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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

1. The Scottish Government conducted a public consultation concerning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses in Scotland, which ran for 12 weeks between January 2014 and April 2014. The purpose of this consultation was to identify any ethical concerns the public may associate with the use of wild animals in travelling circuses, consider how any such issues identified could be resolved and, in particular, gauge public support for, or opposition to, a possible Scottish ban on the use of these animals on ethical grounds. For the purposes of this consultation, “wild animals” were defined as those not commonly domesticated in Great Britain.

2. The issue of wild animals in travelling circuses has been a source of longstanding unease to many people. The 2007 report of the Chairman of the Defra Circus Working Group - the “Radford Report”, referred to in detail in the consultation document, concluded that there was insufficient evidence to support a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses on welfare grounds. However, the Report also noted that this did not preclude there being a welfare issue and indeed stated that the status quo was not a tenable option. This conclusion, in line with a shift in scientific and wider attitudes to animal welfare to actively seek to promote a positive life for animals in addition to preventing their suffering, has led to the consideration of alternate legal approaches regarding the use of these animals.

3. The consultation was an open access, web-based survey consisting of 24 questions that focused specifically on 3 main areas; respect for animals, the travelling environment and ethical costs and benefits; however, questions on what possible financial impacts a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses might have on the circus industry and the wider entertainment industry were also included. Additionally, the consultation gave the public a forum to raise any further ethical points for consideration. Active promotion of the consultation was conducted via email marketing and press coverage and a total of 2043 responses were received.

Respect for Animals

4. The vast majority of respondents believed that the exhibitions and performances required of wild animals in travelling circuses did compromise respect for the animals concerned (89.5% of respondents) and had an adverse impact on the development of respectful and responsible attitudes towards animals in children and young people (94.7% of respondents). While it was clear from respondents' comments that the concept of ‘respect’ had a broad spectrum and meant different things to different people, the key messages were that forcing wild animals to perform tricks for the entertainment of the paying public was demeaning for the animals, compromised their dignity and lessened respect for them. Even if they were treated particularly well, it was considered to be inherently disrespectful in today’s society to hold wild animals captive in an unnatural environment that could not cater for their complex needs. Because of the nature of circuses, 94.7% of respondents...
did not consider that the situation could be remedied by anything other than a complete ban on the use of these animals in travelling circuses.

5. In direct contrast, a minority of respondents, including groups affiliated to the circus industry, were strongly opposed to a ban, being adamant that wild animals in travelling circuses enjoyed a high quality of life which, because of the close, caring bonds that developed between animal and trainer, was actually enriched by training and performance. These respondents maintained that a robust regulatory system with strict monitoring, evaluation and enforcement should be put in place and this would properly secure the welfare and dignity of the animals.

**Travelling Environment**

6. When invited to state whether the ability of wild animals to undertake natural behaviours was compromised in the travelling circus environment, the vast majority of respondents (90.8%) considered that it was. The same percentage of respondents thought that no natural behaviours could be facilitated within the travelling circus environment. Respondents regarded ‘natural behaviours’ as those behaviours that an animal would normally carry out in its wild environment so, any such behaviour that could not be undertaken in the travelling circus environment was seen as compromised.

7. Respondents considered that long periods of confinement between performances or whilst travelling inhibited the animal’s ability and freedom to carry out natural behaviours at will. These were further inhibited due to spatial constraints and lack of opportunity to interact with other animals of the same species on a regular basis. In the main, respondents believed the travelling circus to be a wholly unnatural environment for a wild animal and considered that natural behaviours, by definition, could only occur in the animal’s natural habitat, which the circus could never simulate nor facilitate. Several respondents perceived the harsh training aspect of circus life to be a large factor in the compromising of natural behaviours as they considered that animals were literally being forced against their will to perform incredibly unnatural behaviours that were far removed from what they would do in the wild. Approximately 95.7% of respondents did not believe that the concerns raised surrounding the travelling environment could be resolved without banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses.

8. However, a small minority of respondents appeared to regard ‘natural behaviours’ as behaviours that would occur naturally at the animal’s will but were changeable depending on the animal’s environment. These respondents accepted that certain behaviours, such as roaming for miles to find food, would not be possible in a travelling circus environment but viewed this as a necessary behaviour to ensure survival of the animal in the wild. They argued that such a behaviour would not be needed in the circus and maintained that, even in a wild setting, an animal would not hunt for food if it did not have to. Additionally, respondents argued that there was no conclusive evidence that travelling induced stress related behaviours and, contrary to what other respondents thought, performances and acts were based on natural behaviours of the animals so the needs of all species of animals and their natural behaviours could be catered for in the travelling circus environment.
Ethical Costs and Benefits

9. The vast majority of respondents did not consider that there were any benefits to be gained from having wild animals in travelling circuses (95.8% of respondents) and did not believe that there were sufficient benefits to justify the potential compromise to the wider well-being of wild animals kept in a travelling circus (93.7% of respondents). In their comments, however, respondents conceded that although they considered there were no benefits to the animals, other than that wild animals in circuses were safe from poachers, there could possibly be financial benefits for circus owners and local authorities and entertainment benefits for the paying public. However, they felt strongly that any such benefits were morally unjustifiable in view of the perceived harm to the animals. Respondents thought that the educational value of wild animals in circuses was low in comparison to other learning sources and that circuses were not contributing to any breeding and conservation programmes. Respondents (96.7%) thought that no actual conflict existed between compromising the well-being of wild animals and obtaining any benefit because no justifiable compromise was possible; the only possible solution was a ban.

10. A small minority of respondents considered that the greatest benefit of having wild animals in circuses was the enjoyment it brought to people of all ages, particularly children. They also thought there was an educational benefit because it introduced people to animals they may never otherwise get a chance to view in the flesh, and benefits in relation to animal breeding. Circuses were also considered to be a valuable resource for the supply of animals to the wider entertainment industry for use in film and television by these respondents.

Financial Impacts of a Ban

11. Respondents found the questions relating to the financial impacts of a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses more challenging to answer because many acknowledged that they did not know enough about the subject. Respondents’ comments clearly showed that they had very different ideas about what a ban on the use of wild animals might actually mean for the travelling circuses concerned; for example, some respondents thought that circuses would give up their wild animals, become human-only circuses and continue to visit Scotland; other respondents thought they would leave their animals behind when they visited Scotland; and some respondents thought they would stop visiting Scotland altogether and only travel to countries where it was legal to use wild animals.

12. Only 34% of respondents thought that profits for travelling circuses would increase without wild animals, primarily because they believed that people who had previously boycotted these circuses would attend when they became animal-free; 28.8% thought there would be no change or minimal change so long as circus operators took the necessary steps to safeguard their businesses; 15.6% of respondents thought there would be an immediate decrease in revenue but many considered that, if circuses were willing to adapt to human-only shows, they could eventually attract a much wider audience and profits could increase again; 19.8% of respondents were unsure if profits would increase or decrease but many thought that if the circuses concerned embraced and promoted the change they might flourish.
A majority of respondents (65.8%) thought that circuses would still visit Scotland without wild animals, after they had reinvented themselves into human-only shows; some respondents even considered that circuses would do better economically without the expense of having to keep wild animals.

Ultimately, however, many respondents considered that even if there was a potential decrease in revenue for circuses, this was not justification for allowing the perceived suffering of wild animals in travelling circuses to continue. In addition, respondents felt that attitudes towards these circuses were changing and, regardless of whether a ban on the use of wild animals was put in place or not, the public’s raised awareness regarding animal welfare coupled with an increasing distaste for performing animal acts would result in a continuing decline in popularity and revenue for these types of travelling shows.

Wider Industry Impacts

There were mixed views regarding the impact of a ban on the wider film and television industry. The majority of respondents felt that a ban would have a positive effect across all industries, at least in ethical terms. A ban could act as a warning to other industries that might be mistreating animals and could ultimately lead to stricter controls for animal welfare monitoring; or even to fewer animals being used in these industries. The use of real animals for commercial or entertainment purposes was generally condemned, with respondents viewing substitutes such as CGI far more favourably.

In contrast, a few respondents felt there would be irreparable damage to the film and TV industries by removing a ready supply of trained animals from the UK.

Support for a Ban

A total of 2003 respondents (98%) indicated that they thought the use of wild animals for performance in travelling circuses should be banned in Scotland; and 1969 respondents (96.4%) indicated that they thought the use of wild animals for exhibition (without performing) in travelling circuses should be banned in Scotland.
1. INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

1.1 The issue of wild animals in travelling circuses has been a source of longstanding unease to many. Significant concerns were raised regarding the use of wild animals in travelling circuses as part of the response to the Scottish Government’s 2004 consultation on the Animal Health and Welfare (Scotland) Bill. Since then, a steady stream of letters to Scottish Government Ministers from MSPs, the general public and animal welfare organisations, have shown that ongoing concerns not only involve perceived animal welfare issues but also deal with the ethical point of whether it is acceptable, in today’s society, to regularly transport wild animals throughout the country in order to make them perform simply for public entertainment.

1.2 The 2007 Radford Report, referred to in detail in the consultation document, concluded that there was insufficient evidence to support a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses on welfare grounds. However, the Report also noted that this did not preclude there being a welfare issue and indeed stated that the status quo was not a tenable option. This conclusion, in line with a shift in scientific and wider attitudes to animal welfare to actively seek to promote a positive life for animals in addition to preventing their suffering, has led to the consideration of alternate approaches regarding the use of these animals, one of which is the possibility of a ban on ethical / moral grounds.

EXISTING LEGISLATION

1.3 At present there are no specific animal welfare regulations for wild animals in travelling circuses in Scotland; however, these animals do fall under the scope of wider legislation:

1.4 The Animal Health and Welfare (Scotland) Act 2006 introduces a number of offences, for example, causing or allowing unnecessary suffering (section 19) and for any person responsible for an animal to fail to provide for its welfare needs (section 24) including:

- its need for a suitable environment;
- its need for a suitable diet;
- its need to be able to exhibit normal behaviour patterns;
- any need it has to be housed with, or apart from, other animals;
- its need to be protected from suffering, injury and disease.

1.5 This consultation acknowledges that any instances of neglect or cruelty inflicted on a circus animal during training or at any other time could be an offence under section 19 of this Act and a prosecution could be taken forward by the enforcement authorities under this legislation. However, it also acknowledges that as relatively little is known about the precise physiological and behavioural needs of many exotic species, judging whether someone has failed to meet those needs outlined under section 24 may in some instances be difficult.
1.6 **The Performing Animals (Regulation) Act 1925** makes it an offence for a person to exhibit or train a “performing animal” without being registered with a relevant local authority: it also allows a sheriff to grant an order to prohibit training or exhibition of an animal where he or she is satisfied that this has been accompanied by cruelty. Breach of such an order is also an offence.

1.7 **Commission Regulation (EC) No. 1739/2005** which lays down animal health requirements for the movement of circus animals between Member States.

1.8 **The Welfare of Wild Animals in Travelling Circuses (England) Regulations 2012** make provision for the protection of the welfare of wild animals in travelling circuses in England through a licensing system. These Regulations do not apply to Scotland.

**THE CONSULTATION**

1.9 A consultation concerning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses in Scotland was issued on 22 January 2014, ran for 12 weeks, and closed on 16 April 2014. The purpose of this consultation was to identify any ethical concerns the public may associate with the use of wild animals in travelling circuses, consider how any such issues identified could be resolved and, in particular, gauge public support for, or opposition to, a possible Scottish ban on the use of these animals on ethical grounds.

1.10 In terms of questions, the consultation focused specifically on the 3 main areas which may be of greatest moral concern to the public. These were:

- **Respect for Animals** - Many people consider it outdated and morally wrong to make animals perform tricks and acts, which they would not otherwise perform naturally, in order to entertain or impress a paying public.

- **Travelling environment** - There are specific concerns that the well-being of wild animals in travelling circuses, in terms of their wild nature and instinctive behaviours, is compromised by the necessity of being transported. Many consider that touring accommodation compares unfavourably with that in which a similar animal might be housed in a zoo. Concerns also surround frequent travel.

- **Ethical costs and benefits** - While certain potential welfare issues should already be dealt with under existing legislation, there remains the question of whether the wider potential for the wild animals’ well-being to be compromised outweighs any benefit to humans that might be gained from continuing to use wild animals in travelling circuses.

1.11 Responses on these topics will allow the Scottish Government to gauge public opinion on any ethical concerns relating to these issues. The consultation also gave the public a forum to raise any additional ethical points for consideration.
ASPECTS OUTSIDE THE REMIT OF THIS CONSULTATION

1.12 Although the consultation limited the scope of consideration to the use of wild animals in travelling circuses, a number of respondents have commented that, in their opinion, no animals (including domestic animals in a few cases) should be used for entertainment purposes for profit. In particular, many respondents stated their disappointment that the scope of the consultation excluded static circuses due to their belief that no circus could cater properly for the needs of wild animals. The majority of respondents did not make a clear distinction between the travelling circus and the static circus in their responses, and the nature of some of the concerns raised could be applicable to both. In addition to extending their comments to include static circuses, some respondents went on to condemn zoos, wildlife parks, the use of animals in the television and film industry, factory farms and indeed any organisation or situation that confines an animal to an enclosure.

1.13 Some respondents did, however, distinguish between what they perceived as the moral differences between a circus and a zoo or wildlife park, the circus being perceived as an unnatural exploitation of animals for profit, while the zoo or wildlife park was considered to at least have some educational and conservational purpose. In addition, some respondents thought that zoos and wildlife parks at least provided wild animals with some semblance of a natural habitat whereas circuses were considered to be entirely unnatural environments. Section 2, which focused more heavily on the travelling environment, solicited responses more specific to the travelling circus.
2. METHODOLOGY

CONSULTATION

2.1 The information regarding the current concerns about wild animals in travelling circuses, as outlined in the consultation document, was compiled from a number of sources. The conclusions drawn from the previous public consultation conducted by Defra were used to guide how this consultation should be conducted and the issues it should cover.

2.2 In addition, various ethical papers were referenced to provide a broad view of the current academic approach to animal ethics. A full list of papers referenced can be found in the appendix of the consultation document. The topics raised in these papers provided a basis for the consultation questions, so as to maximise the amount of information that could be garnered from the public regarding specific animal ethics as opposed to welfare issues.

2.3 Once the consultation questions were finalised, they were distributed to the public through a number of mediums. As is standard procedure with all consultations, a Scottish Government press release was issued detailing the purpose of the consultation, instructing people on how to respond and the closing date. The consultation was also published on the web as part of the Scottish Government consultation database, which automatically alerts members of the public who have previously signed up to be notified when a new consultation goes live. Additionally, a number of stakeholders, comprising both groups and individuals, who had expressed particular interest in this consultation were emailed on its release. A full list of contacts emailed by the Scottish Government can be found at Annex 2. Respondents had 12 weeks in which to respond to the consultation.

2.4 There were a number of different response methods available. The preferred, and most popular, method of response was through Questback, an online service that allowed respondents with internet access to respond to the consultation questions online. Respondents were encouraged to use this facility to simplify the processing of responses for analysis, and over 98% of all responses to the consultation were collected using this medium. However, the Scottish Government also provided a Microsoft Word-based questionnaire that could be completed and returned either electronically or by hand, and accepted other written responses, emailed responses, and supporting letters and documents that were submitted.

ANALYSIS

2.5 The analysis was conducted on a question by question basis. For each question, the results from the multiple choice selections, where present, were collated and presented via numerical tables. Thus, quantifiable data comprised a large portion of the analysis for this consultation. From this, it was possible to gain an instant overview of the results for each question.

2.6 The consultation invited respondents to provide comments to explain or support their answers to all questions. A major part of the analysis of this
consultation, therefore, was the identification of predominant and recurring themes within the comments and summarising these in bullet point form on a question by question basis. The provision of precise figures for this type of qualitative analysis is not appropriate; however, the key points raised are generally listed in order of frequency. As much as was possible, where comments have been made pertaining to other questions in the consultation paper, they have been included in the analysis of the question to which they are most relevant. It was not possible to assign some comments that were particularly vague, abstract, open to interpretation or not fully coherent to themes; as with any qualitative analysis, it is recognised that the process of interpretation is not an exact science.

2.7 The results for each question are supplemented by selected quotes taken directly from responses in order to present a flavour of various viewpoints. All quotes used remain unchanged, including where there are typographic or spelling errors.

**BREAKDOWN OF RESPONSES**

2.8 The consultation received a total of 2043 responses - 2011 online via Questback and 32 handwritten or typed. In addition, 24 email acknowledgements of the consultation were also received but none provided data for analysis: 23 of the emails indicated general support for a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses. The remaining email was from East Ayrshire Council who, in lieu of a completed response, attached a copy of a report dated 9th February 2012 reviewing council policy on the letting of council owned sites to circuses, and the subsequent Minute. Since the issue of whether or not councils permit circuses with animals to lease local authority owned land is outside the remit of the consultation, details of the report have not been included in the analysis.

2.9 Out of the total of 2043 responses received, 56 respondents represented themselves as groups or organisations and 1987 indicated they were individuals. From address details it appears that 551 responses (27%) were from groups, organisations or individuals based in Scotland; 1247 (61%) were based in England; 50 (2.4%) were based in Wales; 20 (1%) were based in Northern Ireland; and the remaining 175 (8.6%) were based outside the UK. Responses from outside the UK ranged from as close as Ireland to as far away as Australia. These figures will not be completely accurate however, as some respondents did not provide full address details.

2.10 Around 140 respondents appear to have based comments in their responses on wording suggested by the animal welfare organisation, PETA. Some of the respondents have actually declared this in their answers. However, since these respondents have identified themselves as ‘individuals’, and since not all of their comments are identical, the responses are not being treated as a campaign. Instead, any specific issues are addressed on a question by question basis and any relevant quotes used are attributed to the source. Six groups also utilised the PETA suggested response in their answers, however only 3 of these groups declared themselves as officially affiliated with the PETA organisation.
GROUPS

2.11 Out of a total of 56 responses received from groups or organisations, 17 were based in Scotland; 31 were based in England; 1 was based in Wales; 1 was based in Northern Ireland; and the remaining 6 were based outside the UK. For the purposes of the consultation, 31 group respondents aligned themselves to the animal welfare sector; 4 to local authority; 2 to the circus industry; 1 to the advertising/entertainment industry; 1 to the veterinarian sector; 7 to the general public sector; and 9 to ‘other’ sector.

2.12 The final group (Classical Circus Association) aligned itself to 3 separate sectors; animal welfare, the circus industry and the audio-visual industry and indicated that it was responding on behalf of the Performing Animals Welfare Standards International (PAWSI) and Rona Brown’s Movie Animals. A copy of a letter from representing members of the audio-visual community in the UK and the USA, which formed a supporting part of the Classical Circus Association’s consultation response, can be found at Annex 1.

2.13 Two of the organisations that are included in the above count, Club Amici del Circo and Federation Mondiale du Cirque, declared themselves as ‘other’ and indicated that they were non-profit organisations dedicated to promoting and preserving circus arts and culture worldwide.

