



“SERVING THE HUNTER WHO TRAVELS”

“Hunting provides the principal incentive and revenue for conservation. Hence it is a force for conservation.”

Special To The Hunting Report World Conservation Force Bulletin

by John J. Jackson, III

DATELINE: EUROPE

News Analysis Pro-Hunting Marches A Resounding Success

In the past year there have been three unprecedented marches in Europe to support hunting and the related country way of life. On July 10, 1997, approximately 120,000 people rallied in Hyde Park, London in defense of hunting with hounds. Many people literally walked for days from all over the country to participate. In Paris on February 24, 1998, more than 200,000 hunters and countryside people from all over France and Europe marched through the streets of the capital to demonstrate their determination in the face of the attacks on them. Then, the march of marches took place. On March 1, 270,000 hunters and country people marched from the embankment in London to Hyde Park dramatically demonstrating their solidarity. I recently had the good fortune of visiting with Robin Hanbury Tenison who organized and led the two London

marches and rallies.

Question by me: Robin, how many people were at the March 1 march?

Answer: You mean march and rally. There were 270,000 people.

Question: Did you really organize the effort?

Answer: Yes. I was Executive Direc-



tor of Country-Side Alliance that organized and led the effort. I no longer hold that position. The job is done. I am now off to Borneo in Asia to help put out the raging forest fires there. I have completed all of my duties for the Country-Side Alliance and these are my last few days before I depart for my new challenge in Asia.

Firefighting and environmental causes are my normal interests. People wanted to know why I was helping the hunters. I believe in the cause - I really do, but now the job is done. The Alliance has a new Executive Director and I am off to put out one of the worst environmental fires in history. (The forest fires in Borneo are so immense they may affect the whole world. The United Nations called a special meeting because of the magnitude of the fires and the impact on the environment.)

Question: What was at issue in the Hyde Park march? Was it really hunting?

Answer: Fox hunting was at issue. There was a bill in the Parliament to end fox hunting. When we studied it, everyone came to realize that fox hunting affected many people who were involved with it, the whole country way of life. They discovered their commonality and all joined together.

Question: Was the effort successful?

Answer: The second march and rally, yes. Not the first one. The bill to ban fox hunting with hounds was withdrawn. The Home Secretariat, Jack Strain, said that fox hunting is now

safe for 50 years after the second march. It was his bill.

Question: Were the anti-hunters well organized and strong to have gotten so far?

Answer: No, it was more a matter of Parliament not realizing or being aware of the enormity or importance of hunting and country-side interest. Parliament had only been hearing from one side.

Question: What’s next? Is hunting safe now?

Answer: Yes, fox hunting is safe for now. The House Secretary has said it is safe for 50 years. Gun ownership is at immediate risk, specifically hunting with firearms. Everyone thought that fox hunting would be the first to go. Instead it is safe, and everything else is at risk that is dependent upon firearms. We may lose all hunting with firearms within five years in England.

Question: What did the march and rally cost you?

Answer: It cost approximately £500,000, but we received donations far in excess of our expectations. We had planned to count the money in shifts and finish within 24 hours. The money came in small sums but lots of it. It took three weeks of 24-hour days to count all the small sums. We raised more than £8 million in the last rally. They accused us of getting money from international gun rights organizations but we deliberately turned down such international offers of funding. The hunters and country people provided the funds. (Perhaps fundraising is the reason the animal extremists in the US march on the capital periodically. If 100,000 marchers contribute \$10 each that is \$1 million).

