

Origins Foundation “100 Proofs” - Case Study Analysis

Case study	What it is used to demonstrate	Specific Issue	Evidence needed to substantiate the claim
1. The Quota Conundrum: South Africa	Hunting quotas create economic incentives for private landowners to retain wildlife and protect habitat.	This conflates economic incentive with conservation necessity. Economic projections do not by themselves demonstrate that hunting is necessary to retain habitat or that hunting produces a net conservation benefit.	Comparable properties without hunting; before/after population and habitat data; hunting revenue reinvested in conservation; alternative income models; independent ecological assessment.
2. Exposing the Lies / Trophy Hunters Causing Extinction	Trophy hunting does not necessarily cause species extinction.	Showing that hunting does not drive a species to extinction is not the same as demonstrating a conservation benefit. Populations can remain extant while experiencing demographic, genetic or social impacts.	Population trends, demographic structure, genetic effects, social effects and comparison with non-hunted populations.
3. Quail Research in Oklahoma	Hunter-generated funding supports quail research and management.	This demonstrates that hunting-related money can fund conservation. It does not demonstrate that killing quail is itself conservation. The conservation mechanism is research and habitat/wildlife management.	Evidence that the hunting activity itself, rather than the funding mechanism, produces a net conservation benefit; comparison with alternative funding sources.
4. New Zealand Eastern Whio Link	Hunters and fishermen helped establish predator trapping that contributed to recovery of whio (blue duck).	This is a genuine conservation success, but the mechanism is predator control, habitat protection, monitoring and volunteer action - not hunting whio. It is better evidence that hunters can participate in conservation than that hunting is conservation.	Whether equivalent outcomes could be achieved through non-hunting funding and participation; quantify the specific contribution attributable to hunting.
5. Zimbabwe Elephant Poaching at a Low	Reduced poaching is presented as evidence of hunters' conservation contribution.	A reduction in poaching does not demonstrate that hunting caused the decline. Many factors can influence poaching, including enforcement, intelligence, ranger deployment, economic conditions and community programmes.	Before/after and control-area data; hunting revenue and expenditure; ranger numbers; enforcement data; other interventions and alternative explanations.
6. Pakistan Markhor	Trophy hunting generates community income and incentives while markhor populations recover.	One of the stronger cases, but recovery is associated with a broader community-based conservation system involving local governance, anti-poaching, habitat protection, quotas and revenue-sharing. One specific model cannot automatically be generalised to trophy hunting everywhere.	Separate effects of community governance, habitat protection, anti-poaching and hunting; compare with similar community conservation areas without trophy hunting.
7. Economic Impact of Trophy Hunting in Africa	Hunting generates substantial economic activity and employment.	This supports an economic claim, not necessarily a conservation claim. Economic impact and ecological benefit are different measures.	Independent conservation outcomes; revenue distribution; opportunity costs; comparison with photographic tourism and other wildlife-based enterprises.
8. How Trophy Hunting Helps Protect Biodiversity: Scientific Proof from South Africa	Scientific evidence is presented as proof that trophy hunting protects biodiversity.	The word 'proof' is stronger than the evidence normally permits. A causal conservation benefit requires comparisons and accounting for ecological costs, management differences and confounding factors. South Africa's selective game breeding also raises biodiversity concerns.	Independent studies; comparison areas; population and genetic data; habitat outcomes; transparent financial flows; ecological-cost assessment.
9. Ecosystem Decay Intensifies Biodiversity Loss	Unmanaged wildlife populations can degrade ecosystems, supporting active hunting/management.	The ecological premise may be valid, but it does not establish recreational hunting as the appropriate response. Management can involve translocation, habitat manipulation, predator restoration, fertility control or scientifically justified lethal control.	Evidence that recreational hunting is necessary or superior to alternative management methods in the specific ecosystem.
10. Pride in Protection: Anti-poaching	Hunter support funds anti-poaching and protects wildlife.	The conservation intervention is anti-poaching. Hunter funding demonstrates a financial contribution, not that recreational killing is itself conservation.	How much funding comes from hunting; what reaches the field; alternative funding sources; measurable conservation outcomes attributable to the programme.
11. Proof in Action: Anti-poaching During Crisis	Hunting funds sustain anti-poaching during difficult periods.	The claim needs financial and causal transparency. 'Hunter-funded' can sound more causally important than the evidence establishes unless the contribution and resulting outcomes are quantified.	Funding breakdowns; field expenditure; ranger deployment; poaching rates; comparison with periods/areas with different funding sources.

12. The Profound Impact of Hunting: Heart Morass	A hunter's involvement in purchasing/restoring degraded wetland demonstrates hunting's conservation value.	The conservation achievement is habitat restoration. The case demonstrates that an individual associated with hunting supported wetland conservation; it does not establish that killing wildlife was necessary to produce the restoration.	What portion of restoration depended on hunting; whether the same investment could have come from other motivations/funding; ecological outcomes over time.
13. Lions in Africa: Human-Wildlife Conflict Is Real	Lions can create serious problems for rural communities.	The underlying problem is real, but establishing human-lion conflict does not establish recreational trophy hunting as the appropriate solution. Problem-animal management and recreational hunting should not be conflated.	Evidence comparing lethal control, trophy hunting and non-lethal conflict mitigation; outcomes for people, livestock and lion populations.
14. The Reality Many Rural African Communities Face	Rural communities experience economic hardship and wildlife conflict.	Community hardship deserves serious consideration, but it does not automatically validate hunting as the preferred economic solution. Critical issues are revenue distribution, community control, consent and alternatives.	Who receives the money; household-level benefits; governance and consent; long-term community outcomes; comparison with non-consumptive wildlife enterprises.
15. Man-Eating Lion Spurs Urgent Hunt	A dangerous lion was hunted to protect human lives.	An individual lion posing an immediate threat is a human-wildlife conflict and public-safety issue. Lethal removal may sometimes be justified, but it provides little evidence for recreational trophy hunting as a conservation strategy.	Evidence of the threat, alternatives considered, and clear separation between conflict management and recreational hunting.
16. Duiker Saved	Hunter money funded an anti-poaching team that rescued a snared duiker.	The duiker was saved because an anti-poaching team removed a snare. The conservation action was rescue and anti-poaching; the hunting connection is the funding source. This clearly illustrates the distinction between hunting funding conservation and hunting being conservation.	Whether the same work could be funded through non-hunting sources; quantify hunting's contribution and the conservation outcome.

Key analytical distinction: Several case studies may demonstrate that hunting-related money, participation or advocacy can support a conservation project. That is not necessarily evidence that killing wildlife is itself the conservation intervention. The key counterfactual is whether the same conservation outcome could be achieved through non-hunting funding or management.