

VLADISLAV K. MELNIKOV, Kirov/Russia

On the relativity of borders in hunting management and in game husbandry

Key words: Wildlife management, Russia, hunting season, game husbandry, hunting methods, game density, hunting tourism, hunting culture, hunting art

The scientific conference motto „Grenzen der Jagd – Jagd an der Grenze“ bears a philosophical trend and calls for discussion. It should be regarded as a great find of GWJF headquarters and the president, Professor Dr. M. Stubbe.

This issue is especially of current interest for hunting management and game husbandry and has academic and practical importance. We constantly come across the relativity of borders of the definitions used in legislation regarding hunt, hunting management and hunting husbandry in whole. There are examples of border relativity even within game animal systematics, within belonging of the animal to one or another country or region, speaking of species management borders. Understanding of relativity of different borders underlies the problem solving methods in game husbandry practice and activities of game management specialists. The procedures of game husbandry administration and hunter behavior management; exploited game population management methods; scientific and other recommendations will vary basing on such understanding. I shall try to set forth forcefully and show theoretical and practical importance of such approach with the example of Russia in the first place and also in comparison to other countries whenever possible. Needless to say I

make no pretence to expand the idea in full and leave some of my theses for my colleagues to discuss.

Let us start from examining the subject matter and structure of hunting management as a synthetic (interdisciplinary) science in traditional ideas of Russian hunting managers and German scientist K. LINDNER (1982), without contrapositioning. The subject matter in essence will be the same with only a few exceptions but the structure will be different (MELNIKOV, 2005). What should be at bottom of hunting management and what should we treat preferentially: the game animals, the hunt, the hunter and his interests or the hunting husbandry which includes all of the previous and other elements? Judging on the hunting management structure K. LINDNER presumes that the legal definition of the hunt and hunting methods doctrine are at the bottom of his ternary structure; though he pays attention to the equal importance of all elements (hunter and game animals). However by the example of the Snipe which has been excluded from the list of wild fowl in Germany from 01 April 1977 he shows that rule of law is relative. It can be voluntarily changed and can draw a new line between the wild fowl and non-game fowl at a definite time period. This

also holds true for the legal definition of hunt. If we do not admit the relativity – diversities in different countries can lead to miscommunication and even recriminatory disrespect at the worst. For the most of western European hunters it would most probably hard to acknowledge shooting wolves from the helicopter as legal hunt, as well as with the use of other technical means (different kinds of snowmobiles and vehicles) or with the use of poisons allowed in Russia and Kazakhstan. However the territory of Russia alone is at the present time the habitat for about 50 thousand wolves according to official figures. Twenty years ago their number was estimated at 7–10 thousand. Even more inhabit Kazakhstan and there are no other effective hunting methods against underpopulation (Siberia, Far East and other regions) to control the numbers of predator causing great damage. From the other hand although the pigeon hunt is statute-allowed it has not become widespread due to prevalence of Orthodox ideology. The pigeon is a „holy bird“; in countryside they often inhabit church bell-towers. Notwithstanding that the species is different and the people have been raised on 70 years of atheism the pigeon hunt is still a rarity in Russia. Approximately the same is with the lark hunt. The Larks are considered to be the ambassadors of incoming spring that is why hunting for larks causes ill feelings. We should learn to understand the relativity of such borders and possibilities of changing to gain understanding.

There is also another aspect important for us. The structure of hunting management by K. LINDNER turns this interdisciplinary science into hunting science which noticeably decreases its importance in the eyes of our legislators and statesmen who are unaware about the essence of the issue. «How can it be a science that teaches how to move the trigger? Is it worth to develop? – these are their questions. They suggest replacing the traditional term „hunting management“ for „protection, reproduction and efficient use of game animals“ which is the same in the essence. For the German professional hunting managers and hunters it goes without saying and it is needless to be separated within the structure of hunting management that protection of the game and its reproduction is in the first instance the aim of the hunters them-

selves and their associations and organizations. Without investing money and work you will have nothing to hunt for. We have to constantly demonstrate particularly to many professionals that the hunting management is the doctrine (knowledge) not only on the hunt itself but on game husbandry which doesn't exist without protection and reproduction of the game animals. We have to prove that due to this the game animals are „neither completely wild nor completely domestic“ using the deep philosophical and economical thought of K. LINDNER. This border is also relative. We encounter the relativity of the borders when the game animals are raised on farms, within small fenced territory, deal with half-restricted breeding or fur-breeding. The hunt itself of course is an important activity for the people and game husbandry but not the only one.