SPECIAL REPORT

**Regulatory Matters
ESA Change Impacts
Cheetah Downlisting**

In response to comments filed by Conservation Force and others, the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has changed its downlisting prioritizations under the Endangered

Species Act (ESA). Because of the number of obligations the USFWS has and backlogs under the ESA, it has had to set a schedule of the order in which it will take action. This year, it proposed that downlistings of listed species be given the lowest priority on Tier 2. After receiving the comments it has partially followed Conservation Force’s suggestion by raising the downlisting of foreign species to the highest level of Tier 2. USFWS is now expected to complete the processing of the downlisting of the Namibian cheetah this year. Some of the language in the Federal Register notice is heart warming to those of us who have fought this battle for years. Read it for yourself as follows:

“Two commenters recommended that the Service recognize sustainable use as a reason for delisting species, es-



pecially when the listed status of the species conflicts with the recovery and/or management program of the nation where the species occurs. Both referred primarily to delisting of foreign species, such as the Namibian cheetah and Nile crocodile. One commenter considered inclusion of delisting in Tier 2, albeit at a low level within Tier 2, an improvement over Listing Priority Guidance of FYs 1996 and 1997. The other (Conservation Force) suggested assigning delisting activities to Tier 1 or at least the highest priority of Tier 2.

“Service response: The Service recognizes the conservation benefits of delisting activities for domestic and foreign species. Fees from trophy hunters can, in some cases, provide economic incentives for landowners to maintain healthy populations of game

JOHN J. JACKSON, III
Conservation Force



“SERVING THE HUNTER WHO TRAVELS”

World Conservation Force Bulletin

Editor/Writer
John J. Jackson, III
Publisher
Don Causey

Copyright 1998© by Oxpecker Enterprises Inc. ISSN 1052-4746. This bulletin on hunting-related conservation matters is published periodically free of charge for subscribers to *The Hunting Report*, 9300 S. Dadeland Blvd., Suite 605, Miami, FL 33156-2721. All material contained herein is provided by famed wildlife and hunting attorney John J. Jackson, III with whom *The Hunting Report* has formed a strategic alliance. The purpose of the alliance is to educate the hunting community as well as proadvocacy of hunting rights opportunities. More broadly, the alliance will also seek to open up new hunting opportunities worldwide and ward off attacks on currently available opportunities. For more information on Conservation Force and/or the services available through Jackson’s alliance with *The Hunting Report*, write:

Conservation Force
One Lakeway Center, Suite 1045
Metairie, LA 70002
Tel. 504-837-1233. Fax 504-837-1145.

For reprints of this bulletin or permission to reproduce it and to inquire about other publishing-related matters, write:

The Hunting Report
9300 S. Dadeland Blvd., Suite 605
Miami, FL 33156-2721.
Tel. 305-670-1361. Fax 305-670-1376.

species. It should be noted, however, that several foreign big game species are listed under the Act and import permits have not been issued for hunting trophies for species listed as endangered. A large percentage of international hunters are Americans who might invest in the hunting program if the species were not listed and import was permitted....

“The Service recognizes that listing, reclassifying from endangered to threatened, and delisting actions for foreign species are different, as the conservation benefits of those actions will be different than for domestic species.... The Service has placed delisting at the end of Tier 2 for domestic species, because the conservation benefits of delisting are indirect. For foreign species, particularly when trade is a factor affecting the status of a species, the Service will also take into consideration the international legal status of the species. Thus, for species listed in Appendix II of the Convention on International Trade of Endangered Species (CITES), an alignment of their listing status under the Act should be evaluated. There may be species listed in CITES Appendix II (which allows for regulated trade that is not detrimental to the survival of the species), for which there can be potential conservation benefits of such trade, such as when such trade is part of the management plan of the country of origin. In such cases, listing under the Act as endangered, which prohibits such trade, may have potential conservation detriment for some species. Certainly, the United States should endeavor, when possible, to recognize the conservation programs of foreign countries, when based on sound science (emphasis added).

“The Service expects to reclassify from endangered to threatened some foreign species or populations.... The Service also plans to finalize its review, pursuant to a petition, of the biological status of the cheetah to determine if it qualifies for reclassification from endangered to threatened.... (emphasis added)

“For foreign species only, within the limited allocation assigned to that function, those final determinations

that have potential for conservation benefit, and assist developing countries with the conservation and management of their species, will be of the highest priority within Tier 2 (as suggested by Conservation Force). Currently **proposed** listings and status determinations on petitioned foreign species have the next highest priority within Tier 2. Since the Service cannot develop recovery plans for foreign species, priorities for listing or delisting must by necessity take into account the conservation programs of other countries in determining which actions are of higher priority. In virtually all cases, the only nexus for the US is whether or not to allow importation of species, either for commercial or non-commercial purposes.” (emphasis added)

This means that the programs of for-



foreign nations are finally to be diplomatically accorded more consideration, including the cheetah downlisting petition of Namibia that has been pending since filed by my office years ago.