2.14 The European Circus Association, which is also included in the above count, aligned itself to the circus industry but also indicated that it was a non-profit organisation dedicated to promoting and preserving circus arts and culture as part of Europe’s cultural heritage. A full breakdown of respondents and their affiliations can be found at Annex 3.
3. RESPECT FOR ANIMALS

3.1 This section of the consultation document contained 3 questions relating to the issue of respect for animals:

**Consultation Question 1:** Do you believe that the exhibitions and performances required of wild animals in travelling circuses compromise respect for the animals concerned? Why?

**Consultation Question 2:** Do you believe that the exhibitions and performances required of wild animals in travelling circuses have an adverse impact on the development of respectful and responsible attitudes towards animals in children and young people? Why?

3.2 Answering ‘yes’ to either of these questions suggests that a respondent has ethical concerns that respect for these animals has been compromised and/or that the development of respectful and responsible attitudes towards animals in children and young people has been negatively impacted.

**Consultation Question 3:** Do you consider that concerns relating to respect for animals could be resolved without banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses. If so, how?

3.3 Answering ‘no’ to this question suggests that a respondent is in favour of a ban. There was opportunity for respondents to give views as to how resolution of concerns could be achieved without a ban.

**Overview of results**

3.4 **89.5%** of respondents believed that the exhibitions and performances required of wild animals in travelling circuses compromised respect for the animals concerned.

3.5 **94.7%** of respondents believed that the exhibitions and performances required of wild animals in travelling circuses had an adverse impact on the development of respectful and responsible attitudes towards animals in children and young people.

3.6 **94.7%** of respondents considered that concerns relating to respect for animals could not be resolved without banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses.

3.7 Comments supporting responses to questions 1 and 2 on the perceived impact of wild animals in travelling circuses on respect and responsible attitudes towards animals were wide and varied, indicating that the concept of ‘respect’ had a broad spectrum and clearly, with regard to animals, meant different things to different people. For example, to some respondents, respect for an animal appeared to be akin to caring for that animal’s welfare - its physical and mental wellbeing. For many others, however, respect appeared to encompass a whole school of thought on intrinsic value and an animal’s purpose to simply ‘be wild’ and carry out natural behaviours – something that many felt that wild animals were prevented from doing.
in the circus environment even if they were, in other ways, being well treated. The issue of what respect may mean to people in relation to the use of animals in travelling circuses was discussed at some length in the consultation paper and, as is evident from respondents’ various comments, most felt that respect, for a variety of reasons, was indeed compromised.

3.8 Some respondents' comments have technically gone beyond the specific issues raised in questions 1 and 2, highlighting a large range of additional concerns about the use of wild animals in travelling circuses:

3.9 Welfare concerns - It appears that many respondents have been completely unable to separate ethical issues from perceived welfare concerns; perhaps unsurprising given that having regard for an animal's welfare is considered to be the ethically correct position to take in today's society. Comments relating to perceived welfare concerns have therefore not been excluded from the analysis.

3.10 Training – A specific example of a welfare concern was that many perceived welfare issues in relation to (assumed) negative training methods. Discounting these concerns as being outside the remit of the consultation, however, is not a clear-cut issue because, although training methods do technically go beyond the scope of the consultation, there is an obvious and direct connection between training and performances that has coloured many people’s views.

3.11 Static circuses - As previously noted, for questions 1 and 2 in particular, many respondents did not make a clear distinction between the travelling circus and the static circus in their responses. The nature of many of the ethical concerns raised by respondents regarding the impact of performances on respect for the animals concern and responsibility towards animals would be applicable to both types of circus, since the nature of those performances are considered to be similar.
CONSULTATION QUESTION 1: Do you believe that the exhibitions and performances required of wild animals in travelling circuses compromise respect for the animals concerned? Why?

Table 3.1: Overview of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%.

3.12 A total of 2033 respondents (99.5%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, the vast majority, 1828 respondents (89.5%) answered ‘yes’ indicating that they believed that the exhibitions and performances required of wild animals in travelling circuses compromised respect for the animals concerned; 200 respondents (9.8%) answered ‘no’ (although many of the accompanying comments from these respondents did not support their ‘no’ responses); and 5 respondents (0.2%) answered ‘don’t know’. The remaining 10 respondents (0.5%) left this question blank even though 7 offered comments that did not support the use of wild animals in circuses.

3.13 In total, 1731 respondents (84.7%) offered comments at Question 1.

General Points

3.14 A large number of respondents provided long responses covering multiple points, not all of which were entirely limited to ethics or even directly related to the question. Clearly, respondents have taken the opportunity to express many of their numerous concerns about the use of wild animals in travelling circuses at the start. Some comments anticipated questions that were raised later in the questionnaire and these comments were either reiterated by the respondent at the appropriate question or the respondent has referred to points made previously.

Respondents who answered ‘Yes’ respect is compromised

3.15 A total of 1828 respondents answered ‘yes’ and 1567 provided comments in support of their answers.

Key points

3.16 Key points:

- Wild animals are being exploited by being forced to perform unnatural behaviours (tricks) for reward or out of fear, purely for human gain.
• The circus is an unnatural environment for wild animals and does not cater for their complex needs and basic rights (the 5 freedoms), particularly their right to carry out their natural behaviours.
• Wild animals should be living in their natural habitats (the wild) with their own species or, at the least, living in suitable wildlife sanctuaries if moved for their own protection.
• Wild animals do not exist to be used as a source of amusement/entertainment.
• It is cruel/abusive/inhumane to keep wild animals in a circus environment where they have no quality of life.
• Holding wild animals captive in a circus environment is tantamount to slavery or, at the very least, unpaid labour.
• The circus environment causes suffering and mental distress to wild animals.
• Training methods used on wild animals in circuses are dubious at best and brutal or even abusive at worst.
• Living conditions – particularly living in cages or chains – within a circus environment are inadequate for wild animals and negatively impact their welfare.
• It is degrading, demeaning and undignified for wild animals.
• Wild animals endure poor care in circuses and are sometimes treated badly or even abused.
• Wild animals do not choose or wish to perform but they have no voice or freedom of will; their spirits are broken and they become submissive.
• Putting wild animals in circuses is unjustifiable, immoral, inappropriate and unacceptable and has no place in the modern world – it is barbaric.
• Wild animals in circuses cannot be looked after appropriately while travelling round the country.
• Wild animals in circuses affects attitudes negatively.
• Wild animals in circuses are unnecessary.
• Wild animals should not be treated as toys or possessions to be dominated by humans or used in any way they like.
• The way wild animals are taken from the wild is inhumane/abusive.
• Wild animals have intrinsic value.
• Wild animal exhibitions and performances have no conservation or educational value or purpose.
• The acts and performances do not benefit wild animals in any way.

Fosters disrespect

3.17 Over half of the respondents who commented felt strongly that forcing wild animals to perform what they perceived as ‘unnatural behaviours’ during exhibitions and performances was disrespectful for a variety of reasons and on a number of levels; in particular, many respondents considered that forcing wild animals to perform tricks for the entertainment of humans was ‘unethical’, ‘degrading’ or ‘demeaning’ for the animals, compromised their dignity and lessened respect for them. Some respondents went so far as to say that the performance of these tricks made wild animals a ‘laughing stock’ and that these animals did not exist to be paraded round a circus ring and used as a source of amusement for the paying public.
Safety concerns

3.18 Many respondents considered that it was wrong that these animals were subjected to the ‘harassment’ of having to perform ‘party’ tricks in a chaotic environment of bright lights and loud music while surrounded by crowds of noisy humans. Some respondents also thought that some of the ‘unnatural tricks’ performed were dangerous and could cause injury to the animals, for example, tigers jumping through flaming hoops; or could be physically damaging on a longer term basis, for example, elephants that balance on their back legs or heads on a regular basis. A few respondents also felt that there was a risk to humans who watched or participated in the shows because the performing animals were by their very nature, wild and unpredictable.

“There is no guarantee that such animals are handled fairly and treated well. The animals are wild animals and should not be used in circuses. The safety of those participating and watching is put at risk as well as the welfare of the animals.”
(Individual Respondent)

Essentially exploitation

3.19 It was strongly felt by many that wild animals were being ‘exploited’ by humans who did not have the right to do so, particularly for reasons that they could not condone such as ‘frivolous entertainment’ and ‘human profit’. A few respondents pointed out that the exhibitions and performances in no way benefited the animals and had no conservation or educational value or purpose; some considered it reprehensible to make money out of wild animals in this way and stated that it reflected badly on those who allowed it to happen. Many respondents also thought it extremely wrong and sad that the animals were treated as ‘commodities’ or ‘money-making tools’ and ‘hauled around the country’ from venue to venue in travelling cages that were too small for long periods of travel, all in the name of entertainment. Several respondents commented that circuses treated their animals like ‘possessions’ ‘property’, ‘toys’, ‘playthings’ or ‘props’ and that this was disrespectful and unacceptable because they were sentient creatures with their own intrinsic value. People were free to choose to work in circuses but wild animals used in circuses had no such choice or any freedom of will; if they had, respondents felt they would choose to be elsewhere. Some thought that holding these animals ‘captive’ in a circus environment was akin to slavery.

“These performances are for the benefit of the viewing public, and financial gain of the circus. They do not act as any sort of animal enrichment, education, contribution to conservation of the species, or any other reasonably quantifiable benefit to the species involved, either as individuals or as a group.” (Group Response - Glo-Wild Limited)

“How can you be showing respect for an animal when you are forcing it to submit to your will and perform unnatural acts for financial benefit?” (Individual Respondent)

“to use the phrase 'compromise respect' is not quite strong enough i feel. Animals are quite clearly being exploited when used in circuses to perform ‘tricks’ for the paying public. No animal would, if given the choice, do this of their own free will.” (Individual Respondent)

“And using animals for entertainment is also wrong. They are not ours to use. They are their own beings. Keeping them so is akin to slavery.” (Individual Respondent)
“Wild animals should not be used for entertainment and transported as pieces of furniture from one place to another.” (Individual Respondent)

“Wild animals are not wind-up toys that can be used for entertainment at our whim. To treat them as such inevitably engenders disrespect.” (Individual Respondent)

“These are intelligent, sentient beings that are being hauled around like commodities.” (Individual Respondent)

“Because animals are not toys, for our fun and pleasure. They are sentient creatures.” (Group Response - Unnamed Organisation)

“Objectification of any living thing often leads to disrespect, if not worse.” (Individual Respondent)

“Humans can CHOOSE whether they wish to perform, animals have no CHOICE!! This in itself is disrespectful!!” (Individual Respondent)

Form of imprisonment

3.20 Over half of the respondents who commented thought that it was either ‘disrespectful’, ‘unethical’, ‘inhumane’, ‘inherently cruel’ and/or an ‘abuse of their nature’ to force wild animals to live in an environment that was, in their opinion, so completely unsuitable for them, that could potentially be psychologically harmful and in which they had no quality of life. It was pointed out that the constant confinement and travelling, considered to be deeply stressful for the animals, totally contradicted the whole essence of being ‘wild’. Some thought it tantamount to a life sentence in prison because the animals were unjustly forced to spend a large percentage of their life locked in cramped cages, or tethered. In the opinion of some respondents, in cases where there was only one of a particular species of animal in the circus, this equated to solitary confinement. Some respondents compared their imprisoned state with that of human prisoners and, in their view, the animals had far less freedom.

“No animal should be confined in solitary. For humans it is considered a punishment - so should it be considered for animals - it’s wrong.” (Individual Respondent)

Needs unmet

3.21 Nearly half of the respondents who commented also considered it was unethical to keep wild animals in a circus environment because, in their opinion, it had unsuitable living conditions and was unable to cater for their complex species-specific needs in relation to the 5 freedoms, particularly their environmental and behavioural needs, for example in relation to space and exercise. Conditions were considered to be inappropriate and inadequate and, in the opinion of many respondents, negatively impacted the welfare of the animals, causing great suffering and mental distress. It was also considered wrong that the instincts of wild animals were compromised by being forced to work and travel with humans, contact with whom they would normally have avoided if they had lived in the wild. The full analysis of respondents’ opinions as to whether or not the ability of wild animals to undertake natural behaviors is compromised within the travelling circus environment, can be found at Consultation Question 4. The full analysis of respondents’ opinions
regarding the issue of travelling conditions for wild animals in travelling circuses can be found at Section 4.

3.22 Many respondents considered that a circus life robbed the animals of everything that was important to their lives. They felt strongly that these ‘beautiful, intelligent creatures’ should be respected for what they were and free to live as best suited their nature both for their own benefit and for the benefit of all mankind, including future generations. The animals should be returned to, or simply left in, their natural habitats in the wild where they could live with their own kind, in their social structures and family groups, as nature intended. There they would be free to express natural behaviours such as running, roaming, hunting, foraging for food, choosing mates and breeding freely. If this was not possible because the animals were no longer equipped to fend for themselves in the wild they should, at the very least, be moved to suitable wildlife sanctuaries for their own protection.

“…believe that animals are not here for our entertainment and that they do not belong to us in any way and that wild animals in captivity should be relocated to suitable wildlife refuges for possible reintroduction into the wild for the benefit of all and future generations.” (Individual Respondent)

Wild capture concerns

3.23 A few respondents also felt that the ‘exploitation’ of wild animals in circuses promoted unethical practices in the capture and trade of wild animals. It was perceived that the way wild animals were taken from the wild was ‘inhumane’, for example, young animals removed from their mothers prematurely which was considered to be ‘immoral’ and ‘cruel’.

“They should never be taken from their natural habitat for any reason other than their own protection.” (Individual Respondent)

“Trauma and suffering affects animals who are taken from their native environment and forced to perform. It encourages unethical practices in capture and trade of these animals and financial gain is the priority rather than animal welfare. The animals are seen in an unnatural setting, performing un-natural activities and being denied species-appropriate needs. People need to see animals in their proper environment, exhibiting normal animal behaviour and social bonding. People need to see that they are just like us.” (Individual Respondent)

Outdated entertainment

3.24 Many respondents thought that it was entirely disrespectful to force wild animals to perform in circuses because this practice belonged in the past when people did not know better. Terms such as ‘primitive’, ‘uncivilised’, ‘archaic’, ‘medieval’, ‘unenlightened’ and ‘barbaric’ were used to illustrate the point that they considered this form of entertainment to be completely out of step with modern values and was at the expense of an animal’s life. Several respondents also considered that it was unnecessary to have wild animals in circuses because circuses could function very well without them. Some respondents stated that circuses without animals were more popular and more successful.
“Travelling circuses that exhibit performing wild animals are fundamentally out of step with modern views on the proper way to treat animals, and modern understanding of animals’ environmental, behavioural and social needs. We further suggest that using wild animals in circuses does not engender compassion towards, or understanding of, animals, but instead reinforces outmoded attitudes concerning the acceptability of exploiting or dominating other creatures for entertainment. These are an inheritance from past ages that accepted the existence of travelling menageries and showmen with dancing bears, but they should have no place in 21st century Scotland.” (Group Response - OneKind)

“One of the great circuses of all time is “Cirque de Soleil,” in which not one single animal is used, and it is the most popular circus in the world.” (Individual Respondent)

“This is an out dated and cruel form of ‘entertainment’. It does not fit in with a progressive, modern society.” (Individual Respondent)

“Travelling circuses belong to the past when people were uneducated and did not know better” (Individual Respondent)

“Wild animals do not belong in cages. In the 21st century I find it inhumane. Circuses do not realise that many people stay away because of the use of animals.” (Individual Respondent)

“I’m asking you to please ban animals from circuses. Look at how popular Cirque du Soleil is and you’ll see people don’t need animals for their entertainment. Animals are not meant to be caged, forced to dance with a ball on their nose.” (Individual Respondent)

“Wild animals belong in the wild. Circuses with wild animals evolved in olden times as the general public did not travel and so these were a novelty and their only opportunity to see something which they would not otherwise have been aware of. This is not the case today, with almost everybody having a TV and able to view programmes about wildlife in its own environment. This is a barbaric practice which belongs in medieval times - it is totally and completely incompatible with the 21st century and must stop. I am astonished that Scotland and Ireland could even consider it.” (Individual Respondent)

Training concerns

3.25 Many respondents commented strongly on the methods employed to train wild animals for exhibitions and performances, which were perceived to be ‘questionable’ or ‘dubious’ at best and ‘cruel’ and ‘abusive’ at worst. Respondents stated that animal handling and training was based on techniques using either positive reinforcement (treats) or negative reinforcement (fear) or a combination of the two. Negative reinforcement was also referred to as ‘old-fashioned dominance’. In general, respondents were in favour of positive reinforcement; however, the perception was that food and water was withheld from animals in training until they performed and this was not deemed to be acceptable as they considered the animals’ need for a suitable diet - one of the 5 freedoms - was a fundamental right that should not have to be earned. Negative reinforcement, which was perceived as being punishment of some kind (beatings, whippings etc), was utterly condemned. Some respondents considered that the animals’ spirits were actually broken in order to make them submissive and that this was distressing to them since it meant that the instincts that normally drove these wild animals were completely suppressed.
"Wild animals cannot be trained with sugar-lumps and 'treats.'" (Individual Respondent)

"I don't agree with wild animals being made to perform tricks. I think that their treatment during training is questionable and quite possibly cruel and then they appear in front of an audience to be viewed as a playthings." (Individual Respondent)

"This is an unnatural procedure, animals are trained to do this under duress, by with holding food and often cruelty is involved. Wild animals have emotions and were not put on this earth to live and travel in cages or perform for the amusement of humans. This is inhumane, cruel, shows lack of compassion and certainly compromises respect for the poor animals. Travelling circuses belong to the past when people were uneducated and did not know better." (Individual Respondent)

"Wild animals are more often abused and broken in order to make them 'perform' for human entertainment. This is done with total disrespect for them as another species." (Individual Respondent)

"These animals are "trained" sometimes with abusive methods." (Individual Respondent)

Message concerns

3.26 Several respondents commented that the way wild animals were treated in circuses could negatively affect human attitudes to the value of such animals. Some considered that allowing circuses to continue sent a false message to exposed, impressionable children regarding exotic species; basically, that it was normal and acceptable to abuse such animals for our entertainment. Consequently, in the opinion of some respondents, circuses were therefore as exploitative of children as they were of animals. The full consultation analyses of respondents’ opinions regarding the impact that the exhibitions and performances required of wild animals in travelling circuses have on the development of respectful and responsible attitudes towards animals in children and young people, can be found at Consultation question 2.

