elephant translocations be considered as a way of thinning numbers from more populated countries, e.g. South Africa / Botswana, or would this be a huge waste of resources, financially and otherwise?*

JFW: Elephant translocation is wildly expensive, requiring helicopters, veterinary teams, giant cargo jets—using translocation as a means to reduce elephant populations would be a huge

Continued on Page 12

For hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources.

The distribution of African Indaba is supported by the International Council for Wildlife Conservation CIC and Conservation Force

Continued from Page 11

SafariTalk Interviews John F. Walker on Ivory

waste of resources that could be put to better conservation use. Translocating a few elephants to restart populations that have been wiped out, however, is a different story.

ST: *"Trophy hunting can play a role in wildlife conservation." Do you agree or disagree with this statement and why?*

JFW: Many people find trophy hunting personally abhorrent. But it brings in a lot of money to wildlife departments for very little environmental impact. Hunters pay stiff fees for the privilege of shooting a few animals. So long as the quota of animals that can be hunted is based on a careful biological assessment of how many can be shot without having any significant impact on an animal population, it's pointless to pass up hunting fees as a source of conservation funds.

Hunters are also after untouched wilderness and simple camps, unlike camera-toting tourists who look for lodges, flush toilets and restaurants—all of which have a negative impact on wildlife habitat. Besides, there are many African habitats that are wildlife rich, but of zero tourist interest. Hunters are the only ones who might spend money in these swamps and scrublands.

ST: *With or without the ivory ban, in your opinion, what is the best way to ensure the long term conservation of the African elephant?*

JFW: The best way to ensure that the African elephant has a future is to start by being realistic about its plight. There are some hard decisions ahead. For example, it's not a contradiction to care about elephants and yet accept that in some places their numbers have to be reduced. Elephants don't mix well with fences, roads, villages, development in general. They need space and protection.

In an Africa of ever-shrinking wildlife habitats, that won't be cheap. We should let elephants help fund their future by allowing tightly controlled sales of the tusks they leave behind.



For hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources.

The distribution of African Indaba is supported by the International Council for Wildlife Conservation CIC and Conservation Force

Kenya's Wildlife Debacle: The True Cost of Banning Hunting

Charles E. Kay, Ph.D. in Wildlife Ecology, 480 East 125 North, Providence, UT 84332, Tel. 435-753-0715 e-mail: charles.kay@usu.edu.

Editor's Note: This article of Charles Kay first appeared in the Nov/Dec 2009 issue of *Mule Deer Foundation Magazine*. It is reprinted in *African Indaba* with the kind permission of the author

As I am sure you know, some segments of the public, both here in the United States and abroad, would like to ban hunting in the belief such a move would benefit wildlife, or at least that is what they claim when soliciting funds. It sounds simple, stop hunting animals and you will have more wildlife. Is this, though, a reasonable supposition? For an answer we need to look at the wildlife situation in Kenya for that African country banned all, and I do mean all, hunting in 1977. There is no sport hunting. There is no meat hunting and landowners, be they white or black, have no right to kill wildlife on their property. The ban is total and absolute there being no legal market in either game meat or wildlife products. Kenya outlawed all consumptive use of wildlife at the urging of animal-rights groups in an attempt to stop poaching, or so they said.

At the same time that Kenya prohibited hunting, the Kenya Rangeland Ecological Monitoring Unit began recording the numbers and distribution of livestock and wildlife, primarily large game species, throughout Kenya. This included national parks and other protected areas, black communal lands, and private property, mostly white-owned ranches. So has banning all consumptive use of wildlife worked? Absolutely not, instead it has been a spectacular failure. Since 1977, Kenya has lost 60% to 70% of all its large wildlife even in national parks. Moreover, it is predicted that most large mammals will be extinct in the next 10 to 20 years. So there you have it, if you want to eliminate wildlife, by all means ban hunting!