Consequently we have a right to put the hunter, his interests, hunting husbandry or game animals at the bottom of structure of hunting management as science and class discipline; and the form will change accordingly but the essence of hunting management will not change noticeably. In Russia the hunting husbandry is traditionally at the bottom of hunting management structure. Hunters, game animals and hunt are equal elements of the hunting husbandry. Notable the hunters are not pointed out directly but they are object of economy, administration, organization, legislation and sociology. Analysis of the hunting management essence customary for Russia and suggested by K. LINDNER shows that there are no important diversities but there are certain varieties in structure caused by different meaning of hunt and hunting husbandry in life of noticeable part of people. In Russia we also have to take into consideration meaning of the hunt for population of 26 small nations of far north. K. Lindner also acknowledged the relativity of his structure stating that we need to define purpose and intent of hunting management to gain necessary clarity; the purpose and intent can naturally vary in different countries. The law, legislation, enactments are really of great importance for the hunting husbandry, hunt and hunting management. They provide legal grounds for the development. I have performed comparative analyze of available laws controlling hunt and game management in many coun-

tries. They are of course different, but there is a lot of same. We can draw a conclusion that although the conditions of organizing the hunting husbandry are not the same, Russian experience and development of hunting husbandry are much closer to western European ones and completely differ from American model. But we have many followers of American way of game animal resource management and police exploitation control (the F&W Department is a part of the Department of the Interior). These are unacceptable for Russia. We cannot abolish or forbid traditions in this field as well as in many others. We can see similar concepts between hunting husbandry of Russia, Canada and Northern states of the USA regarding approaches to fur game resource development of trappers and our professional hunters in Siberia and Far East regions. However legislation regulating hunt and hunting husbandry is different in essence and this will determine actions of hunters bringing equally good results. This proves the relativity of borders of legal sphere influence upon hunting husbandry in whole. Thereupon we can again state that despite the differences the European experience, methods and cultural traditions are much closer for Russia. For example supplementary feeding of game animals is forbidden in several states of the USA, except for specialized farms (ranchos). In Russia intensive game husbandry for several hoofed species is impossible without such supplementary feeding due to harsh environmental conditions.

Boundary detection for conservancy area starts from definition of its status and goals. The Russian term for conservancy area is „zapovednik“, which means to forbid, to save unchanged certain nature object in order to observe and study occurring natural processes. There is also the other meaning – to save and pass important idea, spiritual and religious values. Although the official history of conservancy areas totals only about 100 years in Russia, the law has been always forbidding hunt or allowing it only for select circle of people – grand dukes, monarchs, their guests – in certain territories (Belovezhskaya Pushcha, Losiny Ostrov near Moscow). In Siberia, including Far East and Kamchatka there were about 70 territories registered where the hunt was traditionally forbidden by the lo-

cal people – khanty, evenki, eveny and others in the beginning of 20 century. Breakers were often executed.

In the following years the conception of most hunting conservancy areas' goals and borders has changed due to various reasons. They were created to conserve or reproduce the number of game animals. They were administrated by the special branch of the Head department of hunting husbandry and conservancy areas under the Government of the Russian Federation. The conservancy areas' goals were broadened; science divisions were created to study not only fauna but also flora. Limited agricultural activity was allowed in several of the reserves (harvesting and artificial biotic control, supplementary feeding, livestock pasturage, haying). Sometimes such activity has outreached the acceptance limits which drew criticism of the conservancy professionals. Part of the reserves including famous Belovezhskaya Pushcha in Belarus was granted the status of “hunting conservancy areas”. This was done under the guise of artificial biotic control necessity. This was outside the framework of conservancy areas' goals to organize hunting for VIP. Later several zones were separated within the reserves to improve conservation and organize biological data collection. The first one is strictly conserved area where people are allowed only at special routs. The second one is buffer zone where limited activity is allowed including hunting. Sometimes it is regarded as exploitation area. Several reserves including biosphere ones (Sayano-Shushenskiy) has created special game husbandries instead of this zone governed by conservancy area's administration. This is also typical for the reserves in Belarus. Separating of the zones (borders) with the different level of conservation has become a technical solution which allowed prohibiting any kind of hunting and agricultural activity at the strictly conserved area in order to accomplish the main goal of reserves. Hunting and limited agricultural activity is possible in national parks which were created in Russia comparatively recently.