"Imparts to young people in particular that animals are to be used as humans wish rather than respecting their right to a normal life" (Individual Respondent)

"As a qualified teacher I am concerned that circus wild animal acts convey an impression of human dominance over wild animals regardless of the claims made by the circus fraternity that only natural behaviours are demonstrated. This is not the case. For example I have seen performances where lion and tigers have been used in proximity with hyenas (which showed overt stress behaviour). Such species do not associate like this in the wild. I have also seen elephants performing hand stands (I have this on video footage). This is a very anti educational message for young people." (Individual Response)

"Animals deserve the same dignity and respect we do and should be valued and not used for entertainment. It is sending awful messages to young children and as a teacher, I have already picked up on children’s thoughts about this." (Individual Respondent)
Additional quotes

“Yes, animals can only be respected in their natural habitat expressing natural behaviours. Forcing them to perform is not respecting them for what they are, but for what they have been moulded into being, an unnatural representation of themselves and their species.” (Individual Respondent)

“Performing tricks in a circus is plain ridiculous, compromising respect for us, the public, as well as the animals.” (Individual Respondent)

These animals are kept in captivity (ie prison - in fact solitary confinement as they are often the only one of their species) and forced to travel and perform rituals which are alien to their species for the ‘entertainment of humans. As travel in vehicles and these activities which they are forced to carry out are so unnatural to these species one can only assume that they are achieved by the use of punishment if they do not do so. Why anybody in this day and age should feel the need to see a wild animal with its spirit broken and living in confined and unnatural circumstances performing unnatural acts is a mystery to me and I find the whole idea repugnant in the extreme.” (Individual Respondent)

“Animals that are in captivity should live in environments as close to their natural habitat as possible. Eg ; safari parks” (Individual Respondent)

“Animals should live in a more natural habitat, with a well-run zoo being the minimum acceptable standard if they cannot live as nature intended.” (Individual Respondent)

Respondents who answered ‘No’ respect is not compromised

3.27 A total of 200 respondents, including 4 of the groups affiliated with the circus industry, who believed that the exhibitions and performances required of wild animals in travelling circuses did not compromise respect for the animals concerned, answered ‘no’ and 155 respondents provided comments; however, the comments of only 15 respondents actually supported their ‘no’ response.

Key points

3.28 Key points:

- Circuses are an enjoyable, educational experience for people and particularly for children, who will be able to actually see many species of animals rather than just view them on TV, see how the animals and humans work together in circuses and respect each other.
- Training does not violate the dignity of circus animals in good circuses and no-one has more respect for these animals than the trainers and presenters who care for them 24/7; in addition, by willingly working, the animals show respect back to the humans.
- People have misguided perceptions about circus animals or base their views on what they had been told by other people; no-one is qualified to provide a response to this question unless they had personally witnessed circus animals in a licensed circus.
- Circuses have high standards of animal welfare and animals are treated with care and respect.
• Appropriate exhibition and presentation creates a healthy lifestyle for the animals and provides the public with the opportunity to appreciate simple choreographed routines that show their natural abilities, physical capabilities and individual characteristics.
• Robust regulations rather than a ban are needed to maintain excellent animal husbandry and practices in all circuses.
• That other countries regulate rather than ban animals in circuses shows government respect for their training and presentation and reflects the ongoing appeal of the classical circus for the public.
• Trainers in circuses often give exhibitions talks about the animals, their welfare, their training methods and how badly the animals are faring in the wild.
• The animals' welfare is dependent upon the management and care arrangements that the circus has in place.
• There is no direct evidence that the exhibitions and performances required of wild animals compromise respect for them in a travelling circus environment.

Natural talents

3.29 Respondents did not consider the behavior of the animals during exhibitions and performances to be in the least unnatural, disrespectful or undignified. In their opinion the tricks and performances were merely choreographed simple routines of the species' natural movements and physical capabilities. Some respondents considered that the performances actually fostered respect for the animals rather than the reverse. One respondent thought that the animals actually enjoyed performing.

"The animal acts that I have seen have shown off the animals natural abilities and by only showcasing these movements, for me, this shows respect between human and animal and having said that, by willingly working, the animals have shown some respect back to the humans."  (Individual Respondent)

"Appropriate exhibition and presentation creates a healthy lifestyle for the animals and providers the public with the opportunity to appreciate animals' natural abilities and individual characteristics."  (Group Response - Federation Mondiale du Cirque)

"It does not compromise respect, but actually fosters respect, by allowing people to see these magestic animals up close and in real life, not just on TV."  (Individual Respondent)

"Because all the tricks and performance are actually merely choreographed simple routines of the species natural movements and physical capabilities be they dogs, horses, elephants big cats or anything else."  (Individual Respondent)

Sought after entertainment

3.30 One group stated that, rather than circuses being an outdated form of entertainment, families continued to make their way to the Big Top to experience and enjoy circuses with performing animals and visits to circus animal menageries.

"I think the animals enjoy what they are doing and people enjoy being able to get to see them close up."  (Individual Respondent)
Information bias

3.31 A few individuals considered that people had misguided perceptions about circus animals or based their views on what they had been told by other people. Three organisations shared this view, blaming animal welfare groups, animal activists and public relation firms for turning the public against classical circus. One organisation accused the consultation paper of being biased against the use of wild animals in travelling circuses. Three organisations felt strongly that circuses using animals should be regulated rather than banned.

“Unless you have personally witnessed circus animals in the licensed circuses you are not qualified to provide a factual response. Any thing else is merely an often misguided perception.” (Individual Respondent)

“The topic of animals in circus seems to have become an issue on which it is impossible to develop a rational and proactive debate, a sort of taboo subject, a sacrilegious theme surrounded by negativity due to the aggressiveness of minority animal activist campaigns.” (Group Response - Club Amici del Circo)

“I am surprised and disappointed that this consultation document is really quite biased. It is as if you are reading from the text book of all the welfare groups put together. You base your pre-amble on promotional material marketed by the welfare groups who distort the truth. You ignore all the material regarding the science behind animal welfare in a circus situation and ignore what is happening with regards to the regulations in England.” (Group Response - Classical Circus Association)

Educational role

3.32 In the view of 3 respondents, circuses were educational for people, children in particular, because they were able to actually see the animals up close, listen to educational talks about them and benefit from watching how trainers and animals worked together with dignity and mutual respect. In general, respondents also thought that circuses, as well as respecting their animals, had high standards of care with regard to their welfare, although one organisation did point out that the welfare of the animal was very dependent upon the management and care arrangements that the circus had in place.

“The trainers in Circus often give exhibitions and talks about the animals, their welfare, the training methods and how badly the animals are fareing in the wild.” (Individual Respondent)

“Circus training does not violate the animals’ dignity. Nobody has more respect for animals than a circus trainer who lives and works with his animals spending days, months, sometimes years patiently teaching them to do what they naturally do when it is best seen and appreciated by the audience. If anybody respects animals’ dignity, it is the circus trainers who care for them 24/7, 365 days per year.” (Group Response - European Circus Association)

“It can even be said, without doubts, that living conditions in circuses are way more preferable than in most other men-animal cohabitation situations in contemporary life. Circus training does not violate the animals’ dignity and nobody has more respect for animals than a circus trainer who lives and works with his animals spending the whole of life with them.” (Group Response - Club Amici del Circo)
Additional quotes

“Nowhere in the captive animal world are animals more respected than in good animal circuses.” (Group Response - Classical Circus Association)

“In a world where million of animals are treated as “object” circus is the place where Men and Animals are really member of the same travelling family.” (Group Response - Club Amici del Circo)

“Based on what I have seen with my own eyes a both licensed circuses with wild animals I would state that all circus animals are treated with care and respect, and are always in excellent condition.” (Individual Respondent)

“circuses look after animal welfare” (Individual Respondent)

“They have the utmost standards of welfare and care and the claims made by the animal rights groups are incorrect and not justified” (Individual Respondent)

“From what I have seen, animal trainers and presenters have the upmost respect for the animals within their care and also show the animals respect during the performance.” (Individual Respondent)

Respondents who answered ‘Don’t Know’ whether respect is compromised

3.33 A total of 5 respondents answered ‘don’t know’ and 2 provided comments; both thought that it was an outdated practice for circuses to still be using animals for entertainment purposes. One thought that it was inherently cruel to keep animals in a circus environment. Their reasons for selecting the ‘don’t know’ option are unclear.
CONSULTATION QUESTION 2: Do you believe that the exhibitions and performances required of wild animals in travelling circus have an adverse impact on the development of respectful and responsible attitudes towards animals in children and young people? Why?

Table 3.2: Overview of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>1574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%.

3.34 A total of 2032 respondents (99.5%) responded to this question. As can be seen from the table, the vast majority, 1934 respondents (94.7%), answered ‘yes’ indicating they believed that the exhibitions and performances required of wild animals in travelling circus do have an adverse impact on the development of respectful and responsible attitudes towards animals in children and young people; 71 respondents (3.5%) answered ‘no’; and 27 respondents (1.3%) answered ‘don’t know’; the remaining 11 respondents (0.5%) left this question blank even though 7 provided comments, 5 of which were in line with a ‘yes’ response.

3.35 In total, 1689 respondents (82.7%) offered comments at Question 2.

Respondents who answered ‘Yes’ there is an adverse impact in children

3.36 A total of 1934 respondents answered ‘yes’ and 1613 respondents provided comments. The specific reasons given in favour of the position that there was an adverse impact on respectful and responsible attitudes were broad and covered a multitude of concerns.

Key points

3.37 Key points:

- Promotes an anthropocentric idea that humans are the superior species who may use and control other species as we please.
- Abuse towards animals is condoned and normalised in the minds of children especially as it is witnessed in an appealing, family-friendly context which leaves a great impression on the child.
- Promotes the notion that animals are non-sentient objects or playthings which solely exist for our amusement, without reference to their welfare.
• Witnessing animals in a circus damages a child’s capacity for empathy towards living things.
• Wild animal acts in circuses have little to no educational value and actually contradict messages about animal welfare and behaviours children learn through other media.
• Humiliating tricks encourage children to laugh at animals in a derogatory way and admire them only for their ability to perform as opposed to appreciating their intrinsic value.
• Children should be taught that animals need to be free rather than in captivity – circuses contradict and confuse this message.
• Children only believe that the use of animals in circuses is acceptable because do not see the abuse that goes on behind the scenes.
• Circuses misrepresent animals to children by promoting their tricks and performances as ‘natural behaviours’ when they are not.
• Parents taking children to the circus as a ‘treat’ further reinforce the message that this is acceptable entertainment, when it is not.
• Children will echo the abusive practices they see on other animals and pets.
• Condoning the use of animals for profit is a particularly immoral message to send to children.
• Presents animals to children in an antiquated fashion that is unacceptable in a modern society.
• Adversely affects young people’s attitudes towards conservation and the protection of endangered species.

Message concerns

3.38 By far the most dominant comment was simply that, by continuing to allow the presence of wild animals in circuses, young children would readily believe the practice to be normal and acceptable. For whatever reasons, be they ethical, moral or based on perceived notions of maltreatment, the vast majority of respondents deemed performing animals in circuses to be inherently ‘wrong’ and ‘unacceptable’ and, consequently, did not want their children to form the understanding, from witnessing performances, that society as a whole condoned this form of ‘entertainment’.

3.39 A huge number of respondents believed that children were very impressionable and that the circus experience resonated particularly strongly with a young age group. Therefore, according to respondents, if the circus was perceived to promote negative messages, then it followed that the impact on children and young people from experiencing such an environment would also be negative.

Unquestioning children

3.40 Several respondents were also of the opinion that young children in particular were not inclined to question the morality behind what they saw, especially if, as often was the case with the travelling circus, they were actively being taken as a ‘treat’ by a trusted parent or guardian. According to respondents, this parental endorsement, albeit it un-vocalised, would further reinforce the acceptability of the circus and the positivity of wild animal acts in the child’s mind. This, coupled with the belief of many respondents that the circus’s worst practices were kept ‘behind closed
doors’ and away from public eyes, meant that the child’s perception of what was morally right and wrong with regard to the treatment of these animals was skewed from an early age by witnessing circus performances. According to respondents, because children did not necessarily see the perceived cruelty, boredom or fear the animals endured through their life in the circus, they would believe that using animals for entertainment was acceptable and a positive, perhaps even enjoyable, experience for the animal. As far as respondents were concerned, this would perpetuate a culture and society where using wild animals in the circus was an acceptable practice.

3.41 To illustrate this, multiple respondents spoke of their own experiences at the circus when they were younger and said that, while it seemed acceptable and even fun at the time, they reflected back on the experience negatively and felt they were deceived with regard to the level of abuse involved, either through the lack of information from parents or through their own lack of awareness.

"Children do not grow up to respect animals. They are taken by care givers/role models whom they look up to and respect and in turn think that because these people are taking them to view animals forced to perform silly tricks, they are conditioned to think that this is okay." (Individual Respondent)

"Children will follow by example. The adults who accompany them obviously condone circus animal performances and are themselves incapable to differentiating between right and wrong, respect and disrespect for animals. How can children learn respect and responsibility in this situation?" (Individual Respondent)

"Children who are brought to the circus and see their parents and guardians and respected elders laughing at and enjoying these performances will learn that this is the way we relate to animals. This does not foster respect, compassion or responsibility - quite the opposite." (Individual Response affiliated with the Neotropical Primate Conservation Group)

"Obviously if young children see animals in circuses they assume from a young age that this is normal and do not understand the suffering the animals are put through. Children should be taught that this is wrong." (Individual Response)

"When I was a child I went to the circus, never even gave a thought to animal welfare, as my parents took me to the circus, so that must be ok - right? No, not ok for children to think it is ok for these beautiful wild creatures to be tortured into performing." (Individual Response)

Other key concerns

3.42 Over and above these comments, the broad spectrum of ethical arguments for the position that there was an adverse impact on the development of respectful and responsible attitudes in children and young people can be rooted into three key concerns:

- The circus is inherently disrespectful of animals and this lack of respect will be transferred onto impressionable young people witnessing performances.
- The circus has no educational benefit and actively contradicts the messages taught to young people about animal welfare, conservation and the environment.
The circus is an abusive environment for animals and normalises the mistreatment of animals in the minds of young people.

3.43 Several more issues were raised in relation to, and as a consequence of, these viewpoints and these are analysed in more detail below.

An inherent disrespect for animals in the circus

3.44 Over one third of respondents who commented felt that the witnessing of animal training or performances in a travelling circus environment promoted an unhealthy anthropocentric notion that humans, as the supposedly superior race, had the right to control and dominate other species for their own gain at whatever cost to the animal. For environmental and ethical reasons, respondents felt that this was an outdated and dangerous idea to promote to young people.

3.45 Furthermore, about one fifth of respondents who commented thought that circus performances objectified animals or portrayed them as playthings purely for entertainment purposes. In the opinion of respondents, this hindered societal values taught to young people that animals were sentient beings with needs and feelings and did not exist solely to fulfil human purposes. Many respondents felt that the circus contradicted the idea that animals have the right to roam free in the wild and that they should not be held captive. A small group of respondents also argued that exploiting animals for monetary profit was particularly immoral and should not be endorsed to young people.

“*They encourage selfish attitudes towards the world and living things in it. Instead of empathising with and learning about animals, circuses objectify animals for entertainment purposes and thus promote unhealthy anthropocentrism. They normalise the idea of animals existing only for human benefit and imply that control over other living creatures is something to be applauded. Bad living conditions and cruel treatment of animals is also normalised.*” *(Individual Respondent)*

“*By having animals perform in front of children it will give children the idea from an early age that animals are somehow here for our entertainment, that humans somehow have a right to control and train other animals. Children should be taught that animals should be admired and respected but left to be free wherever possible, the only exception being conservation efforts.*” *(Individual Respondent)*

“*Circus’ promote the message that animals are beneath us and exist on this earth for us to do as we please with them. It lowers awareness that animals in fact are capable of emotions and having individual personalities. They're paraded around like props and it is wrong. Our children need to be raised with respectful and responsible attitudes towards all living creatures. Circus culture does nothing to help this.*” *(Individual Respondent)*

“*I believe this has an adverse effect on people of all ages, as it appears to some that animals are merely a commodity, to be used for our entertainment and the quality of life or happiness of the animal is unimportant.*” *(Individual Respondent)*

“*Circus with animals generate the erroneous idea that animals are toys, objects of entertainment. Young people and children grow up with this premise and this leads to disrespect of nature, causing irreversible damage to our society and our planet.*” *(Individual Respondent)*

3.46 Several respondents described the animal performances as humiliating and, in terms of teaching young people to respect animals, respondents felt that
encouraging children to laugh in a derogatory fashion at animal antics sent out a conflicting message. Respondents also commented that young people witnessing circus performances would result in a lack of appreciation for the animal's intrinsic value and inherent 'wildness'; instead, children would only rate the animal based on its ability to perform 'tricks'.

“You cannot teach people (children especially), to laugh at the antics of animals, and simultaneously expect them to have respect for them.

“As described above, I believe it desensitizes children and young people to the incredible and wonderful characteristics and natures of these incredible creatures. They are cheated of an appreciation of the incredibly complex and awe-inspiring nature and psychology of these creatures, of the amazing intelligence behind the workings of our natural environment and natural eco-systems, by introducing them to these incredible creatures in a very reduced capacity, lessening an appreciation of them as sentient, feeling beings.” (Individual Respondent)

“We've stopped the freak shows which would certainly have an adverse impact on how children see humans, it's the same with animals.” (Individual Respondent)

**Lack of educational benefit**

3.47 Additionally, many respondents pointed out that, in contrast to zoos and other wildlife centres, circuses offered very little education about the animal's true wild nature to remedy the above impressions. Specifically, respondents criticised the circus's failure to teach children about animals' natural behaviours and the role of their species in the ecosystem, thus leaving children with zero understanding of the origin and value of wild animals. Respondents went on to say that without an educational slant, the circus misrepresented animals to children, who may well believe the circus to be the animal's natural habitat and the performance an illustration of its natural behaviours. Several respondents claimed that children did not realise the training (and in the opinion of some, this was considered to be of an abusive nature) that went into the animals' performances and simply believed that the animals enjoyed acting out these routines of their own accord.

3.48 Respondents commented that children could only truly learn about animals in more natural environments, where they were able to exhibit normal behaviour, which a circus environment could not simulate or facilitate. In the circus the child could not see an animal's true 'wild' nature, so could not be taught to respect it. Some respondents even suggested that misrepresenting animals to children in this way could have consequences for the illegal animal trade as children may be inclined to 'want one', which could result in a rise in exotic pets that young people and their parents would not know how to care for.

3.49 A small number of respondents commented that the lack of awareness regarding wild animals could also be dangerous for children, who may not know how to conduct themselves safely and appropriately around an aggressive animal, if encountered in the wild.

“Wild animal performances are loved by children, but only show the submissive side of animals. Wild animals have many facets and children should be made aware that shows and performances are not 'natural' habitats for wild animals.” (Individual Response)
“While it may be exciting for a child to see such a wild animal, watching such animals performing un-natural acts will not educate that child into the true nature of the individual animal concerned. Wild animals that are used in performances do so in an un natural environment and in the main not housed in a manner that allows them to exhibit normal behaviour.” (Group Response – SSPCA)

“Children could believe that animals are there for our entertainment when they are not. Although it could be argued that it helps them to learn about animals it does not show anything about normal ecology or behaviour of the species” (Individual Response)

“They would see that animals are just for entertainment and not be educated as to how animals behave in the wild. Tigers don’t jump through flaming hoops in the wild. Elephants don’t dance on their hind legs in the wild. These performances are not an education, they are a perversion.” (Individual Response)

“Of course it does. Ask many children where some of these animals come from and they will say the circus, not their natural habitat. Seeing a performing Lion, Tiger, Elephant, Monkey does not teach children or young adults anything natural about the animal, they are just seen as performers and it teaches them nothing about conservation of these animals or correct animal welfare.” (Individual Response)

3.50 As a consequence of this lack of education, several individual respondents and some organisations affiliated with animal welfare were particularly concerned about the negative implications for conservation efforts and preservation of species. For example, future generations, who may have only seen wild animals in the context of a circus, may not realise or appreciate the intrinsic value of endangered animals or know anything about their true habitats. Respondents also posed the ethical argument that endangered species being made to perform tricks would confuse children as to the importance of these animals. Animal welfare groups referenced several academic papers with research that drew links between viewing animals in an anthropocentric environment and a distortion of how we regarded animals in the wild, with negative impacts on conservation efforts as a result.