The reason this happened, and is still ongoing, is that there is a cost to having wildlife. If you are a poor, black farmer, as many in Kenya are, and if your crops are destroyed by wildlife, you face not only economic ruin, but actual starvation. Similarly, if you raise livestock either on black communal lands or private ranches, there is a cost to letting wildlife consume forage that could otherwise have been used to feed livestock. In addition, there is the cost of being killed or injured by wildlife. You would be appalled at the number of local people injured or killed each year by lions, elephants, and other dangerous game. Children walking to school in rural Africa are all too routinely attacked by wild animals. No American parent would tolerate what goes on in Africa.

That being the case, it is not surprising then that wildlife has simply disappeared, legal or not. So poaching has actually increased even in national parks. You have to remember that black indigenous landowners were forcefully removed at gunpoint, and without compensation, from every national park and game preserve in East and southern Africa to create "wil-

derness" pleasuring grounds for white elites. There are few black tourists in any African national park. So the local people "poach" to feed themselves and to earn a few dollars for their families. So would I and so would you, under similar circumstances.

Recently most of the remaining lions in Nairobi National Park, Nairobi being the capitol of Kenya, were speared to death within sight of the Kenya Wildlife Service's national headquarters, while some 500 bureaucrats sat paralyzed at their desks. "Only a state monopoly could hope to attain such breathtaking heights of incompetence and ineptitude and hope to get away with it." All of which can be traced to the fact that white colonial governments planted the flag and claimed all land and wildlife for king and country, thereby depriving local people of their birth-right. What is even more surprising is that black governments have done little to correct this injustice. Instead, policies like banning all consumptive use of wildlife have made the situation worse.

There is more to this than I can relate here and if you would like additional details, Google [Mike Norton-Griffiths](#) and you should be able to find the website on which he has posted a number of his research articles. Dr. Norton-Griffiths is an economist who was born in the U.S., educated in Britain, and who has lived in Kenya for many years. In 2007, Dr. Norton-Griffiths published a paper in *World Economics* [Vol. 8(2): 41-64] titled, "How Many Wildebeest do You Need?" that chronicles this sad story. "All [the animals rights organizations] care about is that hunting and other consumptive utilization of wildlife is not reintroduced to Kenya, and whether this leads to further losses of wildlife and to the perpetuation of rural poverty is completely irrelevant to them, because their underlying purpose is not to help Kenya but [to enrich themselves through fundraising]."

At the same time that wildlife numbers have fallen precipitously in Kenya following the prohibition on hunting, wildlife populations in Namibia have doubled. While in South Africa, wildlife habitat has doubled and then doubled again. Why the difference? Because both Namibia and South Africa passed legislation giving landowners rights to wildlife. That is to say, the landowners own the wildlife, at the least the large game species. In South Africa, with which I am most familiar, the ranchers have to high-fence their properties before the government will relinquish ownership of game species, and there are other regulations, as well. But there are no closed seasons, no state licenses, no bag limits, and no prohibited methods. Shooting under the midnight sun is legal; i.e., spotlighting. There are also sanctioned markets in both game meat and live animals. The end of wildlife you say? Nothing could be further from the truth.

As the post-apartheid government has withdrawn subsidies from white cattlemen, the landowners have turned to game ranching and both wildlife populations and sport hunting have experienced phenomenal growth. Now that the government has changed the incentives from wildlife being a cost, to wildlife being an asset, a million acres a year are being converted to wildlife - - unlike here in the States where all you hear about is the loss of wildlife habitat. Private landowners, not the national government, have saved the black wildebeest, blesbok, bontebok, and other species including white and black rhinos, because

Continued on Page 14

For hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources.

The distribution of African Indaba is supported by the International Council for Wildlife Conservation CIC and Conservation Force

Continued from Page 13

Kenya's Wildlife Debacle: The True Cost of Banning Hunting

sport hunting now pays the bills. Aldo Leopold predicted as much back in the 1930's when he wrote an essay on "Game Economics" in which he noted that the surest way to save habitat and enhance wildlife was to allow landowners to profit from protecting habitat and enhancing game populations.

At the present time, plains game hunting in Namibia and South Africa is the most cost efficient big game hunting in the world. Moreover, the trophy quality and hunting experience are outstanding. On my second trip to South Africa, I hunted for three weeks and shot 14 animals, six of which made Rowland Ward, the international equivalent of Boone and Crockett. The cost? About the same as one high-end, trophy mule deer or elk hunt on a private ranch or Indian Reservation here in the West.