The question of differentiation of conservation of nature, environment, and animals including game from one hand and the hunting husbandry from the other and their powers is highly im-

portant. The following ranking seems logical to me. The game animals are the part of the wildlife. Conserving them is a part of environment, an element of nature conservation. From the other hand the game animals are an important element of hunting husbandry, same as the hunting grounds are an important element of the environment in which we can also include the game animals. The rational hunting activity is impossible without conservation; that is why conservation should be regarded to as a function of hunting husbandry. Consequently the general questions, conservation principles for game animals and hunting grounds should be the part of nature conservation and correspondent legislation. However the conservation powers and legal acts should not prevail if conserving is not for the conservation itself. For the hunting husbandry conservation is a method of providing reproduction of game animals and maintenance of the hunting grounds quality. That is why these aspects of conservation and hunting husbandry powers in this sphere should be regulated by other legal acts meaning the economic law acts. The attempt to incorporate them into the general environment conservation concept or to neglect them at all leads to violation of interests of hunters and hunting husbandry, hamper its development. In Russia in administrative law this has lead to incapacitation of the hunters and professionals to protect game animals and hunting grounds from poaching and other violations and also to loss of efficiency of reproduction activities. This function was entrusted to the government substituting the supervisory functions by the administrative and economical, without possessing possibilities but substituting hunters and their associations (organizations). We can regard it to as a serious non-democratic retrograde step based upon improper differentiation of the nature conservation powers and hunting husbandry administration powers; improper understanding of their trans-border abilities, the priority of nature conservation in whole at the expense of hunting husbandry interests. From here the multi-level bureaucratic annual procedure of hunting season has formed basing upon: 1) carrying out of the federal environmental impact examination of quotas for main game species in every constituent entity of Russian Federation; 2) order of federal minister of agri-

culture; 3) special order of public authorities in every constituent entity of Russian Federation, often doubled by heads of municipal entities. At last level the decision of hunting season opening based upon necessity of game conservation is most subjective. According to our information there is no such procedure of hunting season opening in any other country of the world. Every year the season is opened for the same dates provided by the law without additional orders and examinations.

The limit of application of night vision scopes, military automatic arms, and electronic devices for hunting aims is closely connected with the juridical borders, law, cultural level and purposeful shaping of the „hunting“ mindset. Taking in mind the rational and civilized idea of fair hunting, usage of night vision scopes, military automatic arms, and electronic devices has to be forbidden. We have to limit the hitting range and wounding power of the arms. Is it rational to use the weapons allowing hitting the aim at 1.000 meters and even further? Within these limitations there can of course be several exceptions to the rules. Such can be killing of dangerous man-eaters (bears, tigers etc), rabid animals etc by special teams of professional hunters. This is also repletion of vital wants for small nations that live by hunting, fishing and gathering. For well known reasons they are not able to cause irreparable damage for game. However forbidding of such devices at hunt is a multivalued procedure. It demands for certain period of time and must be prepared by development of public conscience, of hunters' in the first place, and understanding by the legislators. 20 years ago only limited circle of people were able to buy a hunting rifle in Russia. In most cases these were people working in state and law-enforcement agencies, famous athletes shooters. Professional hunters usually were issued with guns for the hunting season. Quite recently our hunters received the right to legally buy the hunting rifles. A lot of models were manufactured basing upon the military standards and these were bought by a large number of hunters. The breach of the law in using these weapons became one of the reasons of decrease in the number of hoofed game.

Our hunters gained access to electronical calls and decoys and other devices and considered

this as technological progress inclusion. Let me point out that their use is still limited in Russia. At the present moment it is understood that it is necessary to limit the gun chamber volume from five rounds standard for Russia to three rounds for semiautomatic weapons although this will demand for remake. Due to this certain technical and economical problems arouse; not everyone is happy with suggested limitations; that is why we need certain transition period. Probably the use of such guns was allowed at some period of time before prohibition or limitation in Western Europe. I believe the same thing will happen in Russia. Anyways the use of electronical calls is already prohibited; now we need to take steps to prohibit their importation and manufacturing.

