

UNIVERSITY OF THE PEOPLE

BUS 1103-01 Microeconomics- AY2024-T1

Written Assignment Unit 5

Instructor: Galin Todorov

Choose one of the approaches listed below on protecting elephants from poachers in African countries.

A. The government sets up enormous national parks that have sufficient habitat for elephants to thrive and forbids all local people to enter the parks or to injure either the elephants or their habitat in any way.

B. The government sets up national parks and designates ten villages around the park's edges as official tourist centers that become places where tourists can stay and bases for guided tours inside the national park.

I believe approach B is more effective for protecting elephants while also supporting local communities. Banning all villagers from parks, like approach A, harms impoverished locals who depend on park resources. Designating approved tourism villages creates incentives to conserve elephants while benefiting people.

Depending on the approach you have chosen (A or B), explain how the incentives will affect the local villagers, who are often very poor.

Approach A would severely limit villagers' access to food, water, grazing, and plant resources inside protected areas. These communities already struggle economically. Losing access to sustenance sources and traditional lands would exacerbate poverty and provoke resentment against elephants. Poaching could intensify as people feel excluded from conservation efforts.

In contrast, approach B integrates select villages into tourism infrastructure. Villagers gain employment as guides, drivers, hotel staff, vendors, etc. Tourism spending circulates in local

economies. This provides incentives to preserve nearby elephant habitats since communities directly profit from elephant conservation. Educating visitors also cultivates advocates worldwide.

Which approach (A or B) seems more likely to help the elephant population?

Approach B seems more likely to sustain elephant populations over the long term. Outright banning of locals ignores that communities have coexisted with wildlife for generations. Leveraging local knowledge through regulated ecotourism balances preservation with sustainable use of resources. When people benefit from live elephants through tourism, they have a stake in protecting habitats rather than decimating populations through poaching.

Discuss the practice of poaching elephants and the need for environmental protection?

Poaching involves illegally hunting or capturing protected wildlife like elephants for skins, ivory, meat, trophies, etc. It has reached crisis levels, threatening extinction for endangered animals. Protecting species requires preventing poaching and habitat destruction.

Explain how the practice of poaching elephants is a negative externality?

Poaching exemplifies a negative externality - private actors like poachers impose costs on society. They reap private gains from selling elephant parts. But this decimates a public good - elephants' existence. The loss of biodiversity and weakened ecosystems harm the broader public who value conservation. However, poachers don't internalize these external costs. So regulation is needed through bans, law enforcement, and community engagement like approach B.

In summary, supporting local economic development through conservation creates shared incentives for environmental protection. This can make preservation sustainable long-term versus short-sighted poaching. A balanced approach respects traditional ways of life while transitioning communities into conservation allies.

Reference:

Greenlaw, S. A. & Shapiro, D. (2018). Principles of microeconomics, 2e. Open Stax Rice University. <https://d3bxy9euw4e147.cloudfront.net/oscms-prodcms/media/documents/Microeconomics2e-OP.pdf>

Word count: 554