DATELINE: US WEST

News Analysis Wolf Uproar Creates A False Impression

The sensationalism and exaggeration of the plight of the introduced experimental population of wolves in and around Yellowstone National Park has created a false impression that they are the only wolves in the lower 48 states. Nothing could be further from the

truth. Agencies kill more wolves in the lower 48 states every year than are in the experimental Yellowstone populations. Take the case of the gray wolf in Minnesota, which USFWS may downlist soon. There are at least 2,200 of these wolves and at least 200 per year are euthanized by authorities. According to USFWS, the released Mexican wolves in the national forests of eastern Arizona are multiplying, and other wolf populations in Montana and Wyoming are healthy and expanding. The abundance of other wolves in Montana and Wyoming is best demonstrated by the recent draft reassessment of the USFWS Wolf Control Plan for the Northern Rocky Mountains for review and comment, noticed document availability at 63FR20212, April 23, 1998. The Wolf Control Plan has existed since 1988 in the Rocky Mountain areas. Its purpose is to “reduce the probability of wolf-livestock conflict which would allow people to tolerate wolves, thus enhancing the survival and propagation of wolves.” According to USFWS, “...the naturally occurring wolf population in northwest Montana has grown from about 26 wolves in 1987 to over 75 today.” This does not include the introduced Yellowstone population. There are so many naturally occurring wolves in the northwest Montana recovery area that the wolf packs have not increased in that area in the past five years. Instead, they are dispersing into other areas at a rapid rate. Since 1987, the northwest Montana wolves have killed 42 sheep, 51 cattle and five dogs on private property outside of the recovery area they are dispersing from. When they kill sheep or cattle they are captured and removed and in two instances they have been killed by the USFWS. No account whatsoever is taken when they kill natural prey such as game animals. That is not considered a “conflict.” The USFWS reports that “no problem wolf relocated to Glacier National Park has stayed in the Park.” The wolves in that park have actually declined as they kill one another and compete for space and prey. It has proven useless to relocate problem wolves, yet if problem wolves that

have killed sheep and cattle are not relocated or killed, they tend to increase their sheep and cattle killing. Wolves, including reintroduced experimental wolves in the central Idaho and Yellowstone experimental areas, have killed a total of 175 sheep and 61 cattle in the northern Rocky Mountains. Only a few of the wolves are the problem. Most of the cattle and sheep, 56 percent and 60 percent respectively, were killed by wolves that had killed before and been left or relocated. It should be made clear that the number of sheep and cattle they kill are inconsequential because they primarily feed on wild prey. It is interesting to note that when they do strike domestic animals it is a massacre. “During four depredations on sheep an average of 10.2 sheep were killed per depredation. The most sheep killed during one attack by wolves was 28, the most cattle seven.” The USFWS reports that in northwest Montana, “...wolf populations can sustain human-caused losses of up to 35 percent annually without declining (Fritts, et al. 1992)... The wolf population estimate over the past four years, including the 1997 estimate of 74 wolves, has underestimated the number of wolves and wolf packs.”

DATELINE: AFRICA

News... News... News

US Bars Trophy Shipments From Sudan

Hunting trophies and other shipments are not being allowed to be imported into the US as cargo from Sudan. President Clinton signed Executive Order 13067 on November 3, 1997 blocking and prohibiting transactions with Sudan, because of Sudanese support of international terrorism and various other acts contrary to US foreign policy. This means that trophies brought into the US as cargo are subject to seizure. No exception has been made exempting sport-hunting trophy cargo. The action was taken under various emergency powers of the President. One of the

statutes authorizing the action provides the President “shall” first consult with Congress but it is not clear he has done so. A willful violation of the prohibition subjects a person to a fine up to \$50,000 and 10 years in prison. The order remains in effect until revoked. Importation of “accompanied baggage for personal use” is not prohibited. It can’t be confirmed, but that may mean that if you carry your trophies with you as baggage instead of ship them as cargo, it is not prohibited.