The purchase of the weapons by drug-users and mentally challenged persons is prohibited as stated in the special law of Japan and it must be prohibited everywhere as it posed a danger for society. I think it to be the only prohibition cause where there are no other options possible.

The state borders do not exist for migrating animals. They do understand and feel such borders if these are tied up with different level of irritation and peace, hunting. A lot of game animals understand and react to administrative and notial for them reserve zones' borders. They often concentrate within the reproductive zones where they are not troubled and migrate from the adjoining territories. Good husbandry managers use this fact and create special quiet zones for game. Usually such areas are situated within the border zones where the hunt is limited or prohibited. On the border of Tuva and Mongolia I was shown a wonderful colony of bar-headed geese which were nestling on the trees near the frontier picket. The birds paid no attention to the people nearby. Near the border of China where geese were not shot they were flying close to the land. Getting closer to the border of Russia they flew up and up. It is enough to disturb them for a day or two and they will leave the territory no matter whether it is borderline or inside. Wild boars, roe deer and other animals quite often get inside the engineer obstacles. Such fences limit their migration. They play a role of fence in South Africa almost allover the territory of the country. You

can see a rhino moving towards you but it will stop before reaching the fence. In most cases the number of animals including rear species will be higher in the bordering zones. Consequently we can come to conclusion that the borders of state or husbandries do affect animals in many ways. However things get more complicated when we talk about state and administrative borders of large countries due to different law regulation of migrating species. For some part of the year they inhabit one country and then move for the other part to another place. Besides the wild fowl in Russia you can see herds of caribou, moose population and sometimes roe deer in different regions, districts, republics in summer and in winter. Considerable part of moose moves from the bordering zones of Russia to Estonia for wintering; from eastern regions to Yaroslavl region; from northern republic of Komi to Kirov region and from there to southern republic of Tatarstan. In such a manner the resource of these and other game animals appear to be interstate, inter-district. And this calls for special hunting administration, consideration in several state and administrative regions, and sometimes coordination of the way, territory and quotas of production (sea bear, polar bear). Interstate many-sided agreements (conventions) are signed in order to deal with these issues. When the state or association is specially concerned due to impact of the conservation or hunting organization upon the public there are attempts made to make other countries limit hunting for the certain species. For example we know well about former complaints of Sweden societies toward Russia due to the attempts of our hunting and state organizations to control the number of wolf. Total number of moose in Russia is only 2–2,5 times more than in Sweden and the number of wolf is almost 420 times more and they migrate in great numbers from Mongolia and Kazakhstan. Why should we conserve wolf in such numbers taking in mind the number of hoofed mammals population? Of course such claims are not reasonable. That is why we offered to present several dozens of species to improve the destroyed population about 20 years ago when there were almost no wolves in Sweden. At the present moment the situation is stable and a small number of wolves are harvested in Sweden.

Swedish hunters used to come to Kirov region to gain wolf hunting experience. Even more decided against them are the societies in Norway. A bit different but still disputed is the situation with the spring woodcock hunt prohibited in European countries but traditional for us. In Russia we harvest a very limited number of birds during ten days of the season which are not always during mass arrival of woodcock. It is immeasurably less than the number of birds being harvested in winter time in France, England or other countries. Such facts call for harmonization of relationships between hunters and hunting associations of different countries regarding the issues described and other disputed ones. They need to start making arrangements as it is a lot easier to understand each other at this level than at the level of official state bodies.

Things are even more complicated with the impact of the inner administrative borders of Russia upon organization of hunting husbandry and hunters. The claims of bordering administrative entities within Russia for the same game resources usually do not arouse. However federal supervising bodies of Nature resource ministry consider game animals only as a natural resource inhabiting certain bordering territory. They create bureaucratic arrangement for carrying out annual federal state quota examination of the main game species within every administrative entity of Russia. After that these quotas are confirmed by the Ministry of agriculture. Such controlling arrangements do not exist in any other country of the world and complicate the activity of hunting associations and hunters which can not predict whether the hunt will start or not, how many licenses they will be able to receive for every species. Of course this gives evidence that the legal acts controlling hunting activities are not perfect and not democratic. The legal acts limit the rights and initiatives of the hunters. Taking Russia as an example we see the negative collateral impact of administrative borders upon hunters and their associations which are mostly interested in conserving and reproducing the game.