While this has been a blessing for white ranchers, various African governments have also passed laws giving black communal landowners rights to wildlife. In Namibia these are called conservancies and it has been shown that when local people receive a direct financial benefit from wildlife, illegal activity is reduced or even eliminated. It is really quite simple, if sport hunting pays the bills, both wildlife, and more importantly habitat, are not only conserved but enhanced.

In Kenya, animal rights groups claim that wildlife viewing by foreign tourists is more beneficial than sport hunting. In that, though, they are badly mistaken. According to Dr. Norton-Griffiths as "extraordinary as it may seem, not a single tourist company in Kenya invests in wildlife or habitat management even though their very economic future depends upon the resource." This is because most of the large tourist operations are owned by multinational companies, whose only concern is short-term profit. In addition, studies have shown that virtually none of the foreign tourist dollars make it down to the local people, who actually live with wildlife. Instead, black elites divert the money to themselves. It has been estimated that half the gate receipts from national parks "disappear" before reaching the Kenya treasury. Similarly, there is no accountability of the large financial grants that animal-rights groups make to the government each year, rendering them little more than annual bribes. This is why the black elites that run the country have resisted calls to reinstitute hunting. If hunting was again made legal, animal-rights groups would stop giving funds to the central government and thus, there would be less opportunity for rent-seeking behavior by officials; i.e., graft and corruption.

As documented by various scientific studies, wildlife viewing is also more environmentally destructive than sport hunting. This is because the profit margin per person is less, so you have to run a much greater number of tourists through the system to achieve the economic activity generated by a single sport hunter. In addition, tourists expect paved roads and modern five-star accommodations. Water is scarce in arid Africa and tourists require a lot more of it than sport hunters. Furthermore, tourists generate larger quantities of human waste and garbage, both per person and in total, than sport hunters. Sport hunters, on the other hand, are content to stay in tents and drive dirt tracks. No one is arguing that wildlife viewing should not be part of the mix, but to call wildlife viewing "non-consumptive," is simply false. Tourists also have a much larger carbon footprint than safari

hunters.

Hopefully you will never have to confront animal-rights activists while you are out hunting, but if you do, or if you favor that sort of thing, now at least you are armed with the truth about the wildlife debacle in Kenya. Banning hunting is a surefire way to eliminate wildlife. Although to non-hunters this may seem counterintuitive, it is nevertheless true. The reality is that outlawing the consumptive use of wildlife in Kenya has been an unmitigated ecological and human disaster. While in other African countries that have modified their game laws to encourage sport hunting, wildlife populations have increased, as have the private and communal lands devoted to wildlife. As hard as it may be for some people to accept, the free-market system has been more effective at conserving wildlife in Africa than heavy-handed, state-run monopolies.

A New FAO/CIC Initiative

Principles for Developing Sustainable Wildlife Management Laws

This report is a joint initiative of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC). The report was authored by Elisa Morgera (FAO Legal Officer) and Jim Wingard (FAO International Legal Consultant). The authors wish to thank for their inputs: Victor Mosoti (FAO Legal Officer), René Czudek (FAO Wildlife and Protected Area Management Officer), Kai Wollscheid (Director General, CIC), Dominique Reeb (FAO Sub-Regional Senior Forestry Officer), Ali Mekouar (Director of FAO Conference, Council and Protocol Affairs Division; former Chief of the FAO Development Law Service), Alessandro Fodella (FAO International Legal Consultant), Anna Vartanyan (FAO Legal Consultant), Charlotta Jull (FAO Legal Officer) and the participants in the workshop "Review and validation of FAO/CIC draft legislative study on Developing Sustainable Wildlife Management Laws in Western and Central Asia" (Antalya, Turkey, 12-16 May 2008).

Download the entire report at

http://cic-sustainable-hunting-world-wide.org/projects/Principles_dev_sust_man_laws.pdf

[more ...](#)



For hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources.