“Research has shown that the presentation of chimpanzees, for example, in human-centric environments can lead to distorted understanding of the conservation status of that species. Audiences seeing these animals in humanised settings were less likely to believe that the species of animal were threatened in the wild…..In addition to this, misleading comments made by at least one circus proprietor and published in press have suggested that circuses have a role to play in the conservation of endangered species, such as tigers…… It is widely accepted that there is no conservation value to using wild animals in circuses but, if this positive conservation message is being perpetuated by members of the circus industry, this could lead to further damage to perceptions of animals and their protection amongst children and young people that visit such circuses.” (Group Response – Captive Animals’ Protection Society)

“Animals are often dressed up and elicit laughter as a response to the inane acts they are forced to perform. By portraying a species in this way makes the conservation work being done for these often endangered animals, chimps, elephants etc even more difficult as the general public don’t understand the critical issues facing these species.” (Individual Response)

“…members of the zoological community have found that viewing animals who have been forced to perform unnatural tricks not only has zero educational value but also diminishes public interest in the conservation of exotic and endangered species.” (Group Response – PETA)
Perceived welfare issues in the circus

3.51 As with Consultation Question 1, many respondents based their answer, wholly or in part, on perceived welfare issues in the travelling circus. In the opinion of over a quarter of commenters, continuing to allow the use of wild animals in circuses was akin to society as a whole condoning the abuse of these animals. Respondents identified ‘abuse’ as active physical punishment (whipping or beating the animal) or neglect linked to living conditions and quality of life (such as restricted movement due to being caged for long periods). According to respondents, because it was natural for children to copy what they saw, young people would continue to perpetuate the maltreatment of animals long after they had left the circus environment. Over a quarter of respondents who commented felt that witnessing performing animals in a travelling circus would normalise the idea of abuse in the minds of young children. Respondents suggested that this could lead directly to abuse of a child’s pet at home and could even develop into violence against humans, in the future.

“Have you ever heard the term "Monkey see monkey do"? As we all know, children are highly impressionable. So if they see animals being mistreated, they are going to think that's okay to do. And if they think it's okay to abuse animals, they'll think it will be okay to do it to humans too.” (Individual Respondent)

“Circuses normalise the abuse and mistreatment of animals. Animals are subject to control and coercion: whipped and made to perform unnatural tasks. This ‘normalisation’ of abuse and domination teaches children that animals are ciphers, and exist solely for human purposes.” (Individual Respondent)

“By seeing animals being whipped in order to do the tricks intended children view abusive behaviour towards animals as a normal and acceptable. These beliefs may stay with the child right through to adulthood and they themselves may abuse animals since they will have become accustomed to cruelty.” (Individual Respondent)

“Children, far more than adults, are incredibly sensitive to attitudes and atmosphere, and once they are given to believe that cruelty and control over animals is normal, they will exercise this same attitude toward animals and toward people in their own lives. There is a direct corollary between animal abuse in childhood and crimes committed in adulthood.” (Individual Respondent)

3.52 For the reasons stated above, several respondents went on to specifically suggest that visiting a circus could hinder a child’s empathic development. In the opinion of respondents, children became desensitised to violence and the suffering of sentient beings when the travelling circus exposed them to abusive practices. These practices could range from perceived intimidation techniques and physical violence towards the animal in the ring to seeing animals kept isolated in cages ‘backstage’. Respondents suggested that young people’s disregard for the welfare of sentient beings was further enhanced by the circus’s objectification of the animals as identified earlier.

“If children see wild animals being treated in an unnatural way (even if they do not witness actual abuse) they may become less sensitive to the suffering of other living beings. Children should be taught to respect animals and feel empathy towards them, as they have feelings, feel pain and suffer psychologically just as humans do; exposure to circuses can undermine that lesson.” (Individual Respondent)
“It is difficult for a child to learn respect and empathy or another being if it is taught that another being’s suffering is acceptable for the purposes of the child's entertainment. The learning of empathy is primary for the development of a well rounded, beneficial, constructive member of society.” (Individual Respondent)

3.53 Some respondents commented that children in this modern age were already aware of these abusive practices and wanted them to stop and that it was confusing to them that society allowed them to continue.

Additional quotes

“Children do not realise the cruelty used in the training of the animals and therefore think the acts are ‘natural’ and that the animals enjoy performing. Children need to understand the cruelty behind these performances and realise that ALL animals are sentient beings who should be allowed to live their lives in their natural habitat, with their own kind and be able to perform natural behaviour patterns just as we do.” (Group Response – Passive Pressure Animal Welfare Group)

“By dressing up animals and making them perform ‘funny’ tricks, children are encouraged to see animals as amusing ‘things’ - with no more sentience than a Furbie. Outside of the ring, children may see that the animals are chained or kept in tiny travelling cages. To send the message that it is OK to treat those more vulnerable than ourselves in this way, can only have an adverse impact.” (Group Response – Animal Aid)

“Yes, as it is indicating to young people that it is acceptable for animals to be used as a source of amusement, humour and entertainment at the expense of their being able to fulfil their natural behaviours and enjoy optimum welfare. This is likely to impact on how they perceive animals and how they think they should be treated resulting in a lack of respect towards animals and the view that it is acceptable to objectify and treat them as figures of fun.” (Individual Respondent)

No one thinks “Ooh, MR. Bean must be a really nice fellow under all that,” because they have only ever seen him making us laugh. It is the same with animals. While we see them performing tricks, we are forgetting that under the humour, is an animal with as much right to walk the earth as we do.” (Individual Respondent)

“It infers that wild animals are our property and that our needs and wishes are more important than theirs. It teaches children nothing of how animals behave normally or the importance of preserving their natural habitats.” (Individual Respondent)

“It is our measured assessment, based on long experience, that the use of wild animals in travelling circuses categorically conflicts with messages of respect and understanding of animals and their welfare. There is emerging evidence that the use of animals in performances negatively affects attitudes and compromises educational / conservation messages (Ross et al. 2011). It is highly likely that an adverse influence on attitudes of respect and responsibility will be strong amongst children and young people exposed to wild animals in circuses. We consider it to be vital for children and young people to learn about wild animals in their natural habitat, performing natural behavior.” (Group Response – Born Free Foundation)

“Exposing children and young people to the abuse of animals in the circus industry teaches them that it's acceptable to dominate, whip, chain and beat other living, feeling beings who experience the pain of the whips and the stress of confinement to the same extent that we would. Obviously, these things are not acceptable, and such lessons in
insensitivity are not what most parents would knowingly want to teach their children. Furthermore, experts in early childhood development have recommended against taking children to circuses that force animals to perform after finding that such acts inhibit a child’s ability to develop empathy towards both humans and animals alike by teaching them that other living beings are merely objects to be manipulated for their own enjoyment.” (Group Response – PETA)

“Circuses do little to attempt to educate their patrons about the natural behaviour of the wild animals on display, nor their conservation etc. …Given this, circuses can expect to be viewed as considerably less likely to impart knowledge regarding conservation etc.” (Group Response – Animal Defenders International)

Respondents who answered ‘No’ there is not an adverse impact in children

3.54 A total of 71 respondents, including 4 of the groups affiliated with the circus industry, considered that there were no adverse impacts to witnessing wild animals perform in the circus and 55 respondents provided comments. Most of the points made by the respondents who commented were direct contradictions of the opinions of the ‘yes’ respondents. Almost every respondent across the entire consultation who commented on the matter agreed that a child was especially impressionable; however, the difference for the ‘no’ respondents was that the circus was being seen to promote a positive message as opposed to a negative one.

Key points

3.55 Key points:

- Animals are treated with respect in the circus; children will see evidence of this mutual respect and good relationship with the animal and go on to emulate it.
- Children learn about and respect animals through close up encounters and sensory experiences of the kind found in a circus.
- The trainers give educational talks on the animals and conservation.
- Only natural behaviours are performed, not ‘tricks’, so children can learn about the real abilities of the animal in the wild.

Fosters respect

3.56 Some respondents were of the opinion that animals in the circus were greatly respected by their owners and trainers – more so than in a zoo - and children would go on to emulate this respect towards other animals in future. Respondents added that feelings of respect were heightened at the circus particularly because the animals were physically close to the audience; seeing the animals up close in the flesh fostered more respect than experiencing them through other media.

“I know that children respect animals MORE when they see the close communication and trust they have with their trainers through care and reward.” (Individual Respondent)

“the appearance and condition off circus animals teaches children to look after animals” (Individual Respondent)
“Animals are the most popular part of circus for children and youth. Good circus demonstrates to children and youth the responsible care, training and presentation of animals and can help them take action to be more responsible for their own animals.”

(Respondent – Federation Mondiale du Cirque)

“A child gets to see what the animal is capable. The trainers do not train tricks only natural behaviours are done. The animals are trained to be obedient” (Individual Respondent)

“Direct access to these animals and their skills should not be seen as being having an adverse impact on young people or children. Certainly, surveys undertaken in zoos seem to suggest that this direct contact with wild animals is positively correlated to generating interest in these animals. Unfortunately, no similar research has been undertaken on animals in circuses aside from basic work undertaken by Kiley-Worthington (1990) in her 18-month research into circus welfare published in 1990.”

(Respondent)

Educational role

3.57 From an educational perspective, many respondents commented that circus ‘tricks’ only ever mimicked the animal’s natural behaviours - one respondent even going so far as to provide pictorial evidence of this. Because of this, respondents suggested that the performances allowed children to experience animals in a way not wholly unnatural, meaning that they would be able to learn about the animal’s true abilities by watching performances. This experience, respondents commented, was often supplemented by educational and conservational talks given by the trainers themselves. According to respondents, this close up experience also generated more interest in the animals which would improve conservation and animal welfare efforts in the future.

“I believe circus are a great resource of education for children and allow them to be up close to them when they are unable to experience this anywhere else, the animals acts are based purely on natural behaviours as found in the wild there is plenty of evidence to support this” (Individual Respondent)

“... many zoos within the UK and beyond present animal shows and demonstrations not unlike circus presentations utilising wild animals. In fact, it would be true to say that, there are now more performing wild animals in UK zoos than any circus has displayed for a number of years. Moreover, even now, for many people visiting the circus this will be a rare glimpse of various animal species. Whist we have animals displayed on television documentaries and in zoological collections I would suspect many people within the demographics of circus visitors may take no interest in these other forms of contact with these animals.” (Individual Respondent)

“Many animal species are threatened in their natural habitats. Nowadays more tigers live in human care than in the wild. In Africa, elephants are regularly "culled" (shot dead) not only for their ivory, but simply because there is not enough space for them. We protect only what we know. Animals in the circus serve as ambassadors for their wild counterparts - more personally and emotionally than any documentary on TV. Thus, the circus indirectly makes a contribution to conservation by showing how wonderful animals are and why humans should preserve them in the wild.” (Group Response – European Circus Association)

“... circus animal manoeuvres echo manoeuvres that animals in the wild perform. It is obvious from the enjoyment that young people and children of all ages get out of
watching a big cat willingly jump from one pedestal to another in the circus ring. Being up close and personal means that the children can appreciate the power, strength and beauty these animals have. Combined with good signage and educational talks from the owners and trainers visiting a circus makes the whole learning experience much more memorable than a visit to a zoo. Zoos tried to differentiate themselves from circuses and made a case that they were cleverer than circuses, that somehow zoo personnel were better educated, more knowledgeable animal wise, knew more about the animals in their care, so they invented Edutainment – training and working with animals to please and entertain the public under the guise of education, getting their animals to perform manoeuvres in order to get more people through the zoo gates. All put together to impress and entertain the paying public. “(Group Response – Classical Circus Association)

“… the animals they see are up close and personal. The children are never more than 4 or 5 feet away from the wild animal, even the big cats in their cage are very close to the ringside seats. The children can smell them, they can see the animal’s hair and muscle, they can see the animal’s bodies as they move and jump and they can see the eyes and ears of the animal. They can see how alive and alert they are and how they love looking at the audience, how they engage and enjoy the commands and rewards of their trainers. Children never get tired of watching circus animals perform and this reflects in families returning again and again to visit circuses. …Combine this with one to one educational talks with the trainer after the show and children go away with more knowledge of animals in the wild and how to protect their future than they will ever get from a zoo.” (Group Response – Classical Circus Association)

Additional quotes

“There are two very distinct differences between the zoo shows and the circus shows….. The zoo personnel do not spend all their working time with the animals they present… As such they don’t know the all animal’s behavioural patterns or their individual characteristics so the shows are generic and scripted to account loosely for species specific behaviour. …Whereas in the circus the animals are woken up in the morning by their owner/presenter, they are evaluated and monitored as to their wellbeing, exchange of greetings takes priority here; the animals are as pleased to see their constant carer as their carer is to see them. The same carer cleans the animal buildings, feeds, trains and presents the animals too…. This is a 365 days a year commitment and overtime builds a secure, sustainable human and animal society which results in ongoing wellbeing for all concerned. No other industry in the world has this unique one to one complete commitment to the wellbeing of so called wild animals and humans.” (Group Response – Classical Circus Association)

Respondents who answered ‘Don’t Know’ whether there is an adverse impact in children

3.58 A total of 27 respondents answered ‘don’t know’ and the 14 respondents who provided comments based these on their own uncertainty of existing animal welfare education in young people; that is, how much they already knew about the animal’s natural habitat and behaviours before visiting the circus. Many thought that a child’s parents, or the educational messages taught to young people through schools and society would ultimately be a stronger influence on their perception of animals than that of the circus experience alone, particularly as most children only had limited and infrequent exposure to the circus.
Some respondents were not sure how a circus experience would impact on children because the children in question were not able to see the whole picture with regard to perceived animal cruelty in the circus. Others said they simply did not know enough about child psychology to answer fully.

“There are benefits and disadvantages, and the exhibition/performance is only one element which may affect young persons attitudes. This can be further addressed through the provision of information, educational materials etc, which equally have a role in affecting attitudes. It is worth considering and contrasting the situation of zoos which are required (by the amended ZLA) to identify their contribution to education and environmental values. This is an explicit requirement.” (Group Response – Argyll and Bute Council)

“I am not sure as I think it would depend on whether the children were aware of the natural habits these animals would live in.” (Individual Respondent)

“Not expert on child behaviour - but suspect that many children may see as a pet. Older children are, presumably, more likely to display empathy towards a caged wild animal.” (Group Response – Perth and Kinross Council)

“It would be so easy to answer yes to this question, but not sure. As a child I used to go to circuses featuring wild animals, and I don’t feel it had a negative impact on my attitudes - possibly the reverse because I remember seeing how the lions were caged after the circus and thinking how awful it was. Nowadays however, as adults have developed greater awareness of the total undesirability of having wild animals in travelling circuses, I would expect adults to explain to their children why they would not condone this.” (Individual Respondent)

“This is a grey area, little children don’t understand and may fall in love with elephants when they see them in circuses, but they would lose little if they didn’t see them performing and I wonder if those who are enthralled by it as a child do go on to develop greater respect for all animals, so I am not sure. But generally wild animals being made to do demeaning things for entertainment is not a desirable thing and I would hope most responsible parents feel that anyway” (Individual Respondent)

“I have no idea but what I do know is that if children and adults are exposed to the truth behind circuses they never want to visit one again!” (Individual Respondent)
CONSULTATION QUESTION 3: Do you consider that concerns relating to respect for animals could be resolved without banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses. If so, how?

Table 3.3: Overview of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>comments</th>
<th>Individuals No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>comments</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>1935</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

3.60 A total of 2034 respondents (99.6%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, the vast majority, 1935 respondents (94.7%) answered ‘no’ indicating they believed that their perceived concerns in relation to respect for wild animals in travelling circuses could only be resolved by banning their use; 69 respondents (3.4%) answered ‘yes’; and 30 respondents (1.5%) answered ‘don’t know’. The remaining 9 respondents (0.4%) left this question blank (even though 4 offered comments that did not support the use of wild animals in circuses).

3.61 In total, 1242 respondents (60.8%) offered comments at Question 3.

Respondents who answered ‘No’, concerns about respect cannot be resolved without a ban

3.62 A total of 1935 respondents answered ‘no’ and 1168 provided comments. The vast majority considered it impossible to remedy concerns regarding the impact of the use of wild animals in travelling circuses on people’s respect for animals without completely banning their use. A great many respondents who answered ‘no’ took the opportunity to reiterate the points they had already made in questions 1 and 2.

Key points

3.63 Key points:

- Using wild animals in circuses for entertainment is inherently disrespectful and cruel because it is contrary to their nature.
- Even if their circumstances were improved, it is impossible for travelling circuses to provide wild animals with the respect they deserve and their species-specific needs.
- Wild animals should live in their natural habitat or as close to a life of freedom as is possible.
- While measures could be taken to improve the lot of these animals, their lives would not fundamentally be altered due to the nature of circuses.
• These animals are not being given their rights and humans do not have the right to use wild animals any way they see fit.
• It is important to teach people, especially young people, to respect animals and by continuing to allow wild animals to be used in circuses in this way is sending out the wrong message.
• It is an old-fashioned and outdated tradition.
• Any measures introduced could not be standardised or policed 24/7 and there is no guarantee that rules would not be broken or disregarded.

Unnatural environment

3.64 Almost three quarters of the respondents who commented, stated strongly that using wild animals in circuses for entertainment purposes was inherently disrespectful and cruel because it was contrary to the nature of these animals. Many also considered that, while measures could possibly be taken to improve the lot of these animals, their lives would not fundamentally be altered because of the nature of circuses; they perceived it to be impossible for a travelling circus to provide wild animals with their species-specific needs.

Message concerns

3.65 As in previous questions, respondents also considered that humans did not have the right to use wild animals as they saw fit; that the animals should be allowed to remain in the wild with others of their species; and that this disrespectful and outdated use of these animals sent out the wrong messages to young people.

“Any usage of captive animals for entertainment is inherently disrespectful.” (Individual Respondent)

“The nature of the spectacle cannot be changed. Any attempts would just be tokenism.” (Individual Respondent)

“One is automatically showing a lack of respect for wild animals by taking them from their natural habitat in the first place. The transportation of these animals and their subsequent confinement can in no way replicate their natural habitat. A circus environment, in particular a travelling circus environment, is totally unsuitable for all wild animals. Only by banning the use of wild animals will respect for their needs start to be addressed.” (Individual Respondent)

“a travelling circus subjects animals to extreme un-natural environments, confined living and an extremely poor quality of life. A travelling circus can never provide the space and quality of care that a zoo or safari park can provide, where the animal is afforded the opportunity to live in a more natural environment with experts responsible for their care. As such their use should be banned outright in circuses” (Individual Respondent)

“We believe that the use of wild animals in circuses both demonstrates and perpetuates a lack of respect for animals and that banning their use is the only solution to overcome these concerns.” (Group Response - The Captive Animals’ Protection Society)

“Banning wild animals in circuses is a necessary step. There are many other ways to teach about respect for animals, but they would be contradicted if wild animals were still in circuses.” (Individual Respondent)

“It’s a no brainer. Keeping wild animals isolated and in confined spaces shows no respect for their needs and desires.” (Individual Respondent)
Regulation concerns

3.66 Some respondents who had considered the possibility of introducing statutory regulation to improve the welfare and life of wild animals in travelling circuses were unconvinced that this would be a viable option because they believed that enforcement would be an issue. Respondents considered that it would be difficult or even impossible for enforcement officers to monitor travelling circuses if regulations were introduced; others thought that the level of monitoring that would be required to ensure statutory controls were being met would be extremely high and, consequently, unsustainable.