The hunting quotas for game are quite relative. They are determined by the species reproduction characteristics, environmental conditions, the level of hunting activity and its intensity, hunting culture, legal and agricultural limita-

tions which of course change. In the 60-s of the 20th century we were amazed by the high quotas for game animals in Germany, Sweden, Czech Republic, Slovakia and other countries. They exceeded and still do exceed the recommended and approved Russian quotas sometimes for 2–3 times. In Sweden 30 % of autumn number of moose was harvested, in Russia – no more than 10–15 %, and even less in Siberia. In Lithuania and Latvia the quota level is 20–23 %. And the population number compared to density of population in Western Europe is amazing for a lot of hunting managers. The quota for the roe deer in these countries is 30 % and even 40 % while in Russia we cannot exceed the limit of 10–15 %. The same is with wild boar and deer. Our specialists estimate possible volume of incremental product that we could receive with the same population density level. The authorities demanded to provide such density and in order to do so forbid hunting in such regions as the Cis-Ural where depth of the snow reaches 1 m and more. The hunt was forbidden up to reaching „necessary population density level“ oriented for other conditions. For the roe deer including the Siberian Roe Deer this minimum level was estimated by the famous specialist A. A. DANILKIN (2006) at the level of 20 species per 1000 ha. Selective take is allowed after exceeding this level meaning the level of 21–50 per 1000 ha. The population density needs to be increased up to twice as much at average but not up to the level of Germany and Sweden. Of course the means should be other, not so prohibitive. Until that time the roe deer hunt on the most part of territory of Russia has to be closed most probably forever. These improper practical and theoretical conclusions can be made when the hunting quotas are thought to be invariable, independent of certain conditions. The relativity of the comparison method used for validation of conclusions contributes to it. In their turn they lead to improper mostly forbidding decisions that contribute to development of uncontrolled social processes (poaching, decrease of hunters' activity, etc). Actually the density of hoofed mammals in Russia is lower due to harsh environment, their death rate is higher due to different reasons including the number of wolf and other predators, and the survival rate is lower. I usually joke that if

the Siberia had the same living conditions as China which is situated more to the south – the population density of the people would be the same too. At the present moment it is 200 times lower.

The borders of the hunting quotas for foreign hunting tourism are relative in the way. It is all according to economical importance of this field of hunting husbandry in the country and region, to traditions and interest of the local and foreign hunters, to match of their goals or contradictions. In some countries there are special quotas for the foreign countries reaching up to 15–25 % of quota for game animals. Also the period of validity of the hunting license for the foreign hunters can be limited by the certain time period: 10, 14, 30 days etc. Sometimes there can be several such periods within the year. These are not established in Russia. Taking in consideration relatively small numbers of foreign hunters in our country, that is no more than 6 thousand per year (this number is the same for Namibia), the 5 % quota limit will be enough for them if we need to establish it. This can be done to comfort the resident hunters only since due to the tourism development the idea has appeared about impairment of local hunters' interests. Actually there is no essential impairment of local hunters' interests; they only gain from this activity. The tourism profit contributes to the economics of local hunting associations. They use the infrastructure created for the foreign hunters and the results of game husbandry intensification and its development which are necessary for stable work and improvement.

In several African countries (Namibia, Botswana, Tanzania) the agreement with the local people is required to rent the hunting grounds. Local people have to stop hunting and limit livestock breeding. In this case the upper limit of hunting tourism quota will reach almost 100 % of license quotas, because the poaching is not eliminated in full. Local people are satisfied with it because they get all meat of the harvested animals – that is the goal of hunting for them – and up to 50 % of trophy cost. Part of the locals take part in serving foreign hunters as trackers, cooks, skimmers and other assistants which provides additional earnings for them. Considering payments into treasury this trend

becomes an essential investment in economics for some of the developing countries. The similar approach proved to be true for Pakistan where the locals were stimulated financially to struggle with the poachers. This led to increase in number of rear species and hunt become possible. Other countries take in-between position, but several of them including European (Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania) are traditionally oriented to foreign hunting tourism as a most efficient trend of game husbandry.