The distribution of African Indaba is supported by the International Council for Wildlife Conservation CIC and Conservation Force

The Status of Wildlife in Protected Areas Compared to Non-Protected Areas of Kenya

David Western, Samantha Russell, Innes Cuthill

Abstract

We compile over 270 wildlife counts of Kenya's wildlife populations conducted over the last 30 years to compare trends in national parks and reserves with adjacent ecosystems and country-wide trends. The study shows the importance of discriminating human-induced changes from natural population oscillations related to rainfall and ecological factors. National park and reserve populations have declined sharply over the last 30 years, at a rate similar to non-protected areas and country-wide trends. The protected area losses reflect in part their poor coverage of seasonal ungulate migrations.

The losses vary among parks. The largest parks, Tsavo East, Tsavo West and Meru, account for a disproportionate share of the losses due to habitat change and the difficulty of protecting large remote parks. The losses in Kenya's parks add to growing evidence for wildlife declines inside as well as outside African parks. The losses point to the need to quantify the performance of conservation policies and promote integrated landscape practices that combine parks with private and community-based measures.

Citation: Western D. Russell S. Cuthill I (2009) The Status of Wildlife in Protected Areas Compared to Non-Protected Areas of Kenya.

PLoS ONE 4(7): e6140. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0006140, Editor: Michael Somers, University of Pretoria, South Africa. Received: August 22, 2008; Accepted: June 1, 2009; Published: July 8, 2009

For the complete text please click the following link:

<http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0006140>

SOUTH AFRICA: Postponement of the Court Case against the SA Police Services regarding implementation of the Firearms Control Act

The Court case which would have taken place on 29 March 2010 was postponed until a later date and currently there are discussions taking place between the legal teams of SA Hunters and Game Conservation Association and PHASA, and the Minister of Police. The legal status of holders of green licenses is exclusively dependent on the ruling of the High Court in this case, which is still pending and will follow the outcome of the negotiations between the legal teams as mentioned

IN MEMORIAM: Professor Heribert Kalchreuter

Gerhard R Damm



Herby Kalchreuter
Hunter, Conservationist, Biologist, Adventure-Traveler

Professor Heribert Kalchreuter died unexpectedly on 14 March 2010 whilst on holiday in the Dominican Republic. Known as "Herby" to his many friends around the world, he travelled the globe in search of answers to conserve our wildlife heritage. He taught at the College of African Wildlife Management in Mweka/Tanzania, was a member of several commissions of the IUCN, a director of Wetlands International, president of the migrating bird commission of the CIC, and last not least, Herby played an instrumental role in the development and negotiation of the Agreement on the Conservation of the African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds (AEWA). Herby made no bones about being a passionate hunter and he exemplarily bridged the gap between hunters and nature conservationists through his pragmatic approach. This was particularly helpful for reaching a consensus between hunters and conservationists during the AEWA Negotiation Meeting in June 1995.

Heribert Kalchreuter studied geology and forestry in Munich and gained his Diploma in Forestry at the Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, where he also received his Doctorate in 1970. He worked for the Hunting Department of the German Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Forestry. In 1994 he habilitated at the Agricultural University of Poznan, Poland and was awarded a professorship in 2002. Herby's work includes the books "Die Sache mit der Jagd" and "Zurück in die Wildnis". The CIC awarded him with the CIC Literary Prize (Technical) and recognized Herby's life-time achievements with the CIC Literary Cultural Prize.

When Herby visited me in my home in South Africa, we spent many hours discussing the many good and bad aspects of hunting; Herby was controversial, even in hunting circles with his provocative and innovative ideas but his passion for the wild regions and their wild denizens was infectious and touched non-hunters and hunters alike.

Rest in Peace, Herby!

For hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources.