And, Finally...

CIC and IGF: The International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC) had its 45th General Assembly in Prague, Czech Republic, in early May. It was held in the Czech Republic in honor of the organization’s creation there 70 years ago. The International Foundation for the Conservation of Wildlife (IGF) had a simultaneous Board meeting. Both organizations and their members have played a leading role in protecting hunting and wildlife conservation and continue to do so. It was CIC that spearheaded the passage of Resolution Conf. 2.11 at the second Conference of CITES that provides that sport-hunting trophies are not to be treated as commercial trade and thus can be imported even if the animal is listed

Conservation Force Sponsors

The Hunting Report and Conservation Force would like to thank International Foundation for the Conservation of Wildlife (IGF) for generously agreeing to pay all of the costs associated with the publishing of this bulletin. IGF was created by Weatherby Award Winner H.I.H Prince Abdorreza of Iran 20 years ago. Initially called The International Foundation for the Conservation of Game, IGF was already promoting sustainable use of wildlife and conservation of biodiversity 15 years before the UN Rio Conference, which brought these matters to widespread public attention. The foundation has agreed to sponsor Conservation Force Bulletin in order to help international hunters keep abreast of hunting-related wildlife news. Conservation Force’s John J. Jackson, III is a member of the board of IGF and Bertrand des Clers, its director, is a member of the Board of Directors of Conservation Force.



International Foundation for
the Conservation of Wildlife

on Appendix 1. CIC and IGF are present at every important international meeting. Bertrand des Clers, who is a leading Board Member of Conservation Force, is the Executive Director of IGF and the President of the Tropical Game Commission of CIC. I too serve as a Director of IGF and as a Vice President of the Tropical Game Commission of CIC. Both of us also serve on the important CIC ProHunters Action Alliance which is a working group to save hunting. Working together has provided an enormous benefit to hunters around the world. At the meeting, resolutions were adopted to coordinate actions of the leading hunting organizations to put a stop to discriminatory practices of importing countries against the entry of sport hunting trophies, to support the sustainable use of jaguar through sport hunting and other efforts to advance hunting and conservation through hunting. One adopted resolution opposes the adoption of unnecessary and costly barriers to exportation and importation of sport hunting trophies. That measure has already been circulated and endorsed by other important hunting organizations around the world such as FACE, which has 22 national delegations representing some 6.5 million hunters in Europe and from Dallas Safari Club, Safari Club International, IGF, Conservation Force and other endorsements that are still coming in. Working together as a unified force is benefiting everyone and the resource.

□

Travel Aid: Have you ever taken your shoes off on a long plane flight, then not been able to get them back on? After years of swollen lower legs and feet during long flights, I met a gentleman named Dr. Gray who explained that there are medical socks that prevent the collection of blood in the lower legs and feet. I tried them and they do work! They come in different colors and appear to be ordinary dress socks. They are “compression socks” that can be bought in any medical supply store. The name brand that my wife and I tried successfully was JOBST, medical legwear. - *John J. Jackson, III.*

“Serving The Hunter Who Travels”

MEMO

To: Jim Young, Print N Mail
From: Elaina Panozzo, Oxpecker Enterprises
Re: June 1998 Issue of Conservation Force Supplement

Jim,

Here's the file for the June 1998 issue of the Conservation Force Supplement, to be inserted in the June 1998 issue of The Hunting Report. Do not forget to insert John Jackson's picture on page 2. Please fax blue lines for approval ASAP.

Total print run is 4,150. That includes 4,000 copies for insertion into The Hunting Report (active circulation); and 50 copies to be shipped directly to Jackson. The remaining 100 copies are to be shipped to us here in Miami. As usual, bill John Jackson for all costs relating to Conservation Force.

Please call if questions -
Elaina