As we can see from these examples there are practically no borders for the development of the hunting tourism. It contributes to the development of the mutual understanding between hunters and people from different countries, to improvement of the business, hunting, friend and family contacts. This is a very important goal of hunting tourism. The real border of its ability depends upon the acceptable standard of game resource exploitation which must provide for stable reproduction. Quite often this leads to the intensification of game husbandry, restoration of wildlife number, special reproduction and stimulates the development of science.

The process of hunting, game animals, dogs, equipment, hunting trophies, the design of hunters' houses were always of interest for artists, sculptors, photographers and writers. The hunt plot became the element of feature and nonfiction films, not to mention special advertising and informative films about hunting in different countries for various species, about hunters' way of life. Due to the specifics of musical art the hunt was lesser pictured in music. It is usually hunting hymns, hunting songs, although hunting people have special music for traditional rituals and dance. Most probably this art can be regarded as one of the most ancient, same as cave art, however it was impossible to document it at that period.

With gradual development of culture, art, literature, the importance of the game animals and hunting in lives of the grand people and others – the themes, style, fashion and forms of expression changed. However it was in the picture in the art of all developed cultures of the ancient world, medieval ages, not to mention our time. We can find hunting motives on surviving panels, frescos, stelae that decorated civil and ceremonial buildings in India, ancient states

of Central Asia, northern Africa, Mediterranean and America. We can find such motives in household items and accessories which formed the whole trend known as „animal style“. Hunting motives are widely shown in art and literature of the medieval Europe and Russia, as we can judge upon the special and fiction literature, art galleries and museums, the traditional crafts of all peoples. I found hunting motives practically in every museum and art gallery of every large town in Russia and any other country while gathering information for this peculiar theme as suggested by professor PAVL HELL several decades ago. I am no art historian however I made a conclusion that the hunting motives in every trend of art are practically boundless. The borders are determined only by the imagination and experience of the artists, sculptures and other craftsmen. The limitations can be set only by philosophical and theological prohibitions, traditions and economical abilities of the authors, by the needs of the society and clients. However there have always been creative individuals that neglected any kind of prohibitions.

And in total we can state with confidence that all kind of borders in game management and hunting husbandry are relative. This is a general rule with few exceptions.

Summary

Relativity of boundaries between game management and hunting husbandry

Mutual understanding between different specialists working in different countries and conditions depends greatly on correct interpretation of relativity of two terms: game management and hunting husbandry. In the article there is an author's standpoint regarding such boundaries on several coinciding directions, given by the conference organizers.

The comparison of game management structures proposed by K. Lindner and those of Russian game managers shows their slight difference, but on basic grounds it is of the same nature, which is more vital. The difference in the structure is caused by other meaning of hunt and hunting husbandry in life of significant part of

Russian population, especially important in life and material culture of 26 minor populations of the Far North.

Taking wolf as an example, which numbers on the territory of Russia are about 50 thousand species, shows that the effective limitation of quantity is impossible without the use of aviation and other motorized vehicles, forbidden in other countries. On the other hand, in Russia there is no hunt on larks on ethic and religious reasons and pigeon hunt is not so widespread.

Analyses of the law on hunt and hunting husbandry in the countries of West and East Europe, North America and others results in the conclusion, that despite unlikeness of hunting management conditions, the experience and its development in Russia is closer to west-european way and fundamentally differs from american model of police control.

Analysed is the evolution of aims and propositions of national reserves in Russia and Belorussia from total prohibition to the creation of buffer areas and hunting husbandries on the borders of reserves controlled by the administration and to limited or dominant economic activity.

The limitations on the use of night viewing devices, military automatic guns and electronic devices must be maximized. In Russia it demands a certain amount of time and must be preceded by the development of public mind, firstly among the hunters who have adapted to technical achievements and among legislators.