The distribution of African Indaba is supported by the International Council for Wildlife Conservation CIC and Conservation Force

Managing the Conflicts Between People and Lion

Wildlife Management Working Paper 13

Review and insights from the literature and field experience
Published by Food and Agriculture Organization of the
United Nations Rome, 2010

Authors: P. Chardonnet (IGF Foundation), France, B. Soto (TFCA), Mozambique, H. Fritz (CNRS), France, W. Crossmary (CNRS), France, N. Drouet-Hoguet, Wildlife Consultant, France, P. Mesochina (IGF Foundation), France, M. Pellerin, Wildlife Consultant, France, D. Mallon, (MMU), United Kingdom, L. Bakker, (WWF) – The Netherlands, H. Boulet, (IGF Foundation), Mozambique, F. Lamarque (IGF Foundation), France

Introduction by Philippe Chardonnet

Not long ago, when large mammals harmed people we talked of accidents; when they damaged people's assets we referred to incidents. Nowadays, human/wildlife conflicts are regarded as common occurrences. It seems that what were once considered exceptional or abnormal events have become normal or usual. Whether this is a result of higher frequency and amplitude is not clear, because we do not have reliable statistics to make accurate comparisons.

Similarly, human-eating and livestock-raiding lions might be seen as normal lions expressing their carnivorous nature in particular circumstances. Contemporary lions are not wilder or crueller or more dangerous than before: it is just that these particular circumstances seem to be recorded more frequently. Also, communication is now instant and universal: news of a casualty in a remote wilderness can be reported at once on the internet, spreading the information worldwide. Furthermore, a problem lion seems to have a greater psychological impact than a problem crocodile: a crocodile victim disappears, but a lion victim is more likely to be noticed; also, according to B. Soto, a lion incident might be perceived as an intrusion into the human environment, whereas a crocodile incident might be viewed as a human intrusion into the crocodile environment. The result is that the lion might be regarded as more at fault than the crocodile, even though the consequences are the same.

In any case, the interface between humans and wildlife is increasing: growing human population and encroachment into lion habitat have simply augmented the incidence of contact between people and lions. Similarly, the harvesting of wildlife has increased, leaving less natural prey for lions.

Obviously, the probability of clashes between people and lions now tends to be higher. Long established traditional ways of deterring fierce, fully-grown lions might become partly ineffective, and lethal methods are not always acceptable by modern standards. Triggers for human eaters and cattle raiders are being investigated, and knowledge of behavioral factors is improving. New methods to protect people and livestock from lions are being tested in a number of risk situations; these methods are also designed to conserve the lion itself from eradication over its

natural range.

Conservation of the lion is now a topical concern because our ancestors, the hunted humans (Ehrenreich, 1999) of the past who were chased by predators have become hunting humans and predators themselves.

Interestingly, this study was undertaken during a period of rising general interest in conservation of the lion. Two regional strategies for the conservation of the African lion have been developed under the auspices of the Cat Specialist Group of the World Conservation Union/Species Survival Commission, one for West and Central Africa, the other for Eastern and Southern Africa.¹ And more and more lion-range states are developing national action plans. This provides evidence of the effort invested in tackling the diverse issues related to lion conservation. By focusing on the human/lion interactions, the present study is complementary to the work of the World Conservation Union. This study also echoes the dynamic forum facilitated by the African Lion Working Group.² We hope that this review will contribute to the challenge of long-term conservation of the African lion. Success will be attained when the lion changes from being perceived as vermin or a pest to being regarded as a wealth or an asset.

You can download this 66-page paper at

<http://www.africanindaba.co.za/news.htm>

Breakthrough: CIC Coordinates Global Platform on Hunting Ammunition



The International Council on Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC: www.cic-wildlife.org) is grateful to our colleagues from The World Forum on the Future of Sport Shooting Activities (WFSA: www.wfsa.net) and our friends from the Federation of Associations for Hunting and Conservation of the European Union (FACE: www.face.eu) for the very constructive and groundbreaking meeting on the 4th of February between the organizations in Rome.

"The extraordinary achievement of this meeting was to agree to jointly find solutions for possible challenges arising in the use of hunting and sports ammunition with the prime objective to protect human as well as environmental health and security", said Dieter Schramm, President of CIC. The representatives of the 3 organizations concluded to form a continuous discussion platform to be coordinated by CIC.

The 3 partners agreed in Rome on the next steps to take in relation to the design and implementation of a Road Map of collaboration.

For hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources.

