



Cambridge International AS & A Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH

9239/12

Paper 1 Written Exam

February/March 2025

INSERT

1 hour 30 minutes

INFORMATION

- This insert contains all the resources referred to in the questions.
- You may annotate this insert and use the blank spaces for planning. **Do not write your answers** on the insert.



This document has 4 pages. Any blank pages are indicated.

The following documents consider issues related to animal rights. Read them both in order to answer all the questions on the paper.

Document A: adapted from *End trophy hunting in South Africa, or we won't visit your country, say tourists*, an article written by Don Pinnock, published in 'Daily Maverick' (South Africa) in 2022. The author is a South African writer, investigative journalist, and photographer. He is a Research Fellow at the Centre of Criminology, University of Cape Town, South Africa. Daily Maverick is a South African daily online publication and weekly print newspaper.

Trophy hunting does not contribute to conservation. This senseless killing of wild animals is not only unethical and cruel, but also a disgrace to South Africa's reputation. The South African government is out of step with public opinion because it allows people to hunt wild animals for trophies, such as tusks and skins, to decorate their homes.

Trophy hunters run loud, expensive campaigns to convince the public they kill for conservation and the good of poor communities. However, two recent surveys revealed that trophy hunting is a threat to tourism in South Africa and that the public disagrees with trophy hunting.

World Animal Protection (WAP) commissioned research surveying 10,900 people from around the world, including international tourists from countries who most frequently visit South Africa. South African citizens were also surveyed. The findings showed that at least 84% of international tourists agree that the South African government should prioritise wildlife-friendly tourism over trophy hunting. Furthermore, at least 74% agreed that continuing to allow trophy hunting would damage South Africa's reputation. 72% said that trophy hunting would put them off visiting the country altogether.

A survey of 3,599 South African people by Humane Society International/Africa (HSI/Africa), also found considerable objection to trophy hunting. The survey asked people from all race and gender groups, six language groups and a range of ages and household incomes, both urban and rural. The survey noted that opposition to trophy hunting is more marked among the younger age group (15–17) at 79%, compared with 68% of those between 25 and 34. This trend was consistent across all results.

"Our new survey shows without a doubt," said HSI/Africa wildlife specialist Dr Matthew Schurch, "that most South Africans reject the unjustifiable practice of trophy hunting."

However, according to the Professional Hunters Register, thousands of foreign trophy hunters still fly into South Africa to shoot and kill every imaginable species of animal. These range from squirrels and African wild cats to the largest animals, such as elephants and hippos. They even target endangered aardvarks. Between 2016 and 2020, trophy hunters killed a staggering 174,000 animals from 83 species in South Africa.

WAP wildlife campaign manager, Edith Kabesiime, commented on the results of the WAP survey. She said it was clear the public understood that the "life of a wild animal is worth so much more than the trophy it is too often reduced to." This view was shared by tourists as well as South Africans who want to see the incredible wildlife protected. Kabesiime argues that the government needs to listen to South African voices who clearly want to see change.

Continuing to make wild animals shoot-to-kill targets at the mercy of wealthy tourists is outdated in a world where public attitudes are swiftly changing. Wildlife has the right to a life free from cruel commercial exploitation. Banning trophy hunting will improve South Africa's reputation. It will help to protect wildlife in South Africa and encourage the development of new conservation and wildlife-friendly alternatives for tourists.

Document B: adapted from *The story behind why Gilgit-Baltistan allows trophy hunting*, an article written by Babar Khan, Syed Muhammad Abubakar and Kundan Shrestha, published in 'The Express Tribune' (Pakistan) in 2021. The authors work for the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, an intergovernmental knowledge and learning centre that aims to empower people in eight regional countries including Pakistan. The Express Tribune is a newspaper based in Pakistan.

In 1989, Syed Yahya Shah – a local political and religious leader from the Bar Valley in Gilgit-Baltistan, northern Pakistan – came up with a rather unusual approach to conservation: helping the Siberian ibex in the valley thrive by allowing it to be hunted for its horns.

Trophy hunting was banned in Pakistan in the early 20th century. Before this, organised hunting expeditions during British rule had driven ungulates* to the brink of extinction. This was unfortunate because ungulates, such as the ibex and markhor, have great significance for local communities. These animals are a source of income, meat, and hides. Ungulates appear in folklore and the markhor is Pakistan's national animal.

So, Syed Yahya Shah proposed that the Bar Valley community should receive government permission to open their valley to commercial trophy hunting. Foreigners would pay to hunt a limited number of Siberian ibex each year in specific areas. The hunters would take the head with spiral horns as a trophy, while the community would keep the meat. The community would use the proceeds raised from trophy hunting to invest in wildlife conservation and community development. His proposal was forwarded to the International Union for Conservation of Nature for consideration.

There is much debate about the morality and economics of trophy hunting for conservation. Opponents argue that big-game hunting zones in Africa are being abandoned because big-game has been hunted out of these areas. They claim that the money intended for communities and conservation efforts ends up in the pockets of a few individuals. However, even major conservation organisations such as the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) argue that properly managed and science-based trophy hunting can benefit wildlife.

In 1989, Ashiq Ahmed Khan, an eminent conservationist visited the Bar Valley with representatives of the Gilgit-Baltistan Forest and Wildlife Department, and WWF. They went to evaluate Syed Yahya Shah's proposal. Studying the ibex population, Khan decided that for an ungulate to be considered for trophy hunting, it should be over nine years old, with horns larger than 40 inches. He predicted that hunting older male animals would do the least harm to the species. Khan concluded that through government-regulated trophy hunting, the community and wildlife conservation would benefit. The community-based trophy hunting programme was implemented in 1991.

Since the trophy hunting scheme has been operational there has been a huge increase in markhor and ibex populations across the mountainous region of Pakistan. The population of markhor in Gilgit-Baltistan increased from 1,900 in 2012 to 2,800 in 2016. There is also anecdotal evidence to suggest that trophy hunting has been beneficial for endangered species such as the snow leopard. The scheme has also led to better infrastructure and services for communities and supported conservation efforts. From 1995 to 2020, Pakistan received USD 4.86 million from the sale of trophy hunting permits for markhor. Of this, USD 4.3 million has been invested in the social, economic, and environmental development of the local communities.

Syed Yahya Shah's proposal received much scrutiny and evaluation before it was finally implemented. However, it is clear that there is much to admire and learn from the success of the community-based trophy hunting programme in Gilgit-Baltistan.

*Ungulates are large mammals with hooves.

BLANK PAGE

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

To avoid the issue of disclosure of answer-related information to candidates, all copyright acknowledgements are reproduced online in the Cambridge Assessment International Education Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations and is freely available to download at www.cambridgeinternational.org after the live examination series.

Cambridge Assessment International Education is part of Cambridge Assessment. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is a department of the University of Cambridge.