“[The conditions are inherently cruel but besides that there are insufficient inspectors to keep an eye on it and circuses have demonstrated time after time that they cannot be trusted to treat the animals humanely or in accordance with the law.]” (Individual Respondent)

“Not possible to police” (Individual Respondent)

“Animals need to have rights. Even when they are given rights, humans do not abide by this. Unless the animals are monitored 24/7, then how is anyone to know how they are treated? Despite what the trainers/owners may say.” (Individual Respondent)

“Without a very high level of resource and regulation, it would be virtually impossible to ensure acceptable standards of living and humane treatment.” (Individual Respondent)

“1. Wild animals should not be in captivity. 2. It is impossible to monitor the methods of training animals in circuses.” (Individual Respondent)

“It would be too difficult to monitor how the animals are being treated.” (Individual Respondent)

Additional quotes

“It is not humane. They are punished, confined and deprived of all their needs and instincts. It must be banned. It cannot be corrected.” (Individual Respondent)

“…The very nature of the circus is the abuse of wild animals and just about as far away from respecting them as you could possibly get.” (Individual Respondent)

“It is inhumane and cruel. All the animals’ natural instincts are thwarted. There is no way keeping animals in circuses can possibly be improved, except by banning the practice entirely.” (Individual Respondent)

“There is simply no humane way to use animals in circuses. In addition to being subjected to premature maternal separation, the constant threat of physical punishment and prolonged and unnatural confinement, these animals are deprived of the opportunity to satisfy virtually all of their species-specific needs and instincts. The use of wild animals in circuses must be banned because the welfare problems experienced by animals in travelling circuses are inherent in their use and cannot be corrected by any change in practice. Choosing to allow these kinds of welfare problems to continue by failing to ban animals in circuses would demonstrate a complete lack of respect for animals.” (Group Response - PETA UK)

“…There is no way to utilize wild animals ‘humanely’ in circuses. Banning is necessary (as has already been done in several forward-thinking countries around the world) because the welfare problems are too ingrained. Better laws or different practice will not resolve the problem.” (Individual Respondent)
Respondents who answered ‘Yes’, concerns about respect can be resolved without a ban

3.67 A total of 69 respondents answered ‘yes’ and 57 respondents provided comments. The comments of 22 respondents did not support their ‘yes’ response; another 9 respondents offered no useful suggestions regarding alternatives to banning.

Key points

3.68 Key points:

- A rigorous, independent, unbiased licensing and inspection system should be put in place which is properly enforced with regular unannounced checks and the power to stop performances.
- Educate the public, in particular by familiarising the young with wildlife and teach them to respect animals.
- Suitable and adequate legislative controls are already in place and these should be maintained.
- A global organisation should be put in place that has the resources to police every organisation that uses animals for entertainment.
- Government should work with circuses to draw up an animal welfare policy.
- Circuses should have to attain a certain standard.
- Concerns about respect would be diminished if circus performances were more like zoo-based animal demonstrations i.e. with a strong educational element.
- Showing greater respect to the animals by only displaying them in the ring rather than having them perform, keeping them in the most natural environment possible and permitting only essential human contact.

Regulatory approach

3.69 Twelve respondents thought that banning was unnecessary because any concerns could be completely resolved by introducing statutory regulation and a licensing system with proper enforcement. It was recognised that the regulatory system would have to be robust and enforcement strict if the public was to believe in it. It was pointed out that circuses in England were already regulated and being policed with reported findings made public.

"Inspection and licensing system the public can believe in to have the power to allow or stop performances." (Individual Respondent)

"Substitute 'welfare' for 'respect' - a rigorous inspection system, properly enforced, is the way forward." (Individual Respondent)
“circus have long called for an independent, unbiased licensing system with regular unannounced checks to ensure they adhere to the licensing standards, if they had something to hide why would they be calling for this measure to be put in place” (Individual Respondent)

“If regulations were to be put in place to ensure the animals needs are met and the animals are treated much better” (Individual Respondent)

“Good regulations and strict enforcement ensures animal health and welfare preserving the freedom of choice that would be sacrificed by a ban.” (Group Response – Federation Mondiale du Cirque)

“Many other countries in Europe have regulated, not banned animals in the circus. Clear regulations make sure that no animal is deprived of its dignity, e.g. no animal must be made fun of.” (Group Response – European Circus Association)

“The welfare of animals can definitely be secured by in depth robust regulation. Respect for animals in captivity is one for each individual to assess within their own consciousness and involves examining their own upbringing and culture. Their family values and respect for each other as human beings has a part to play on how they view animals. Within traditional circuses family values are paramount and play an important part in their daily lives and working policies. This is reflected in their attitude towards the animals in their care. How this can be monitored and evaluated is by constant review and monitoring of the wellbeing of the animals in their care by the circus fraternity and reported to society and government in the lengthy inspections by government vets. With regards to the English Regulations all the visits to the licensed circuses are posted on the defra website for all to see.” (Group Response – Classical Circus Association)

3.70 Four of the groups affiliated with the circus industry were totally opposed to banning the use of wild animals in circuses and united in their desire for a clear, robust regulatory system with strict monitoring, evaluation and enforcement to be put in place; in their opinion, this would properly secure the welfare and dignity of the animals. One group pointed out that many other countries in Europe had regulated animals in circuses rather than banned them. A couple of respondents thought that suitable and adequate legislative controls were already in place for the protection of animals and that these should be maintained.

“The Council does NOT support the ban, and believe that there are adequate existing controls under the Animal Health and Welfare (Scotland) Act 1981/2006 and the Civic Government (Scotland) Act 1982 to regulate standards of animal health and welfare of any animals used in circuses.” (Group Response – Argyll and Bute Council)

3.71 Three respondents thought that legislation to regulate circuses had already been introduced and were content for this to be sustained or even for standards to be raised. One respondent thought that standards in circuses should be raised in line with the 2 circuses that are regulated in England; another felt that legislation was not required and that it would be much better for the Government to talk to and work with circuses and draw up suitable animal welfare policy once they were fully conversant with the subject. Another respondent believed a global organisation that had the resources to police every organisation using animals for entertainment should be set up.
Discrimination concerns

3.72 One Group observed that visiting circuses with animals was a question of taste and banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses would be unfair because this would take choice away from the public; another group stated that banning the use of wild or non-indigenous animals in circuses would represent a serious discrimination against the circus activity. One circus group stated that the Scottish Government’s consultation document demonstrated its bias against circuses by only presenting information about bans and failing to provide information about countries where regulated circuses thrive.

“Given that many people observe the sincere and consistent respect for animals by their caretakers and presenters it is evident that this is a question of taste. Those who do not enjoy opera or hawking exhibition or horseracing do not go to such events..... Consultation Document demonstrates its bias against circuses by only presenting information about bans - which exist in a handful of countries around the world - and failing to provide information about the many countries in which circuses thrive and operate pursuant to government regulation - which also protects them. The Consultation Document also clearly shows that there is little to no interest by its authors in doing anything other than to ban since it dismisses out of hand any regulatory option. That pre-conceived notion that is conveyed to the public by the Document itself renders this “consultation” process a sham. One hopes that persons who are less biased that the authors of the Document will review the results.” (Group Response - Federation Mondiale du Cirque)

“Because the Club Amici del Circo believes that banning the use of wild or non-indigenous animals in circuses would represent a serious discrimination for the circus activity - also in comparison with the majority and more important European legislation - and a standpoint that is not proven by scientific and ethical argumentations. The ban would not entail any actual improvement in the welfare of animals in Scotland, but it would only damage an expressive form that has its modern roots in Scotland itself. Therefore, the CAdeC has always promoted and supported the idea of regulating the methods of use of all animals, rather than a total or partial ban, believing that training is legitimate according to the most modern ethological criteria.” (Group Response – Club Amici del Circo)

Educational approach

3.73 A few respondents felt that education of the public, in particular by familiarising the young with wildlife and teaching them to respect animals, was the way to resolve any perceived concerns about the use of wild animals in circuses; one respondent thought that concerns about respect would be diminished if circus performances had a strong educational element similar to zoo-based animal demonstrations. Another respondent thought that greater respect could be shown to the animals by only displaying them in the ring rather than having them perform, keeping them in the most natural environment possible and permitting only essential human contact.
“.....With all the knowledge we have today about the animals, their natural habitats and natural behaviour, also the way they are presented in the circus today has changed. More than ever before the real attraction is the beauty of the animals, their strength and grace. Nowhere else on earth can one see horses parading on their hind legs, lions and tigers jumping across long distances, elephants carefully lying down on top of their trainer, sealions playfully balancing and colourful parrots flying free through the air right above the heads of the audience - and all of that within just 3 hours of a circus show.”

(Group Response – European Circus Association)

Respondents who answered ‘Don’t Know’ whether concerns about respect can be resolved without a ban

3.74 A total of 30 respondents answered ‘don’t know’ and 13 provided comments. One respondent did not know if banning the use of wild animals in circuses was important for educational purposes but doubted that children would take environmental concerns in relation to wild animals seriously if the only time they saw them was when they were performing amusing antics that people paid to see; another respondent commented that wild animals should only be shown to the public for educational purposes.

3.75 One respondent was unsure if concerns could be resolved without banning but considered that there would need to be strong legislation in place as a deterrent for wrongdoers; other respondents thought that a ban would make no difference and that welfare issues with wild animals would continue. Another respondent thought that banning the use of wild animals in circuses would help but pointed out, without offering specifics, that there were other ways to prevent disrespect to animals. Other respondents commented that they did not know how concerns could be addressed without a ban but thought other measures needed to be taken into account and were open to suggestions.

3.76 Finally, one respondent thought that bona fide research needed to be undertaken in support of the claim that the use of wild animals in circuses engendered disrespect towards the animals, stating that until research was done question 3 was meaningless.
4. TRAVELLING ENVIRONMENT

4.1 This section of the consultation document contained 3 questions relating to wild animals in the travelling circus environment:

Consultation Question 4: Do you believe that the ability of none, some, or all wild animals to undertake natural behaviours are compromised within the travelling circus environment? Which species? Which needs? Why?

4.2 This was a multiple choice question and respondents could select ‘none’, ‘some’, ‘all’ or ‘don’t know’ in response. Answering ‘all’ suggested that the respondent considered that the ability to undertake natural behaviours within the travelling circus environment was compromised in all species; selecting ‘none’ suggested that the respondent considered that the ability to undertake natural behaviours was not compromised in any species within the travelling circus environment; respondents who selected ‘some’ were invited to identify which species of wild animal they considered were compromised and which behavioural needs. All respondents were invited to comment on their answers.

Consultation Question 5: Do you consider that it is possible to facilitate the natural behaviour of none, some or all wild animals within the travelling circus environment? Which species? How?

4.3 This was also a multiple choice question and again respondents could select ‘none’, ‘some’ or ‘all’ in response. Answering ‘none’ suggested that the respondent considered that it was not possible to facilitate the natural behaviour of any wild species within the travelling circus environment; selecting ‘all’ suggested that the respondent considered that it was possible to facilitate the natural behaviour of all wild species within the travelling circus environment; respondents who selected ‘some’ were invited to identify which species of wild animal they considered could be facilitated and which behavioural needs. All respondents were invited to comment on their answers.

Consultation Question 6: Do you consider that the concerns raised surrounding the travelling environment could be resolved without banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses? How?

4.4 Respondents could answer ‘yes’, ‘no’ or ‘don’t know’ to this question. Answering ‘no’ suggested that the respondent considered that the concerns raised surrounding the travelling environment could not be resolved without banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses; respondents who answered ‘yes’ appear to have taken the opposite view. All respondents were invited to comment on their answers.

Overview of results

4.5 90.8% of respondents believed that the ability of all wild animals to undertake natural behaviours was compromised within the travelling circus environment.
4.6  **90.8%** of respondents did not consider that it was possible to facilitate the natural behaviour of any wild animals within the travelling circus environment.

4.7  **95.7%** of respondents did not consider that concerns raised surrounding the travelling environment could be resolved without banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses.

4.8  On the whole, the comments supporting answers for questions 4 and 5 conclusively indicate that respondents felt strongly that animals' natural behaviours were being compromised in the circus environment for several reasons; for example, natural behaviours inhibited due to spatial constraints and lack of opportunity to interact with other animals of the same species on a regular basis. A detailed analysis of respondents' comments can be found at consultation questions 4 and 5.
CONSULTATION QUESTION 4: Do you believe that the ability of none, some, or all wild animals to undertake natural behaviours are compromised within the travelling circus environment? Which species? Which needs? Why?

Table 4.1: Overview of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

4.9 A total of 2024 respondents (99.1%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, the vast majority, 1855 respondents (90.8%), answered ‘all’ indicating they believed that the ability of all wild animals to undertake natural behaviours were compromised within the travelling circus environment; 40 respondents (2%) answered ‘some’; 111 respondents (5.4%) answered ‘none’; 18 respondents (0.9%) answered ‘don’t know’ and the remaining 19 respondents (0.9%) left this question blank even though 13 offered comments, all of which were in line with an ‘all’ response.

4.10 In total, 1556 respondents (76.2%) offered comments at Question 4.

Respondents who answered ‘All’ wild animals have behaviours compromised

4.11 A total of 1855 respondents answered ‘all’ and 1429 provided comments.

Key points

4.12 Key points:

- Long periods of confinement between performances or whilst travelling inhibit the animal’s ability and freedom to carry out natural behaviours at will.
- The travelling circus is a wholly unnatural environment for a wild animal – natural behaviours by definition can only occur in the animal’s natural habitat, which the circus can never simulate nor facilitate.
- Animals in the circus are forced to act unnaturally through training regimes and performances, supressing their natural instincts.
- A wild animal’s natural behaviours are compromised simply by being held in captivity.
- Prolonged periods travelling in small, cramped beast-wagons distress the animals and further inhibit natural behaviours.
• Animals in the circus have no control over their lifestyle and the rigidity of routine consequently means they cannot perform certain behaviours of their own free will.
• All animals have specific complex needs and behaviours which the travelling circus does not have the resources to accommodate.
• Life in the circus affects the animal’s psychological state – the only ‘natural’ behaviours shown are signs of distress at being held in such an environment.
• Perceived strict and sometimes abusive training regimes seek to supress natural behaviours and cause distress.

Unnatural environment

4.13 It is clear that the vast number of respondents regard ‘natural behaviours’ as those behaviours that the animal in question would normally carry out in their wild environment. Therefore, for the majority of respondents, any behaviour that the animal would normally undertake in its natural habitat that could not be undertaken in the travelling circus was seen as compromised. In the main, this was due to the confined nature of the travelling circus as respondents felt that animals simply did not have as much space to carry out their behaviours as they would in the wild. For several respondents, however, the fact that the travelling circus was perceived as an ‘unnatural environment’ automatically meant that the animals’ natural behaviours were compromised by definition. According to these respondents, ‘natural behaviours’ can only be undertaken in a natural environment. In fact for many commenters, the only animal behaviours that were seen to be natural in the circus were signs of distress, such as pacing, weaving and gnawing at the bars.

“Animals are forced to occupy unnatural environments in close proximity with one another. In a zoo an enclosure can be created to satisfy an animals individual requirements. This is seldom possible on a truck.” (Individual Respondent)

“Natural behaviours require natural environments, something which a circus, travelling or not, can never provide.” (Individual Respondent)

“Impossible to replicate natural behaviour in a completely unnatural environment.” (Individual Respondent)

“Regardless of the species or their needs, the environment in the travelling circus is not their natural environment and therefore inhibits natural behaviour.” (Individual Respondent)

Training concerns

4.14 Several respondents suggested that a perceived harsh training aspect of circus life was a large factor in the compromising of natural behaviours as the animals were literally being forced against their will to perform incredibly unnatural behaviours that were far removed from what they would do in the wild. Respondents went on further to say that frequent training regimes and strict daily routines would seek to suppress natural behaviours and discourage the animal from performing them from a very young age. For example, their instinct to attack humans or a young animal’s need for free play.
Specific Natural Behaviours and Needs Identified as being compromised

4.15 In the opinion of respondents, several specific natural behaviours were highlighted as being inhibited due to conditions in the travelling circus, and certain needs pertaining to the animal’s wellbeing and quality of life were allegedly not being met. These were as follows:

- No freedom to roam as far or as often as the animal normally would due to travelling and confinement.
- Animal’s social needs not catered for, including: social creatures who naturally live in herds being kept in isolation; solitary creatures being kept in constant close proximity to others of the same or different species; families being separated too soon and predators and their natural prey being kept within sight of each other, all of which would cause distress.
- No freedom to hunt, forage, gather or graze for own food.
- Loss of freedom of choice to carry out natural behaviours at will due to the animals adhering only to a man-made schedule.
- A natural habitat was seen as essential for carrying out natural behaviours – this is unobtainable in a travelling circus.
- Animals unable to choose to breed or raise young naturally in the wild.
- Animals unable to exercise due to confinement, affecting their physical health.
- Lack of mental stimulation in the circus resulting in stress and boredom behaviours.
- The circus is unable to provide the space or environment needed for play, which is particularly important for young animals as they learn natural behaviours this way.
- Animal unable to rest or sleep when it naturally would due to training regimes.
- The animal’s natural inclination to avoid humans, bright lights and sounds is compromised.

Physical needs and behaviours not catered for

4.16 An animal’s period of confinement in the travelling circus, or being caged or chained, was the main reason respondents provided in support of their opinion that the animal’s natural behaviours were compromised. Around a third of respondents who answered ‘all’ felt that being restrained or restricted in this way resulted in the animal being unable to perform certain movements such as running, climbing and grooming. In the event of chaining, the animal might even be unable to move all parts of its body freely.