The distribution of African Indaba is supported by the International Council for Wildlife Conservation CIC and Conservation Force



For Enquiries and Tickets Contact Marianna at the PHASA Office
 Telephone: +27-12-667-2048
 or email PHASA at info@phasa.co.za

African Wildlife Heritage Gala Dinner Auction list

Contact PHASA +27-12-667-2048 for details
TELEPHONE BIDS WELCOME

TANDA TULA SAFARI CAMP, TIMBAVATI PRIVATE NATURE RESERVE The package is for 2 people for 2 nights and includes accommodation, all meals, morning & afternoon teas & coffees, all game drives and guided walks, all local soft drinks, beers, wines and spirits. There is an option to spend one night at our "Star Beds" camp at Machaton hide.

7 Night Accommodation Package in KNP 1 bungalow for two adults in the Kruger National Park. Accommodation only. .

Magnum of Van Loveren Wines of Distinction Cabernet Sauvignon – Shiraz – 2008

Gorongozza Accommodation Package Three nights – full board

Bushpig Hunt over Hounds Two bushpigs to be hunted over highly trained hounds for two hunters or one hunter and one observer. Hunt (two days and two nights) will take place in the York/Hanover KZN Midlands

Buffalo hunt – Selous Game Reserve, Tanzania US\$8 000 credit towards a 7 day buffalo hunt during October to November 2011 or 2012 in the Selous Game Reserve/Tanzania with Pori Trackers of Africa Ltd/Ondjamba Safaris-Game Trackers Africa

Twelve day Hunting Safari, Mozambique One elephant and one leopard to be hunted between 1st July 2010 and 31st December 2010 in the Mangalane, Sabie area in the Moamba district ca 150 km north-west from Maputo.

Accommodation Package, Mafigeni Safari Company, Tzaneen for two nights for 2 people sharing incl. accommodation, dinner, bed and breakfast as well as a guided game view on horseback.

Four Ball at Leopard Creek Country Club The exclusive Leopard Creek Country Club owned by Johann Rupert, and Gary Player offers one four ball subject to availability and excluding weekends and public holidays.

Four Hunting packages – Madikwe Game Reserve North West Province donated by North West Parks and Tourism Board

- One free roaming male lion (between four and six years) 14 day hunt;
- One free roaming male lion (between four and six years) 14 day hunt;
- One buffalo (between 38" and 42") 7 day hunt;
- One white rhino (between 18" and 24") 7 day hunt

0.80ct Tanzanite Set in 18K white gold pendant and chain. Donated by SunStar Diamonds.

Accommodation packages Malawi for 2 people for 6 nights

- Two nights for two people sharing at Nyala Lodge, Lengwe National Park, Malawi, includes accommodation, all meals and 2 game activities, excludes National Park fees, drinks and items of a personal nature. To be used before 1 December 2010 and is not valid during public holidays.
- One night for two people on Mumbo Island including accommodation on Mumbo Island with all meals, boat transfers, National Park fees, kayaking and snorkeling gear also included. Excludes transport to get to Mumbo Island reception. To be taken between 1 March 2010 and 11 December 2010. Normal terms and conditions apply.
- Three nights for two people at Mvu Wilderness Camp, Liwonde National Park – includes accommodation on a full board basis, all meals and 2 game activities per day. Excludes drinks and park fees. Valid for 1 year – cannot be used over public holidays and festivals.

For hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources.

The distribution of African Indaba is supported by the International Council for Wildlife Conservation CIC and Conservation Force

OBITUARY: Brian Nicholson

Rolf D Baldus

It with great sadness to let the African Indaba readers know that Brian Nicholson has gone on his last safari. He died at the age of 79 years in Australia where he had been living with his children and their families since he had left Kenya

Brian was one of the fathers of the Selous Game Reserve and one of the pioneers of using safari hunting to sustain a protected area and conserve its wildlife. His intimate involvement with the Selous Game reserve spans almost a quarter of a century, including the transition from the colonial administration to the independent Government of the Republic of Tanzania.

He was born on June 20th, 1930 in Eldoret, Kenya. At a time when academic degrees were deemed less important than common sense, bush craft and determination, he became involved in animal capture and professional hunting at the tender age of 17. With 19 he joined the then Tanganyika Game Department as an elephant control officer. Until 1973 when he voluntarily resigned from his post of game warden, Southern Tanzania, he had travelled many thousands of miles through the reserve, mostly on foot, which still makes him one of the persons with the most intimate knowledge of the area.

