

ЧТО ВАЖНЕЕ — ЗАЩИТА ЖИВОТНЫХ-ХИЩНИКОВ ИЛИ ПОДДЕРЖКА ФЕРМЕРОВ И РЫБАКОВ, РАБОТАЮЩИХ НА НАШ УСТОЙЧИВЫЙ ЛАНДШАФТ?

Я. Бохач, доктор биологии, эколог

Республика Чехия

WHAT IS MORE IMPORTANT — PROTECTION OF ANIMAL PREDATORS OR SUPPORT OF FARMERS AND FISHERMEN WORKING FOR OUR SUSTAINABLE LANDSCAPE?

Jaroslav Boháč, Doctor of Biology, Ecologist

Czech Republic

Обсуждается конфликт между сохранением охраняемых видов в ЕС и экономическими проблемами. На примере сохранения баклана и конфликта с рыболовством.

Ключевые слова: сохранение видов, экономическое развитие, этика общества.

The conflict between the conservation of protected species in EU and economic problems is discussed. The cormorant conservation and conflict with fishery is done as example.

Keywords: species conservation, economical development, society ethics.

In the Czech Republic and in other EU countries, practically all wild species are protected from the point of view of the EU directive on the protection of wild plant and animal species and their habitats. In addition, each EU country has established specially protected species, the extinction, damage or destruction of their habitat is completely ruled out. In the event of damage, farmers and fishermen are provided with financial compensation.

Such conflicting species include, above all, large carnivores such as bears and wolves, and the fish-eating species cormorants and otters. Beaver protection has a very special position. All these species have significantly increased their range in recent years and there have been very significant conflicts between farmers and fishermen.

In the ecological and environmental protection part, the vision of the objectively determined so-called favorable state of the populations of the mentioned animals in sensitive areas is missing and the problems that may arise in the near future are not taken into account. For the time being, there will probably be a significant discrepancy between the ideas and goals of nature protection, administrative units and farms. The current and forthcoming plans for the care of protected predators are, above all, consistent with their name, and will probably arouse further tensions as the number of animals expands to other territories.

A key measure of the proposed care program for large carnivores in the Czech Republic is an extensive

educational and awareness-raising campaign, which should take place simultaneously at three different levels and which aims to change public opinion (see information asymmetry) and reduce the pressure of illegal hunting. It is required to improve the cooperation of nature protection with the Police of the Czech Republic in solving cases of illegal hunting.

There is a need for a more realistic assessment of the possibilities of preventive protection measures against damage, if in the case of a wolf (so far limited areas) it seems to be financially and organizationally demanding, and at the same time not completely effective. In the case of otters (almost the entire territory), preventive measures can be used only sporadically. In the case of bears (in case of sudden occurrence) and beavers, damage prevention is difficult and in the case of cormorants, ravens and wild cats, it is not feasible.

According to breeders, nature protectionists recommendations to use so-called other measures are technically difficult to solve and financially too demanding or unrealistic. The verdict then states that this has not been sufficiently used. However, the implementation of the so-called other measure can also be more costly than compensation for killed animals.

The natural predators of the existing protected selected animals have been reduced in our landscape, man as an end predator has prevented the spread of diseases and the protection has evoked a feeling of security,

a loss of shyness. This evokes the question of whether in some cases (territories) it is really a targeted return of wilderness, especially in the cultural landscape, or rather a certain way of monitored subsidized breeding.

On the other hand, sections of the public and most farms in predator areas are recommended to be widely publicized for injured animals as a realistic view of the situation, which, unlike professional predator marketing, has no real chance of success.

Impacts in the social field are mainly the changed lifestyle of many livestock breeders and inhabitants, especially wolf and other affected areas. These are mainly limited possibilities for property protection, restrictions on well-being, living space and freedom of business.

Apart from personal time and financial deposits, the effects are a considerable emotional burden. Experiences with infected animals in the corral — the idea that it is a natural process is not well received. They often show a reluctance to breed sheep, so-called fish for predator, and they often mind the different approach to farmed animals and predators.

The decisions made by conservationists do not always have a positive impact on the state of nature. The extent to which recreation, predators attacks or abandonment of pastoralism reduce the recreational value of the landscape, revenues from services, increase structural unemployment and other adverse events, is a task solved by a territorial institution.

Legislation is a significant variable on the part of nature conservation. Above all, it is a more responsible assessment of the public interest, another public interest that outweighs the public interest. The so-called public opinion, generally has a function of social control in society. It is a completely semantically neutral term when the term public has a different interpretation. Furthermore, the reality of achieving the goal by so-called other means. The issue of taking into account the wording of Act No. 114/1992 Coll. § 56 paragraph 2, especially a) in the interest of wildlife protection and protection of natural habitats, b) in the interest of prevention of serious damage, especially to crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, waters and other types of property. From what can the severity of the damage be deduced, for example? Injury, moral damage is also

unforgettable here. In the event of a dispute, the Ministry of the Environment will rather admit the nature conservation, resp. its organization AOPK (Agency for nature and landscape protection), the same department decides here. The territorial institution is also in the negotiations.

In connection with the expression and actions of some entities, let us recall the Charter of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms, Articles 16 to 18, inter alia, to protect reputation, guarantee freedom of speech, the right to information, the right to express their views, censorship is inadmissible. The use of the referendum, the right of petition for municipalities, should be an effective part of territory management.

Finally, let us present an opinion based on breeders and professional research activities. An overly generous, centralized system of support and subsidies from public funds is easily misused and leads to a waste of resources. The bureaucratic apparatus is not able to ensure the efficient use of grant funds.

A large inflow of money brings with it an increase in costs and a decrease in productivity. Centrally managed grant funds limit free decision-making (business activities, scientific topics, non-profit sectors), inefficient costs increase on the way to the target beneficiary and thus there is a disproportionate growth of non-profit activities, production reduction and thus reduction of public finances. The success of organizations should not be judged on the amount of subsidies obtained, but on the quality of the activities provided. Proper management of the landscape should lead to a reduction in the resources needed to protect it. The enormous increase in subsidies for nature protection means that it is not done properly, that the situation is deteriorating, that new problems are growing or that the goals are unrealistic (too megalomaniacal) and do not correspond to technical possibilities and the current state of knowledge. Science is often forced to resort to solving unrealistic goals or to focus on ideologically motivated policy-supported topics, instead of promoting free choice of topics and high quality benefits.

The issue of conflicts between the protection of specially protected species and fishermen will be demonstrated in more detail on the example of the cormorant (*Phalacrocorax carbo sinensis*).

Литература

1. Boháč J. Biologické, sociální a ekonomické hodnocení nástrojů managementu redukujících predaci kormorána v České republice, České Budějovice, ZF JU v Českých Budějovicích. 2006.
2. Boháč J. Biologické, sociální a ekonomické hodnocení nástrojů managementu redukujících predaci kormorána v České republice. Závěrečná zpráva o realizaci projektu MŠMT ČR. Zemědělská fakulta JU. 2008.
3. EP European Parliament resolution of 15 November 2017 on an Action Plan for nature, people and the economy (2017/2819(RSP)). 2017. <http://europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&reference=P8-TA-2017-0441&format=XML&language=EN>
4. European Commission: Research and Innovation. A Sustainable Bioeconomy for Europe: Strengthening the Connection between Economy, Society and the Environment, Updated Bioeconomy Strategy. 10.2777/792130. 2018.