There are no national boundaries for migratory animals. The latter started to get aware of the ones if they go together with different disturbance rates like hunting. The same situation for the wild animals is with the relativity of reserve borders, reproduction areas and national parks there they are not disturbed. They are seldom got concentrated in such places moving to adjoining areas. Applied are several examples of the reaction of wild animals on state and inner borders. The hunting husbandry is impossible without animal protection, that's why it should be regarded as a function of the husbandry. General statements of hunting animals' protection are a part of the environmental law. But legal acts on their protection must not dominate if the protection is for the sake of protection. In Russia such domination of state environment

Реюме

Об относительности границ в охотоведении и охотничьем хозяйстве.

В.К.Мельников

От правильного понимания относительности границ в охотоведении и охотничьем хозяйстве зависит взаимопонимание специалистов, работающих в различных условиях в разных странах. В статье приводится позиция автора об относительности таких границ по нескольким важным направлениям, предложенным организаторами конференции. Сравнение структур охотоведения, предложенных К.Линднером и российскими охотоведами, показывает, что они несколько различны, но содержание, что значительно важнее, принципиально одно и то же. Различия в структуре, вызваны другим значением охоты и охотничьего хозяйства в жизни значительной части населения в России, особенно важным в жизни и материальной культуре 26 малых народов Крайнего Севера.

На примере волка, численность которого на просторах России составляет около 50 тыс. особей, показывается что эффективное ограничение численности его невозможно без применения авиации, других механизированных средств, запрещенных в других странах. С другой стороны в России по этическим и религиозным причинам не практикуется охота на жаворонков, не получила распространения охота на голубей.

Анализ законодательства об охоте и охотничьем хозяйстве стран Западной и Восточной Европы, Северной Америки и других позволяет сделать вывод, что, несмотря на неодинаковые условия ведения охотничьего хозяйства, опыт и развитие его в России ближе к западно-европейскому пути и в принципе отличаются от американской модели полицейского контроля.

Анализируется эволюция целей и задач заповедников в России, Белоруссии от полного запрета охоты (заповедать – запретить) до создания буферных зон, охотничьих хозяйств на границах заповедников, руководимых их администрацией, до ограниченной или преобладающей хозяйственной деятельности.

Пределы применения на охоте приборов ночного видения, боевого автоматического оружия, электронных приспособлений должны быть максимально ограничены. В России это требует определенного времени и должно быть подготовлено развитием общественного сознания, в первую очередь у охотников, которые «приобщились» к техническим западным достижениям, понимания у законодателей.

Государственные границы для мигрирующих животных не существуют. Они их ощущают и понимают, если такие границы совпадают с разным режимом беспокойства или охоты. Точно также многие охотничьи животные понимают и соответствующим образом реагируют на административные, условные для них границы заказников, зон покоя, воспроизводственных участков, заповедников, где их не беспокоят. Они нередко концентрируются в таких местах, перемещаясь из сопредельных территорий. Приводится несколько примеров реакций различных животных на межгосударственные и внутренние границы. Охотничье хозяйство невозможно без охраны животных, поэтому ее следует рассматривать как функцию этого хозяйства. Общие вопросы охраны охотничьих животных – часть природоохранного законодательства. Но правовые акты по их охране не должны доминировать, если охрана осуществляется не ради охраны. В России доминирование природоохранительной государственной функции привело в административном праве к лишению охотников и работников охотхозяйств возможности охранять охотничьих животных и от браконьеров, к серьезному ущемлению их прав.

Относительность границ, нормативов рассматривается на примере уровня допустимого использования охотничьих животных в разных условиях, в том числе и для целей охотничьего туризма, который способствует развитию взаимопонимания между охотниками и народами различных стран, укреплению деловых, охотничьих, дружеских, в том числе семейных контактов. И в этом чрезвычайно важная роль его.

protection function has resulted in administrative law in deprivation the hunters and game managers of the opportunity to protect hunting species from poachers, limits their rights. The relativity of the boundaries and rules is shown on the example of the level of acceptable use of hunting animals in different conditions including the aims of hunting tourism, which encouraged the development of understanding between hunters and local people of different countries, also serves to consolidation of business, hunting, friendship and other contacts. Here is its main role.