In order to finance the management, infrastructure and anti-poaching operations of the Selous which he had expanded to its present size of nearly 50,000 km², he was able to convince the colonial administration to allow hunting tourism. Brian worked out the details and had soon a flourishing hunting industry which operated on the basis of low and sustainable quotas and strict control. The oppression of poaching soon led to big ivory including hundredpounders, fine cats and old buffalo bulls being harvested, not to mention the many antelopes. The proceeds from hunting were kept for the upkeep of the game reserve. Unfortunately this strictly controlled system was not continued after his departure.

In the fifties and sixties Brian published a number of articles (see page 20 in: http://www.wildlife-baldus.com/download/nr_44.pdf) which show his great talents as a field biologist and conservation manager and planner. Brian visited the Selous again in 1979 together with the photographer Hugo van Lawick and the author Peter Matthiessen, who wrote the book "Sand Rivers" about their foot safari. In 2001 Brian Nicholson's book "The Last of Old Africa" was published. It is a classic African hunting book and amongst the best ones ever released - and his stories have the advantage of being true. It is a great pity that this book is out of print, and I can hope only that a reprint will soon be done. During the last years of his life Brian continued to take an active interest in the future of the Selous. The upkeep of Governance in hunting tourism and conservation in general was amongst his major concerns.

It was truly an honour when Brian agreed to provide a chapter for the book „ The Wild Heart of Africa – The Selous Game Reserve in Tanzania“ (Rowland Ward 2009), which we produced as a team of people who had worked or were working in the Selous. Brian narrated the reserve's development years

from 1922 to Independence and I should like to give him the word and quote from the book, his last publication:

"A proposal to start controlled professional hunting safaris on a strict quota basis was made by me in 1953 when on safari with G.H. Swynerton, who was head of the Game Department at the time. Ionides had always been absolutely against and hostile to any form of development of the Game Reserve whether in the form of hunting safaris or tourism and lodges. Swynerton also flatly rejected my idea and no further progress was made in this direction until 1962. It must be noted that tourism as a major industry in Tanganyika did not exist and it was not until about 1958 that the Government started to recognize it and invest in it with the creation of the National Parks organisation

By 1961 when Tanganyika became an independent state, tourism had evolved into a meaningful industry. For some years I had a feeling of unease about the long term future of a vast wilderness area such as the Selous Game Reserve and believed that to survive it had to be made valuable in terms of revenue and foreign exchange earnings for the country. In 1962 Major Bruce Kinloch M.C. was transferred from Uganda to Tanganyika and became the new head of the Game Department. He was a progressive and dynamic personality. One of his earliest moves was to split the Game Department's responsibilities and administration into four regions, each covering about one quarter of the country, with a senior game warden directly responsible to him, in charge of each Region. I was promoted to senior game warden south-eastern region which included the whole of the Selous Game Reserve, now about 20,000 square miles in area. My base was Morogoro and Allen Rees who remained at Mahenge assisted me. Kinloch strongly supported my views on permitting hunting safaris into the Selous and asked me to put forward a development plan for him to approach the Government with. Over the next eighteen months in conjunction with Rees a detailed proposal, defining hunting block boundaries, quotas for each species of game animal in the blocks, projected revenues and forex, regulations for controlling the safaris and budget estimates to open up the areas with dry season tracks, airstrips etc. were prepared.

Kinloch was able to persuade the Government to back this project. Funding began in 1964, with the first professional safaris starting in 1965. Over the next few years the Selous Game Reserve was one of the most popular areas for professional hunting safaris and became self-financing from direct revenues."

Without Brian Nicholson the World Heritage Site „Selous“ would not be what it is today, May my wish that his successors continue to hold it in trust not be in vain!

See page 3 for a photo of Brian Nicholson

For hunter-conservationists and all people who are interested in the conservation, management and the sustainable use of Africa's wild natural resources.

The distribution of African Indaba is supported by the International Council for Wildlife Conservation CIC and Conservation Force