4.17 The unstable nature of a travelling circus also meant, in the opinion of respondents, that the animals would be unable to freely roam across large spaces and establish permanent territories. Not only would this distress animals, but it would mean that they were unable to hunt to graze to the same extent as they would in the wild. Hunting, grazing and foraging were mentioned by over 15% of respondents as behaviours that were compromised within the travelling circus environment. Respondents also mentioned that, even though the animals would be provided with food, this could not emulate, and would be of a substandard quality to, the natural diet of an animal that kills its prey or grazes at will.
“Capture denies the freedom to be in a natural and familiar environment and appropriate diet and breaks social bonds. Confinement inhibits natural movement. Being forced to travel and perform prevents choice in behaviour and denies attempts to communicate needs.” (Individual Respondent)

“If any wild animal is to be kept in captivity, they need to have an appropriate amount of space and the right environment in which to thrive. This obviously can’t be accommodated when they are being constantly moved around. Some of the larger animals would probably need a space as large as the Big Top itself to enable it to have the freedom to run and exercise, along with things like trees/climbing frames etc. I’m quite sure each time a circus sets up, it does not have several square acres of space available, nor the materials to build and stock all of the necessary sized enclosures to keep the animals.” (Individual Respondent)

“Where wild animals are concerned, I don’t believe that they are able to undertake their natural behaviours in a confined space, regardless of the size of the cage.” (Individual Respondent)

“All species have their freedom of movement severely compromised for the majority of their time. Many, such as elephants need to walk for many miles per day and enjoy bathing and I have seen them in chains in a dark tent. … exercise areas are sometimes available, but they are also completely inadequate. … Natural feeding behaviour such as foraging or hunting, freedom of movement, mating, dustbathing, giving birth, raising young. These are all compromised because a circus by its very nature cannot give wild animals any of these things. because they are on the move constantly, have limited space etc -that's why we need a ban.” (Individual Respondent)

Social needs not catered for

4.18 Around a fifth of respondents who answered ‘all’ spoke of compromise to the animals’ natural social behaviours. A wide range of examples were given where animals were unable to exercise their usual social habits within a species specific social structure due to the limitations of space and numbers of animals in a travelling circus. For example, according to respondents, social animals such as elephants were often left in isolation for years at a time whereas solitary animals like tigers were housed near other animals and were constantly around humans. Additionally, unsuitable animals were kept within close proximity and sight of each other, such as predators and their natural prey, which could cause confusion and distress to both species.

4.19 Many respondents also criticised the travelling circus for being unable to accommodate complex social structures such as prides and herds. Social hierarchies which would otherwise emerge naturally, through fighting and breeding, were created artificially, if present at all. Respondents commented that, even if the travelling circus was able to provide social interaction or isolation to some extent, it was not flexible enough to cater for all the differing social needs for different animals depending on the time of year. Additionally, respondents believed that the separation of mother and baby too early, as might occur in the circus, would prevent the young from learning natural behaviours from the mother and interfere with the latter’s parental instincts. Again, respondents felt that this denial of a natural behaviour was particularly damaging for the family oriented elephant.
Freedom of choice and will not catered for

4.20 Respondents felt that there were many other ‘natural’ activities that a travelling circus environment could not fully facilitate that may arguably see the animal’s quality of life in this environment as lower in comparison to life in the wild, but would not necessarily affect the animal’s welfare or breach the five freedoms. Breeding at will, adhering to various diurnal or nocturnal patterns of sleeping, resting, basking and wakefulness and bathing or climbing trees were seen as natural luxuries that simply were not catered for in the travelling circus. In the opinion of respondents, even if these activities could be performed to some extent, they would be performed in a controlled manner and could not necessarily occur if and exactly when the animal wanted, nor on the same scale as the animal could perform them in the wild.

“Any wild animal kept in a cage will not behave naturally. Humans kept in a cage would not exhibit natural behavior that they employ when free to do as they please, why would other animals be any different?” (Individual Respondent)

“Pretty much all species and all needs except, arguably, nutrition.” (Individual Respondent)

“All animals in circuses are deprived of space and the natural ability to roam. They are deprived of the ability to choose a mate and raise their young in a stress free environment. They are not allowed to eat foods they would in the wild, they are not allowed to hunt. They cannot do anything in a traveling environment that they could do wild. Their life is pitiful. You can give them food and water and bedding yes, but every animal on this planet requires a lot more than just the bare basics to live an enriching life. No well educated person on this planet, who has studied wildlife or animals would agree they are able to live fulfilling lives in a circus environment.” (Individual Respondent)

“Being captive, by definition they can’t choose their own behaviours, so humans cannot assume that anything they do is the same as what they would do if not captive.” (Individual Respondent)

“Animals (wild/exotic and domestic) should not live their lives in chains, cages and cramped stalls. Can an elephant dust bathe on the SECC car park? Can a zebra, camel or for that matter a horse wander and graze when tethered in a tiny stall on a public park? Can a dog chase a ball or even wag its tail when caged in the back of a windowless van? To be anthropomorphic about it – you could exist if kept in a six foot cubed cell, provided with food and water and mucked out once a day. You could exist but you would have no quality of life.” (Group Response – Animal Concern Advice Line)

Specific Species Mentioned

4.21 When invited to identify the particular species whose needs and behaviours might be compromised in a travelling circus environment, 359 respondents stated that specifically all wild animals’ behaviours were compromised; 217 respondents commented that the natural behaviours of all animals and/or species were compromised, without clarifying whether they specifically meant wild animals; and 31 respondents stated specifically that the natural behaviour of both wild and domestic animal species were compromised through life in a travelling circus.

4.22 Additionally, respondents mentioned a number of specific species the natural behaviours of which they felt to be most compromised in the travelling circus environment. Some species were referred to in more general terms as ‘large
mammals’, ‘carnivores’ and ‘big cats’. Generally, respondents felt that the natural behaviours of all wild species of animals were compromised in the travelling circus; the graph below indicates the frequency of which other species were mentioned within the context of discussing their suitability for the travelling circus environment:

### Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species Mentioned</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seals</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kangaroos</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodiles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polar Bears</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhino</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snakes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostriches</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Cats</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llamas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Lions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcas/Whales</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolphins</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Other' Species Mentioned</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reindeer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bison</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankoles (Watusi)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raccoons</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wild Species

#### 4.23 Elephants (310 respondents) -

The most predominantly discussed species was, by far, the elephant. Respondents felt that these creatures in particular had their needs compromised by living in a travelling circus environment, both because conditions were so radically different from what the elephant would encounter in the wild and because elephants in particular were seen to possess a capacity for emotions akin to that of a human, making their captivity a particularly distressing experience. In a purely physical sense, according to respondents, the circus could not cater for the larger spaces these animals needed to enjoy a satisfactory quality of
life. Several respondents described what they perceived to be the natural behaviour of elephants – dust and mud bathing, walking in herds for miles daily and interacting with other elephants as part of a close family unit – to illustrate that these activities would not be possible in a travelling circus environment where the elephant would have no access to water or mud holes, was usually chained up to restrict movement and was isolated from other elephants and its own family. Additionally, in preventing the elephant from carrying out its natural behaviours, respondents felt that the level of isolation and lack of mental stimulation the elephant would experience in the travelling circus would be particularly distressing for such a highly social and intelligent animal, again resulting in a poorer quality of life.

4.24 **Tigers** (236 respondents) - Tigers were also mentioned frequently. In this case, their solitary nature was referred to in order to illustrate the level of distress that being in constant close proximity to other animals (though not necessarily other tigers) and humans would create. In the opinions of respondents, the constant noisy and crowded atmosphere of the travelling circus completely compromised the tiger’s natural solitary behaviour and its inclination to avoid humans, making life stressful for the tiger. Additionally, respondents felt that lions, tigers and other predatory animals would be confused by being kept in close proximity to, and possibly also in sight of, animals that would usually be their prey in a wild environment. Respondents were decided in their opinions that this would cause distress to all the animals involved.

4.25 Additionally, a few respondents thought that the travelling circus was breaching the tiger’s right to attack humans by declawing it; this physical mutilation was seen as a violation of the tiger’s freedom to perform aggressive natural behaviours.

4.26 Like the elephant, respondents felt that, in its natural habitat, the tiger would have a large area to mark as its territory and would travel considerable distances to hunt and breed within this area. Being a confined and unstable environment, respondents claimed that a travelling circus would obviously be unable to provide this.

4.27 **Zebras and Camels** - The points made for camels (151 respondents) and zebras (165 respondents) were similar in nature, due to the fact that they were both grazing animals which were perceived by respondents to live in herds. In the main, respondents felt that these animals were unable to graze at leisure, as they would in the wild, not having the freedom in a travelling circus to roam about as much or as far as they would wish. In the case of zebras, the Scottish climate was also said to be unsuited to their needs.

4.28 **Lions** (74 respondents) - Much like the tiger and other big cats, respondents felt that lions would not have the space they required to undertake natural hunting and roaming behaviours. Additionally, many respondents felt that a lion’s social needs would not be catered for as there would not be enough lions present to create a true ‘pride’; the lions would not be allowed to fight amongst themselves for dominant alpha roles within a natural social structure. Even groups affiliated with the circus conceded the animals would not be allowed to fight each other for reasons of ‘humanity’.
4.29 **Monkeys** (31 respondents) - Respondents commented again on the lack of group social structure provided for monkeys in a travelling circus and a lack of mental stimulation generally for these intelligent creatures. Lack of trees to climb and play on was also mentioned.

4.30 **Bears** (23 respondents) - Again, respondents commented on the large territories that bears roam in the wild and their solitary habits, which they felt the travelling circus would be unable to replicate. Polar bears were mentioned with regard to climate unsuitability in Scotland.

4.31 **Other animals including giraffes and birds** - A variety of other wild animals were mentioned by a few respondents (45 respondents all together); however all points raised in relation to these animals have already been generally discussed. These included limitations of free roaming or natural feeding behaviours due to lack of space, unsuitability of environment (missing key features such as trees or pools) and the strict routines of the circus inhibiting free choice.

### Companion and Domestic animals

4.32 Although outside the scope of the consultation, a small number of respondents discussed the implications of keeping more domesticated animals in a travelling circus environment.

4.33 **Horses** (32 respondents) - With regard to horses, some respondents commented that these animals were domesticated enough to be kept in a travelling circus without much compromise on their natural behaviours. However, the majority of respondents felt that they were not provided with enough space to gallop or exhibit roaming behaviours in herds.

4.34 **Dogs** (23 respondents) - Being domesticated animals, some respondents felt that dogs would not be necessarily affected psychologically by trauma through travelling and conceded that they may actually enjoy performing tricks in the circus. Additionally, some respondents felt it may be acceptable to keep dogs in the circus as their living space requirements were small enough to be met just as well as in the home. Other respondents still felt strongly, however, that conditions in the travelling circus were unsuitable for even a domestic animal such as this but did not specify reasons beyond lack of enjoyment on the dog’s part and lack of space.

### Sample of respondent’s quotes

> “horses, camels and elephants are herd animals with strict hierarchical structures in which the young learn to be their particular animal, so this is not possible in a travelling circus.

> lions, tigers and other wild cats catch their food by expending great energy in running to catch their prey and then devouring it together; this is not how they feed imprisoned in circus cages.” *(Individual Respondent)*

> “All animals that are kept captive are denied their freedom and hence are unable to show natural behaviours as they are kept in unnatural environments. They are subject to confined pens and are made to travel and forced to train to perform, all of which are unnatural.”
Elephants: in the wild they can walk up to 30 miles per day in herds made up of siblings, aunts and mothers. In circuses they are kept isolated and are unable to walk anywhere as they are kept chained.

Lions and tigers: in the wild they hunt for their food, in circuses they are fed substandard and unnatural meats.

Zebras and camels: gazing animals love to graze in fresh grasses but are unable to do so as they are not given the room to be able to do this. It is much cheaper to keep them confined in pens, again putting profits ahead of welfare.

Monkeys: are social animals that love to climb, play, forage and groom each other. They are often kept in isolation and in baron cages.

Circus animals also display unnatural behaviours that are not displayed in the wild such as pacing, cage biting, repetitive movements, circling and self mutilation as they are stressed, depressed, bored, terrified and/or in pain. (Individual Respondent)

“All wild animals require specific and varying environments. All animals in travelling circuses are denied these natural environments. It is quite impossible for a travelling circus to provide adequate space for large animals such as elephants who migrate miles in a day. Nor can they provide the versatile surroundings that a tiger needs such as space to roam, trees to climb for the feeling of safety, water to bathe and cool off in.

Furthermore, the travelling circus environment cannot accommodate to animals’ social needs. Lions and lionesses live naturally in a support group or pride but cannot be transported in this way due to the unnatural cages and stressful environment they are kept in. Studies have proven that elephants develop psychological issues when deprived of vital social contact with their families.” (Individual Respondent)

“Tigers; Their territories range over large areas often 30 or more miles, they mainly live as solitary animals. As top predators they hunt for food, with all the skill that involves, gorge themselves on fresh meat, selecting the most beneficial parts. At times they are unsuccessful and starve a day or two. They mate, breed in a natural cycle and rarely interact with humans. They live in climates suitable to their build and metabolism. None of this is possible within the travelling circus.

Lions; Have similar requirements to Tigers apart from living in or seeking out prides. Males frequently live in “harems” and will vigorously defend them against other mature males. Females often live together in groups. Mature young adult males will either be forced out or fight the dominant male for his “harem”. They don’t interact with humans either. None of these activities are possible within a travelling circus environment.

Zebras; These live in large community groups, they also travel long distances together. They travel to where they find grasses etc to eat and eat on an intermittent basis. They run, “joust” and play/fight in wide open spaces. They also have no interaction with humans. They live in climates suitable to their build and metabolism. None of this is possible within a travelling circus environment.

Elephants; Live in matriarchal herds, are highly social and have strong connections to each other. Their maternal instincts are strong and their babies stay with them for several years, also helping with the care of younger siblings. They dust bath and bathe & play in water. They also travel great distances. They don’t interact with humans either. None of this is possible in the travelling circus environment.

Camels, Kangaroos, Red bears and other wild animals are unable to fulfill their normal activities (feeding, mating) social and family structures. Their social structures are engineered by keeping group animals as single or enforced pairs. Their own essential activities and behaviours are disregarded, ignored or obliterated to fit in with the requirements & structure within the travelling circus. Being confined in artificial, cramped conditions and required to perform tasks that are artificial and unnatural situations and environments all add to the stress that these creatures suffer. The circus environment will not and can not allow any wild animal to undertake their natural behaviours regarding sleeping, eating, mating, in short all the activities they would normally perform in the wild!” (Individual Respondent)
“Horses are intelligent and whilst more domesticated and at home with people, being transported and performing, also need respite from the daily performances, with space to graze, run and rest; being on the move frequently without adequate grazing and outdoor space is cruel and miserable living. Even birds such as parrots, whilst being intelligent & often enjoying learning 'tricks', need the space to fly regularly and if frequently caged, need a large adequately stocked Avery; lengthy travel in small cages is just inappropriate. This is why, to my mind, the circus environment is totally inappropriate for animals of any kind.” (Individual Respondent)

“Tigers and other big cats need space to roam around, places to hide and sleep. They often exhibit stereotypical behaviour, such as pacing and chewing on their paws, a sign of stress and lack of mental stimulation. Elephants are similar, needing large spaces and tons of food, as well as activities to keep them entertained and their minds active. These behaviours can be dangerous to the animals themselves, even causing harm. I can only think of those two definite examples, but it’s logical to think this affects all species, as it happens in humans too.” (Individual Respondent)

Respondents who answered ‘Some’ wild animals have behaviours compromised

4.35 A total of 40 respondents answered 'some' indicating they considered that only some animals had their natural behaviours compromised through life in a travelling circus and 30 provided comments. There appeared to be 3 prominent reasons why respondents chose this option:

- They felt that the travelling circus environment would clearly affect some animals more than others - for example, large animals that required a lot of space in the wild and animals that roamed in herds could not be catered for; however, the natural environment of some smaller animals could possibly be recreated.
- They wanted to clarify that they only believed the natural behaviours of wild animals were compromised, not domestic animals.
- They were unsure of the extent to which an animal’s behaviour may be compromised; however they acknowledged that animals seemed to display distressed behaviour in captivity.

“For horses, dogs and other domestic species I think the correct environment and treatment is there. For Lions, Tigers, Bears and Elephants I struggle to see their needs being met in a trailer cage.” (Individual Respondent)

Respondents who answered ‘None’ of the wild animals have their behaviours compromised

4.36 A total of 111 respondents, including 4 of the groups affiliated with the circus industry, considered that the natural behaviours of no animals were compromised in the travelling circus environment and 75 provided comments; however, over half of the comments appeared to be more in keeping with an ‘all’ response. Additional arguments were raised by a small minority of respondents who expressed themselves particularly strongly on these issues.
Key points

4.37 Key points:

- In circuses, as opposed to zoos, there is no conclusive evidence that travelling induces stress related behaviours and in fact travelling, done correctly, can enhance a circus animal’s quality of life.
- The needs of all species of animal and their natural behaviours can be catered for in the travelling circus. Any behaviours not catered for are not essential for the animal’s survival nor would performing them enhance the quality of their life.
- The performances are based on natural behaviours – the animals are not forced to perform unnatural tricks.
- There are no true ‘wild’ animals in the travelling circus – all animals are accustomed to the circus way of life and are practically domesticated so the question is null and void.
- For reasons of humanity some natural behaviours, such as fighting, cannot be fulfilled in the circus, but animals can do as much as they would be able to in a zoo and there is more mental stimulation provided in the circus.

Behavioural adaptation

4.38 As previously discussed, the vast majority of respondents who commented on this question seem to view ‘natural behaviours’ as behaviours that the animal would undertake in the wild. As an exception to this, a number of respondents who answered ‘none’ to this question seemed to regard ‘natural behaviours’ as behaviours which would occur naturally at the animal’s will but are changeable depending on the animal’s environment. For example, respondents accepted the fact that certain behaviours, such as roaming for miles to find food, would not be possible in a travelling circus environment. However, since this was viewed as a necessary behaviour to ensure survival of the animal in the wild and such a behaviour would not be needed in the circus, respondents felt it was not a fair comparison to make as it could be argued that the animal would not, even in a wild setting, hunt for food if it did not have to.