Zusammenfassung

Über die Relativität von Grenzen im Jagdmanagement und in der Wildtierbewirtschaftung

Die Grenzen der Jagd, des Wildtiermanagements und der Wildhege werden in ihrer akademischen und praktischen Bedeutung am Beispiel Russlands und im Vergleich zu Europa und Nordamerika analysiert. Die Jagd von Hubschraubern oder mit Motorschlitten auf Wölfe ist in Russland und Kasachstan bei einem gegenwärtigen Bestand von ca. 50.000 Tieren ganz legal, für Westeuropa kaum vorstellbar. Die Jagd auf Schnepfen und anderes Flugwild, besonders die Frühlingsjagd, fußt auf unterschiedlichen Naturbedingungen und ökonomischen, religiösen und kulturellen Traditionen. Dagegen wird der Jagd auf Tauben (heiliger Vogel) in Russland kaum nachgegangen. Dennoch hat die Jagd in Russland mit dem übrigen Europa viele Gemeinsamkeiten, im Gegensatz zu jener in den nordamerikanischen Regionen. Die Traditionen von 26 nationalen Minderheiten und Völkern des Hohen Nordens gilt es auch in Zukunft zu achten.

Die Bedeutung von Schutzgebieten, Zapovedniks, und ihre historische Entwicklung werden hervorgehoben. Jäger haben wichtige Funktionen des Ressourcenschutzes und der Abwehr der Wilderei übernommen. Seit 20 Jahren ist der Erwerb von Jagdwaffen wesentlich erleichtert worden, was andererseits zum Rückgang mehrerer Wildarten geführt hat. Das war Veranlassung, dass halbautomatische Waffen

nur noch mit Magazinen für drei Patronen gebaut werden. Die Jagd mit Nachtsichtgeräten und anderen unerlaubten technischen Hilfsmitteln sowie mit vollautomatischen Militärwaffen wird abgelehnt.

Wildarten in Grenzregionen und Meeren sowie migrierende Arten werfen spezielle Aspekte Länder übergreifender Verständigung auf. Über die Jagd- und Naturschutzadministration, anders als in Westeuropa, werden die jährlichen Quoten zur Wildnutzung festgelegt. Es gibt immer noch zu viele administrative Hürden in der jagdlichen Praxis. Insgesamt ist das Nutzungsprozent von Wildarten wie Elch, Reh und Wildschwein, gemessen an der Bestandsgröße, in Russland weit geringer als in Nord- und Westeuropa. Außerdem sind die Wilddichten und Überlebensraten bei hohen Wolfsdichten und infolge harter klimatischer Bedingungen sowie unerlaubter Wilderei in Russland viel geringer. Etwa 6000 ausländische Jäger kommen pro Jahr nach Russland. Dem Jagdtourismus wird eine positive Rolle im Rahmen der Völkerverständigung zugewiesen. Jagd und jagdbare Tiere haben seither Kultur, Kunst und Literatur in großer Motivwahl grenzüberschreitend bereichert, so auch in Russlands Literatur, Galerien und Museen.

Literatur

- DANILKIN, A.A. (2006): Dikie kopytnye v ochotnič'em chozjajstve (osnovy upravlenija resursami). – Geos, Moscow.
- LINDNER, K. (2004): Ochotovedenie: sovremennoe položenie i klassifikacija discipliny. (Perevod A.P. SAVELJEVA et al.: Zarubežnyj opyt ochotnič'ego chozjajstva). – Ochotovedenie No. 5 (52): 166–175, Kirov.
- MELNIKOV, V.K. (2005): O strukture ochotovedenija. – Biologičeskie resursy: sostojanie, ispozvanie, ochrana. – Kirov, 27–30.

Anschrift des Verfassers:

Prof. Dr. VLADISLAV K. MELNIKOV
(Außerordentliches Mitglied der GWJF)
Agricultural Academy
Engelstr. 107–49
610046 Kirov/Russia
E-Mail: vkmelnikov@yandex.ru

ZOBODAT - www.zobodat.at

Zoologisch-Botanische Datenbank/Zoological-Botanical Database

Digitale Literatur/Digital Literature

Zeitschrift/Journal: [Beiträge zur Jagd- und Wildforschung](#)

Jahr/Year: 2008

Band/Volume: [33](#)

Autor(en)/Author(s): Melnikov Vladislav Konstantinovic

Artikel/Article: [On the relativity of borders in hunting management and in game husbandry 57-66](#)