4.39 Similarly, a few respondents alluded to the Radford Report and its findings on the effects of frequent travel on animals in the travelling circus, and made the point that, as was concluded in the report, the element of transportation did not impact negatively on the animal’s welfare. These same respondents also perceived that the act of transport alone did not breach any of the five freedoms. Respondents concluded that, since the freedom to exhibit normal behaviour was not impinged upon by travel alone, and since this consultation did not technically extend to cover any effects of training and performance on natural behaviours, then a ban could not be brought into effect on the grounds that natural behaviours of animals in a travelling circus were compromised. Indeed, respondents claimed that the animals may develop new behaviours and movements whilst acclimatising themselves to frequent travel, but the animal’s willingness to enter the transport containers showed that these new ‘normal’ behaviours were not necessarily negative. This would be in contrast to zoos, where respondents claimed that the animals’ unwillingness to travel when necessary and heightened stress levels had been well documented.
“Even the big carnivores have large exercise areas. Big cats sleep up to eighteen hours a day and are natural lazy predators in the wild, they gorge on a huge animal and sleep it off. Elephants do NOT need to walk miles and miles in the wild, they HAVE to to survive and find enough food and water. These needs and exercise in the ring and on site take care of all these animals needs and they also have a full rich life without having to struggle for survival. The wild is not utopia today it is Belsen.” (Individual Respondent)

“The animals I have seen within circuses have had no problem undertaking their natural behaviour. Big cats for example spend most of their day asleep, this they can do in a circus environment. When awake, these animals would run, jump, hunt, have sex and maybe even fight. All of these can be achieved in a circus, although in all captive environments, fighting is not encouraged and hunting is not necessary, as food is provided for them. Where there is unrelated mixed groups (male and female), mating has been possible with offspring born.” (Individual Respondent)

“Some "natural" behaviours that the animal rights activists complain about are ficticious, or badly interpreted. For instance, they go on about Elephants travelling many, many miles each day, in the wild. Though this is true, experts have pointed out that the Ele’s only do this in the wild to find enough food. If food is plentiful (as provided by Circuses) then they have no need to roam around to find food. All aspects of performance are geared around each animals natural behaviour.” (Individual Respondent)

“…much enlightend exercise cages for big cats and electric fenced off areas for hooved stock give them a chance to exercise. most animals in the wild would cover large areas in search off food only” (Individual Respondent)

“Obviously Tigers can’t chase, catch and kill their prey when living in a circus but they cant do that in a zoo either. At least in a circus they have some interaction with people, and interesting things to do.” (Individual Respondent)

“This is covered by experts in the Radford report. The wild and domesticated animals are transported in ‘purpose built’ vehicles. These vehicles have now been inspected 7 times by Defra inspectors and have passed on every occasion. Circus animals typically travel 40 miles once a week, unlike race and police horses for example who travel often hundreds of miles on a daily basis - all without incident nor need for defra inspections.” (Individual Respondent)

“The fact that circus animals are acclimated and are not adversely effected by transport is borne out by experience and scientific study and underlines the discriminatory intent behind this consultation since the "excuse" for a ban is travel…. In sum, Kiley-Worthington (1990) found in the circus no "evidence of distress or displeasure either in loading, travelling or unloading…. Nevill (2004) studied types of transport housing used and its effects on the animals. The authors state: Unlike most livestock that are naïve to transport, frequent transport is a way of life for circus animals. When compared with livestock transport, loading density is not usually as high for circus animals, and circus animals can perform a wider range of behaviour and postural adjustments that compensate for conditions experienced during transport…. “ (Group Response – Federation Mondiale du Cirque)

“All kinds of animals have been living and trained in circuses for decades. These animals live, travel and breed regularly in an unforced way within the circus facilities showing that animal accommodation standards are currently entirely compatible with their nature. As a consequence, it is possible to consider the classical dichotomy between “domesticated animals” and "wild animals" in circuses as obsolete, because in the circus community all animals are domesticated as they have been living with men for generations. Therefore, from a practical and ethical point of view, the distinction between indigenous and exotic animals is only apparent.” (Group Response – Club Amici del Circo)
Respondents who answered ‘Don’t Know’ whether any wild animals have behaviours compromised

4.40 A total of 18 respondents answered ‘don’t know’ and 9 provided comments. Of these, most felt that they were not expert enough to express opinions on animal behaviours.

“Limited space and stimulation will impinge on some species more than others, but whether this compromises welfare should be judged by experts rather than public.”
(Individual Respondent)
CONSULTATION QUESTION 5: Do you consider that it is possible to facilitate the natural behaviour of none, some or all wild animals within the travelling circus environment? Which species? How?

Table 4.4: Overview of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

4.41 A total of 2029 respondents (99.3%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, the vast majority, 1856 respondents (90.8%) answered ‘none’ indicating that they thought it was not possible to facilitate the natural behavior of any wild animals within the travelling circus environment; 54 respondents (2.6%) answered ‘some’; 88 respondents (4.3%) answered ‘all’; and 31 respondents (1.5%) answered ‘don’t know’. The remaining 14 respondents (0.7%) left this question blank even though 5 provided comments; the comments of 3 respondents did not support the use of wild animals in circuses and the other comments were not particularly relevant.

4.42 In total, 1188 respondents (58.1%) offered comments at Question 5.

Respondents who answered ‘None’ of the wild animals can have behaviours facilitated

4.43 A total of 1856 respondents answered ‘none’ and 1079 provided comments.

Key points

4.44 Key points:

- Wild animals cannot act naturally in an unnatural environment; as life in a travelling circus is completely unnatural for them, there is no way to facilitate the natural behaviour of these animals in this environment, particularly when it is constantly changing.
- It is not possible to facilitate wild animals' natural behaviours in a travelling circus sufficiently to adequately provide the animals with a good quality of life.
- The only way to facilitate anything like natural behaviour would be to return circus animals to the wild or transfer them to suitable sanctuaries; or better still, do not remove them from the wild in the first place.
- The natural environment of wild animals, by definition, cannot be recreated or replicated in any other environment.
• As a business that needs to make money in order to continue, it is unlikely that a travelling circus would be willing to commit the time and money that would be required to facilitate the natural behaviours of wild animals.

• Captive animals, by definition, cannot choose their own behaviours in a circus environment so it cannot be assumed that anything they do would be the same as what they would do if they were free and living in the wild.

• Some circus animals may have forgotten or not even be aware what constitutes their species' natural behaviour.

Unnatural environment

4.45 In general, respondents were strongly of the opinion that it was impossible for wild animals to act naturally in an unnatural environment; and since the respondents considered that the circus environment was completely unnatural for wild animals, it therefore followed that there was no way the natural behavior of these animals could be facilitated within this environment. Some respondents explained in considerable detail why they thought it was impossible for wild animals to act naturally within the circus environment, reiterating many of their points from question 4.

“Natural behaviours are simply too broad and too complex to be facilitated.” (Individual Respondent)

“Absolutely not, in any shape or form other than the animal is breathing air!” (Individual Respondent)

“I do not believe that it is possible to facilitate any species' natural behavior within the travelling circus environment, due to the constraints placed on each species ability to move, interact, mate, socialize, hide, sleep, nest, roam, groom, and hunt, and many other species specific natural behaviors.” (Individual Respondent)

4.46 Some respondents stated that anyone who wished to see a wild animal in a 'natural' environment should go to a zoo; however, a few respondents considered that even zoos struggled to facilitate the natural behaviour of the animals they housed. Within the circus environment it was impossible; for example, elephants needed to roam but had to be kept chained by the ankle so that they could only take one step forward or one step back; big cats were predators and needed to hunt over large areas but had to be kept in cages because they were dangerous. Consequently, while respondents agreed that lack of space was a major issue that frustrated the facilitation of animals' natural behaviour, they were unable to suggest a way round this limitation. Even if the circus could conceivably acquire large areas of ground, the animals would not be able to run freely because issues of safety both for them and, more importantly, for any humans they encountered along the way would effectively preclude this.

“If people wanted to see an animal in a 'natural' environment, they'd go to Edinburgh Zoo...Zoo's and wildlife parks spend millions on trying to emulate 'natural' environments so animals can be viewed behaving 'naturally', and still this is not always successful.” (Individual Respondent)
Performance concerns

4.47 Respondents stated that the animals had to perform tricks in the circus ring for the edification of humans, with whom they would not normally be exposed to or interact with, and this behaviour alone eliminated the possibility of natural behaviour in the circus environment. In fact, it was pointed out by one respondent that the very purpose of a circus was to inhibit natural behaviours in wild animals so that people could be ‘entertained’ by the unnatural behaviours.

“Eradicating the natural behaviour of the animals is surely part of the training process of these animals?...Audiences come to the circus to see a performance; this in itself eliminates the possibility of natural animal behaviour.” (Individual respondent)

4.48 A few respondents also pointed out that a circus was first and foremost a business that had to make money in order to continue, so were of the opinion that, even if the circus could facilitate some natural behaviours for the animals, it would not wish to do so, or would only pay lip service to the idea, because facilitating the natural behaviours and well-being of circus animals would eat into its profits.

“I would be concerned about these organisations paying lip service to the idea of facilitating a natural environment. The only reason for them to do that is to enable them to continue the practice of using performing animals, and their ultimate aim is to make money.” (Individual Respondent)

“Circuses have to work to a schedule - animals don’t. Even if this were possible in reality it’s not going to happen. The priority of a circus is to make money - facilitating animals natural behaviour will cost money and time.” (Individual Respondent)

Travel concerns

4.49 It was further pointed out by respondents that the animals spent a great deal of time travelling and in confinement and that natural environments could not be copied within the limited confines of a cage, a lorry or a trailer. Some respondents considered that even if travelling circuses, when not on the road, could actually provide areas of ground that to some extent mimicked the animals’ natural environment, the animals would only be able to start getting used to it before they were once more bundled up into their transports and moved on to the next location. Constant movement was the very essence of a travelling circus and nothing could be done to alter that. Respondents also thought that it was impossible for circuses to accommodate the social structures of wild animals regardless of whether they were solitary or herd animals.

“It is not possible to make a cage like the wild.” (Individual Respondent)

“Travelling’ circuses cannot facilitate natural behaviour because they travel… An industry that relies upon transporting from place to place, ‘storing’ them in temporary compounds, and forcing them to perform at traumatic events, directly conflicts in every way with the concept of natural behaviour.” (Individual Respondent)

“This is Impossible within the environment of a travelling circus. Even zoos struggle to facilitate the natural behaviour of the animals.” (Individual Respondent)
“Circuses by their nature are itinerant. They are designed with ease of movement and public safety at the forefront. With the best will in the world they are simply unable to provide a suitable environment for wild animals. Even the better zoos find this a challenge and they are static. Opportunities for the expression of natural behaviours is severely compromised by the nature of the working environment of a travelling circus and there is very little scope for improvement. They cannot reach an acceptable standard for a suitably enriched and spacious environment for wild animals.” (Individual Respondent)

Facilitating behaviours insufficient

4.50 A few respondents considered that it may be possible for circuses to try to facilitate some natural behaviours for wild animals but did not think any efforts would be sufficient to adequately provide the animals with a good quality of life. Other respondents felt that since captive animals were unable to choose their own behaviours in a circus environment it could not be assumed that anything they did in this unnatural environment would be the same as what they would do if they were free and living in the wild. Some respondents thought that the animals’ natural behaviours would be modified in the circus environment to the extent that their natural instincts would be repressed or even permanently altered. Some even believed that long-term circus animals and those born into the life may even have actually forgotten or be unaware of what constitutes their natural behaviours and instincts, which they considered sad. In the opinion of one respondent if natural behaviour had to be facilitated, it inherently implied that it was no longer natural behaviour.

“As previously stated the way animals live and perform represses their natural behaviour.” (Individual Respondent)

“No, it would be impossible for any circus, traveling or not, to be able to provide a safe and large environment for the animals to facilitate natural behaviour. Besides which, they will have unlearnt such natural behaviour” (Individual Respondent)

4.51 A few respondents ultimately considered that the natural environment of wild animals, by definition, could not be recreated or replicated in any other environment and it would always be a game of compromise for the animal being held captive. Consequently, as indicated in comments to previous questions, many respondents thought that the only way to facilitate anything close to natural behaviour would be to return the animals to the wild or transfer them to suitable sanctuaries. Better still, many thought the animals should not have been removed from the wild in the first place.

“The quintessence of natural behaviour is freedom to move and do whatever is desired and needed. No captivity can be facilitated to restore this freedom.” (Individual Respondent)

“Where are the open spaces that most of these animals would inhabit in the wild? They cannot be replicated in a circus environment. How could these animals run, hunt, mate, swim, bask in the sun? Natural behaviour can only be facilitated in any animal’s natural habitat.” (Individual Respondent)
Other points

4.52 A large number of respondents also reiterated points they made in question 1 in relation to welfare issues:

- Wild animals should not be kept in captivity to entertain people.
- Circuses can and should adapt to consist only of human acts.
- There is no place for wild animal circus acts in the modern world.
- The circus environment, travel and housing does not permit adequate welfare.

Respondents who answered ‘Some’ wild animals can have behaviours facilitated

4.53 A total of 54 respondents answered ‘some’ and 40 provided comments; the comments of 21 of these respondents offered no examples of the natural behaviours of any animals they thought could be facilitated. Another 10 respondents suggested that the natural behaviours of some domestic animals (cats, dogs, rabbits), companion animals (horses) and farm animals (pigs, goats, sheep) could be facilitated and possibly the natural behaviours of ‘smaller’ animals (unspecified); however, 5 of these respondents stated that the natural behaviours of ‘larger animals’ or ‘larger wild animals’ could not be facilitated.

4.54 The remaining 9 respondents offered the following comments:

- As elephants follow each other in the wild they could do the same in a circus ring.
- The animals’ environments could be enriched by offering them some form of stimulus.
- Animals can carry out instinctive natural behaviours to an extent - eat what is given, try to forage, to nest or to dig.
- The natural behaviours of reptiles could possibly be catered for with enough room and warmth.
- The animals’ dietary needs can be catered for.
- Aspects such as exercise could be fulfilled although not in the same way as in the natural environment.
- Animals that would naturally live in small groups could be allowed to live/travel/perform/exhibit together; however this would only accommodate a very limited range of behaviours in a limited number of species.

Respondents who answered ‘All’ wild animals can have behaviours facilitated

4.55 A total of 88 respondents answered ‘all’ and 54 provided comments; the comments of 6 of these respondents offered no explanation as to why they thought all the natural behaviours of all animals could be facilitated; and the comments of 37 did not support their answers in any way, indicating rather that they thought the natural behaviours of wild animals in circuses could not be facilitated and that these animals did not belong in circuses.
The remaining 11 respondents offered the following comments:

- Animals are kept in species related groups and allowed into large outdoor exercise areas daily for the majority of the day.
- All natural behaviours could be facilitated providing the animals had enough room and other members of their species to interact with.
- Even big cats have large exercise areas in circuses; these animals are natural lazy predators that sleep up to 18 hours a day after gorging; elephants only walk for miles and miles in the wild because they have to in order to survive and find enough food and water; being fed and getting exercise in the circus ring and on site takes care of all the animals' needs so that they have a full rich life without having to struggle for survival in the wild.
- Wild animals adapt to changing environments; they will hunt if necessary but will not miss this natural behaviour if food is given to them.
- All the natural behaviours of all animals could be facilitated with enough money.
- Circus performances are developed and built around each animal's natural instinctive behaviour and abilities.

No further expansion of these points is considered necessary under question 5 as they have all been thoroughly analysed under question 4.

**Sample of respondents’ quotes**

“In the circus environment experienced trainers work with individual animals every day, building exercise (and presentation) regimes that build on the natural abilities of the species and its individual skills. It should be noted that while good trainers can create a working relationship with nearly any species, the list of animal set forth in the Consultation Document as being shown in the circus on the continent is quite misleading. The Federation is unaware of any circus in Western Europe presenting bears, for example. While there are a few individuals of species such as rhino that continue to be associated with circus, those animals have lived for decades with their human and animal companions. The primary animals presented in circuses today are horses, dogs, sealions, big cats and elephants.”  

- Group Response - Federation Mondiale du Cirque

“Animals, even so called "wild" animals, adapt to changing environments. If they don't need to go hunting, if they don't have to protect themselves from other predators, they will not miss that natural behaviour, but enjoy the food that is given to them and the protection that the circus environment provides for them. If course, it may be a bigger and more expensive endeavour for certain species than for others to provide that environment, but if a circus can provide everything according to given regulations, it is possible to facilitate the natural behaviour of the animals. The modern training is based exactly on natural instinctive behaviours of animals, trying to show up their natural attitudes and beauties.”  

- Group Response - European Circus Association

“Placed under the travelling environment section this is a ridiculous question as to what facilitates a circus animal's natural behaviour in a travelling environment. It is the same as a zoo or safari animal being moved from one location to another, or indeed a race horse from one racecourse to another or a companion animal on a visit to a vet. Where does natural behaviour come into this? this is a man-made logistical necessity, to move an animal from one place to another. The animal has no choice and the best we can hope for is that it is done with the best interests of the animal in mind - please refer to the paragraph in question 4 regarding circus animal transport as there is no other animal
industry working with wild animals where animals are transported successfully keeping in mind their wellbeing and best interests.

To suggest that animals in circuses do not have a ‘good life’ or a full and active life characteristic of its kind is nonsensical, wild animals in circuses are multi-generational born and bred. Perhaps the only thing they are obstructed in doing is the hunt and kill of prey and travelling to do so. All their other natural activities are catered for within circuses.” (Group Response - Classical Circus Association)

“It is known that several scientific investigations have demonstrated that the correct use of animals in circus shows is compatible with nature and quality of life of the animals themselves. However, we do not wish to deal with this topic in this case; we rather want to focus on the ethical and philosophical aspect. The modern training is based exactly on natural instinctive behaviours of animals, trying to show up their natural attitudes and beauties.” (Group Response - Club Amici del Circo)

Respondents who answered ‘Don’t Know’ if any wild animals can have behaviours facilitated

4.58 A total of 31 respondents answered ‘don’t know’ and 10 provided comments offering the following points:

- Insufficient knowledge/expertise to respond differently but doubted that all natural behaviours could be facilitated in the travelling circus environment.
- Some natural behaviours could possibly be facilitated but this was not relevant as the animals would still be compromised.
- The best way to facilitate natural behaviours would be to put the animals in their natural environment.
- Facilitating natural behaviours would take considerable time and money which circus owners were unlikely to provide.
- Experts in species’ animal behaviour would have to be consulted.
CONSULTATION QUESTION 6: Do you consider that the concerns raised surrounding the travelling environment could be resolved without banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses? How?

Table 4.5: Overview of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

4.59 A total of 2024 respondents (99.1%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, the vast majority, 1956 respondents (95.7%) answered ‘no’ indicating that they thought it was not possible to resolve concerns surrounding the travelling environment without banning the use of wild animals in circuses; 52 respondents (2.5%) answered ‘yes’; and 16 respondents (0.8%) answered ‘don’t know’. The remaining 19 respondents (0.9%) left this question blank although 13 offered comments that clearly did not support the use of wild animals in circuses.

4.60 In total, 999 respondents (48.9%) offered comments at Question 6.

Respondents who answered ‘No’ travelling concerns cannot be resolved without a ban

4.61 A total of 1956 respondents answered ‘no’ and 948 provided comments. A great many respondents who commented stated that there was no possibility of concerns about wild animals in the travelling environment being met without a ban; this was the only solution and there was no room for ‘compromise’ in the form of regulation. Respondents who commented on this issue stated that although legislating for better conditions for wild animals in travelling circuses might improve things, it would not ultimately resolve the issues; policing in particular would always be difficult and ultimately inadequate because the circuses travelled around too much to be monitored properly. In the opinion of respondents, ‘profits’ were too important to circus owners for them to wholeheartedly implement and maintain costly and time-consuming upgrades for wild animals without continuous encouragement, in the form of monitoring, from authorities.

4.62 Respondents made many other comments in support of their ‘no’ answers but no new points were introduced.

Key points

4.63 Points supporting a ban on the use of wild animals in circuses and reiterated from previous consultation questions, related to the following issues:
Wild animals should not be a source of public entertainment.
Wild animals should not be used as a revenue stream.
Training practices for wild animals in circuses are cruel.
Wild animals are forced to learn to do tricks for food.
There is a lack of respect for wild animals in circuses.
Travelling is traumatic for wild animals.
Wild animals spend too much time in their transporters.
Wild animals in circuses is an outmoded practice.
It is unnecessary to have wild animals in circuses.
Wild animals in circuses sends the wrong messages to children.
Wild animals in circuses have a poor standard of welfare.

Sample of respondents’ quotes

"We cannot see how statutory regulation (licensing) could remove the fundamental and inherent welfare problems of a travelling circus, including confinement, travel, restriction of behaviour, performance stress, etc. Furthermore, in view of the small numbers of wild animals currently touring in the UK, a complete ban would be more cost-effective from the point of view of public finances than the creation and running of an expert and effective regulatory and inspection system for the long term.
Regulators with specialist knowledge of the species being used would need to monitor conditions of travel, housing, handling, training and performance on a day-to-day basis during the touring season, which is unlikely to be practical. Indeed, most of the detailed information about animal welfare in circuses to date has been uncovered by patient, long-term investigations by animal protection NGOs rather than by regulators, veterinarians or scientists." (Group Response – OneKind)

"With the best will in the world, this cannot be resolved without a complete ban. It cannot be regulated properly due to circuses always on the move." (Individual Respondent)

"It’s too risky. How would people know that the animals were ok if these circuses are travelling everywhere. It’s awful. It can’t be regulated and it’s not sustainable." (Individual Respondent)

"No, these animals should not be in contact with humans, be travelling in lorries day in, day out, be performing tricks for rewards, be having to listen to the noises, hustle and bustle of crowds, laughter, applause, etc.” (Individual Respondent)

"The concerns will remain, the people running circuses are not wildlife experts, they are handlers, and will do what it takes to break an animal and get it to perform. The objective is performing to make money.” (Individual Respondent)

"It’s not just about banning the suffering involved it’s about raising human consciousness to a point where we no longer see what’s so funny about ‘dancing elephants’ and caged lions ‘lifting a paw’ (after they’ve normally been ‘taught’ to do these silly things, by means of electric shocks. Even if they were given treats - it debases us all to reduce animals to the level of ‘performing seals’).” (Individual Respondent)

"It is the travelling environment that is perhaps the most worrying and the fact that none of us really know what happens to circus animals when out of the limelight. There have been some sickening undercover reports of abuse. This should have been enough to ban animal use in circuses.” (Individual Respondent)
“The whole ethos of a circus is to travel and I think this is totally unfair to the animals involved. I believe the first motive of a circus is to make money and I firmly believe that their treatment of animals is totally unjustified, whatever changes are made to the travelling arrangements.” (Individual Respondent)

“Keeping wild animals in circuses is so outdated and akin to sending small boys up chimneys.” (Individual Respondent)

“Absolutely not! The truth is that like any other form of entertainment, the circus has to evolve or become extinct. It is immoral and contradictory to everything we teach our children about respecting the planet and its inhabitants.” (Individual Respondent)

Respondents who answered ‘Yes’ travel concerns can be resolved without a ban

4.64 A total of 52 respondents, who thought it was possible to resolve concerns surrounding the travelling environment without banning the use of wild animals in circuses, answered ‘yes’ and 36 respondents provided comments but the comments of only 28 actually supported their ‘yes’ response.

Key points

4.65 Those 28 respondents offered the following comments:

- Clear regulations, with penalties and strict enforcement that define how a circus may transport its animals, should be introduced.
- Tried and tested licensed transport method should be adopted for circus animals.
- Animals do not travel very far from site to site.
- The Government should talk directly to circuses with wild animals.
- Concerns could be addressed via the application of standards and enforcement under the Animal Health and Welfare (Scotland) Act 2006.
- Education should improve treatment of animals over time, without legislation.
- Public concerns would probably be addressed if circuses had to provide each species with specific care requirements laid down by independent experts.
- Animal handlers should be unchanging, considerate individuals who win and retain an animals’ trust.
- Artificial habitats should be set up at every circus venue and breaks should be arranged for the animals in between travelling.
- Animals get a new environment, new sights and sounds at each venue which is beneficial for them.
- Exercise areas/training methods are already adequate and should be maintained.
- The Government should not listen to animal rights groups’ lies and propaganda.

Regulation sufficient

4.66 The comments of this minority of respondents mostly related to travel/transport, regulation of circuses and welfare conditions for circus animals. A few respondents, including 4 of the groups affiliated to the circus industry, considered that strict enforcement of good, clear regulations, defining how a circus may transport its animals, should be introduced and this would address any actual
concerns the public might have. One group representing circus interests (see quotes below) stated that regulation of performing animals would comply with the legal principle of proportionality (imposing restrictions only to the extent necessary to address the identified concerns) and that this would avoid undue and discriminatory infringement on fundamental human rights which would occur when an absolute ban was put in place. Strict enforcement would address any individual cases where welfare needs were not being met.

Alternative mechanisms

4.67 One individual considered that the tried and tested licensed animal transport method should be adopted for circus animals. Another individual suggested that note should be taken of what the experts have said about travelling circus animals but did not elaborate. It was pointed out by other respondents that circuses do not travel very far from site to site and ensure that travel is minimal (see comments below). One group observed that concerns could be addressed via the application of standards and enforcement under the Animal Health and Welfare (Scotland) Act 2006 (see quotes below). Yet another respondent suggested that the Government should talk directly to circuses about wild animals but did not indicate to what effect. One respondent considered that education should improve people’s treatment of animals over time without the need for legislation.

4.68 One respondent felt that any public concerns would probably be addressed if circuses had to provide each species with care requirements laid down by independent experts. This respondent and others suggested areas where care requirements could be considered or improved upon, such as better travelling ways and travel time limits; floor space; exercise regime; improved general treatment; better foods; caring, considerate and unchanging animal handlers who earn and retain animals’ trust; natural habitats set up at every circus place stop and breaks, possibly one day long or more, arranged for the animals in between travelling. One respondent considered that it was actually beneficial to the animals to go to new venues because at each one they got a new environment with new sights and sounds.

4.69 A few respondents thought that concerns for wild animals in circuses were unfounded; one commented that exercise areas and training methods were adequate as they were and should be maintained. A few respondents also suggested that the Government should not listen to animal rights groups because what they said about circuses was lies and propaganda; animal circuses were simply being used as glamorous targets to raise funds.

“A vocal minority of activists seek to ban animals in human care, including in circuses, zoos and other environments based on extreme ideology. The Federation believes that any actual concerns the public may have can be addressed through good regulations and strict enforcement. Regulation of performing animals complies with the legal principle of proportionality (imposing restrictions only to the extent necessary to address the identified concerns) and avoids undue and discriminatory infringement on fundamental human rights that occurs when an absolute ban is put in place. Strict enforcement can address any individual cases where welfare needs are not being met.”

(Group Response - Federation Mondiale du Cirque)
“Again, all it needs is clear regulations that define how a circus may transport its animals. It may be difficult with some species, but circuses that fulfil the regulations must be allowed to travel with their animals. Examples from many European countries show that it is possible to guarantee animal welfare in travelling circuses by strictly enforcing licensing and regulating systems. Several species of animals live close and with men, in many different situations and here is no ethical-juridical reason to discriminate the use of animals in circus.” (Group Response – European Circus Association)

“There have been a number of claims from animal rights lobby groups that animals in circuses are constantly being confined to the basic accommodation and transported long distances. This is misleading as circuses in the UK general move short distances from one venue to another and tend to stay on these sites for a week or more. The only long distance animals may be subject to could be the initially transport from their winter quarters to the site of the beginning and closing of the circus season. Finally, most circus animals are generally born within their circus environment or at the very least introduced to this at a very young age. This would suggest that as there appears no obvious chronic disease in these animals that they can and do successfully habituate to this environment and periodic transportation.” (Individual Respondent)

“Animals travel the world over every day, horses, dogs, birds etc and no one makes any comments regarding these. As soon as its a camel, a lion or an elephant, some people say its cruel to travel it around the country. I don't feel that it is. As I understand it, circuses tend to travel usually once a week, so its not much travelling and I have seen animals being loaded at a circus, all the animal trailers had individual sections for each animal, food and water was available during the journey and the animals loaded quietly and easily, no fuss and no forcing the animals into the trailers.” (Individual Respondent)

“Yes, through the application of standards and enforcement under the Animal Health and Welfare (Scotland) Act. It is also noted that there is a licensing regime for circuses as well as zoos. It is almost certain that any and all of these concerns COULD be addressed.” (Group Response – Argyll and Bute Council)

“Yes of course it can, circus animals do not travel very far from site to site and if you examine the recent tour itineraries as part of the licensing conditions for the English defra regulations 2012 you will see this is totally transparent and documented. These regulations prove that it is possible to cater for all animals in the circus environment without a ban which would be completely disproportionate.” (Group Response – Classical Circus Association)

Respondents who answered ‘Don’t Know’ whether travel concerns can be resolved without a ban

4.70 A total of 16 respondents answered ‘don’t know’ and 2 provided comments; 1 respondent suggested that a potential business strategy for travelling circuses would be for them to use only domestic animals in their performances instead of wild animals; the other respondent did not understand the question.
5. ETHICAL COSTS AND BENEFITS

5.1 This section of the consultation document contained 3 questions relating to wild animals in the travelling circus environment:

**Consultation Question 7 - Do you consider that there are any benefits to be gained from having wild animals in travelling circuses? What are they?**

**Consultation Question 8 - Do you believe that there are sufficient benefits to justify the potential compromise to the wider well-being of wild animals kept in a travelling circus? Why?**

**Consultation Question 9 - Do you consider that the potential conflict between compromising the well-being of wild animals and obtaining any benefit could be resolved without banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses? If so, how?**

5.2 These were multiple choice questions and respondents could select ‘yes’, ‘no’ or ‘don’t know’ in response to each. Answering ‘yes’ to question 7 suggested that the respondent considered that there were benefits to be gained from having wild animals in travelling circuses; answering ‘yes’ to question 8 suggested that the respondent believed that there were sufficient benefits to justify the potential compromise to the wider well-being of wild animals kept in a travelling circus; answering ‘yes’ to question 9 suggested that the respondent did consider that the potential conflict between compromising the well-being of wild animals and obtaining any benefit could be resolved without banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses. All respondents were invited to comment on their answers.

**Overview of results**

5.3 **95.8%** of respondents considered that there were no benefits to be gained from having wild animals in travelling circuses.

5.4 **93.7%** of respondents considered that there were not sufficient benefits to justify the potential compromise to the wider well-being of wild animals kept in a travelling circus.

5.5 **96.7%** of respondents considered that the potential conflict between compromising the well-being of wild animals and obtaining any benefit could not be resolved without banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses.

5.6 A detailed analysis of respondents’ comments can be found at consultation questions 7, 8 and 9.

**Open letter from representatives of the audio-visual community**

5.7 In support of their consultation response to question 7, the Classical Circus Association provided an open letter from film producers, directors and professionals representing members of the audio-visual community in the UK and the USA. This
letter pointed out that their industry had a long history of featuring animals in commercials, film and TV productions. The letter also acknowledged that concerns had been raised about the use of animals in their industry and made the following points:

- Animal rights propaganda has distorted the facts about animals in entertainment.
- PAWSI (Performing Animals Welfare Standards International) was convened to promote animal welfare standards and training for personnel in the industry.
- PAWSI issued a code to ensure a high duty of care when animals worked.
- PAWSI provided a monitoring system to uphold standards.
- Vets were available with species specific knowledge to handle any projects concerning domestic or exotic animals.
- No evidence to show that using animals in performances was detrimental to their welfare.
- In fact, the opposite, according to scientific evidence published in a book (Kiley-Worthington M 1090 Animals in Circuses and Zoos).
- Film companies in the UK and worldwide worked with circus animals as they were very well handled, used to lights and transportation, alert and eager to work and produced results without stress to themselves.
- If restrictions were placed upon the availability of certain species of animals for filming in the UK, audio-visual productions would simply re-locate abroad.
- In which case, the UK film personnel would lose jobs.
- The animal industry would like to have strict regulations in place to oversee all aspects of animals that worked in their industry.

5.8 A copy of the letter can be found at Annex 1.
CONSULTATION QUESTION 7: Do you consider that there are any benefits to be gained from having wild animals in travelling circuses? What are they?

Table 5.1: Overview of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>2043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%.

5.9 A total of 2035 respondents (99.6%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, the vast majority, 1958 respondents (95.8%) answered 'no' indicating that they did not think there were any benefits to be gained from having wild animals in travelling circuses; 66 respondents (3.2%) answered 'yes'; 11 respondents (0.5%) answered 'don't know'. The remaining 8 respondents (0.4%) left this question blank although 3 offered comments that did not support the use of wild animals in circuses.

5.10 In total, 1060 respondents (51.9%) offered comments at Question 7.

Respondents who answered ‘No’ there are no benefits from having wild animals

5.11 A total of 1958 respondents answered ‘no’, indicating that they did not think there were any benefits to be gained from having wild animals in circuses, and 996 provided comments.

Key points

5.12 Key points:

- The use of wild animals in circuses produces no benefits for the animals.
- The use of wild animals in circuses may provide financial benefits for circus owners but at a huge cost to the animals.
- The use of wild animals in circuses may provide entertainment benefits to the paying public but at a huge cost to the animals.
- The educational value of wild animals in circuses is low compared to other learning sources and may even be counter-productive.
- Circuses without wild animals are as good as, or even better than, animal circuses.
- Breeding and conservation is not recognised as a benefit of having wild animals in circuses.
- Circuses may provide a benefit to local authorities.
- Wild animals in circuses are safe from poachers but at a price.
5.13 Most of the respondents who commented explained or qualified their answer and the points they made were mainly focused in 5 key areas. Other potential benefits mentioned related to breeding and conservation, poaching and local authorities.

**Benefits to wild animals in circuses**

5.14 Most of the respondents who commented either stated categorically or made it quite clear from their comments that, in their opinion, the use of wild animals in circuses did not benefit the animals in any way. They reiterated many of the concerns they raised in previous questions referring in particular to the lack of respect for these animals, which respondents’ considered was perpetuated by animal circuses; the animals’ perceived poor welfare which they considered was due to the focus of the circus being all on making money rather than on the wellbeing of the animals; and their strongly held belief that wild animals belonged in the wild, or in suitable safari parks, rather than in the unnatural environment of a circus. Respondents thought that using wild animals in circuses was disrespectful and unethical, that it trivialised the animals and that the only respect audiences would gain after watching performances would be respect for humans’ dominance over animals. Some respondents felt strongly that circuses misled people about what a respectable and responsible attitude towards animals actually was, pointing out that continuing to allow animals to be used in circuses was branding the practice as socially acceptable in this day and age which, in their opinion, it no longer was.

“This is a very interesting question because the benefits are all there already but only for the circus owners, not for the animals. Obviously the animals do help to draw in the less informed public and thus stand to gain revenue. I will categorically say again though that there is no benefit to the animals whatsoever!” *(Individual Respondent)*

“There are no benefits to the captive creatures or to the animal kingdom overall.” *(Individual Respondent)*

“There are no benefits to the animals and their wellbeing and welfare should be the priority above entertainment value.” *(Individual Respondent)*

**Financial benefits to circus owners**

5.15 Many respondents who answered ‘no’ conceded in their comments that there may be a benefit to circus owners by way of revenue. It was considered likely by some that the circus owner would think the circus could draw in more of ‘the less informed public’ with wild animals performing which could, in turn, increase revenue. Respondents thought strongly, however, that this was in no way justification for ‘animal abuse’ and that any financial ‘benefit’ should not be taken into consideration because ethical behaviour should transcend exploitative behaviour; exploiting animals for pleasure and human gain, regardless of the cost to the animal, should be a thing of the past.

5.16 In fact, many respondents thought it was unlikely that the numbers of people visiting circuses would dramatically change if there were no animals involved; some considered this could even increase the number of people visiting animal circuses
as, in their opinion, many people refused to go because of ethical concerns about the animals. In spite of the fact that circuses perpetuated the idea that animals as entertainment make money, many respondents considered that circuses may equally be losing money so they needed to stop using animals to make their living and find alternative ways of entertaining the public.

“There is financial gain on the part of the circus owners which should not be taken into consideration as ethical behaviour should transcend exploitative behaviour. There are no benefits. In fact there is loss of the dignity of humans who choose to persist with this type of entertainment.” (Individual Respondent)

“The circuses might be making money, but they are equally losing money from all the people who refuse to go because of ethical concerns. Even if the circuses were making more money than they are losing that is not an excuse to allow cruelty to animals.” (Individual Respondent)

“The only benefits to be gained are by humans, for humans (financial and entertainment). The animals' suffering is seen as secondary to the industry. Their welfare will always be compromised.” (Individual Respondent)

Entertainment benefits to the paying public

5.17 Respondents commented that some people may consider the enjoyment of the paying public at the circus as a benefit; in their opinion, however, a few minutes of entertainment were certainly not worth the sad lives the animals had to live in their captive and unnatural, travelling environment. Even if it was considered to be impressive what wild animals could do, satiating the curiosity of ‘people who were not educated enough to understand the needs of wild animals’ or ‘unethical people who did not care’ came at a huge cost to the animals and was completely unjustified.

5.18 Respondents pointed out that there was a plethora of alternative entertainments for humans that did not involve subjecting wild animals to circus life; one respondent went so far as to say that wild animals in circuses was a blight on society’s perception of itself as ‘civilised’ and was therefore harmful to the collective human psyche. To sum up, in the opinion of respondents, this was not entertainment for any right-minded adult or child; the lives of the general public were not improved by watching sad animals perform tricks, the economy did not benefit and the animals suffered.

“It only fulfills the needs of people who are not educated well enough to understand the needs of wild animals” (Individual Respondent)

“The only possible benefits for humans are entertainment and satiating curiosity, which come at an indescribable cost for the animals involved.” (Individual Respondent)

“Benefits to who? The people who come to see them? Is there entertainment for 2-30 mins worth these animals traveling and being captive? NO. They shouldn’t be in this situation.” (Individual Respondent)

The educational value of wild animals in circuses

5.19 Many respondents considered it extremely likely that people who were not against the use of wild animals in circuses would argue that there was an
educational benefit. Quite a few respondents conceded that circuses could give children access to animals they might never get to see in their natural habitats but they considered this argument weak due to the evolution of the modern zoo. Respondents thought that zoos were much better placed to teach people and they felt that even under-privileged children would be able to visit a suitable zoo or wildlife park at some point, even if they were unable to avail themselves of opportunities to travel in order to see these animals in their natural environments. In addition, all children could learn about exotic animals from the internet, from books and, in particular, from wildlife programmes on television. It was considered that the quality of some natural history films and documentaries was second to none and the educational benefits would be extremely worthwhile.

5.20 Respondents also argued that the circus setting did not educate in any way that mattered because it exposed children to an inaccurate portrayal of the way exotic animals naturally behaved. In other words, the behaviours exhibited by wild animals in circuses were nothing like the behaviours they exhibited in the wild, so nothing useful could be learned about the species from watching animals in circuses, particularly as the primary objective was entertainment, not education. Respondents felt strongly that the internet and filmed documentaries were far better educational substitutes where motives were much more in line with conservation, empathy and education and provided insight to the intrinsic worth of these animals.

5.21 In addition, some respondents considered that circuses were actually counter-productive in terms of educating the public and increasing awareness of diminishing numbers of wild animals due to loss of habitat and poaching. They felt that the public would not see a need to protect habitats if they thought wild animals lived happily in circuses for the sole purpose of human exploitation; quite the opposite, in fact. A few respondents generally hoped that more education of the public would reduce the appeal of circuses and encourage people to learn more about these animals and the threats they were under.

"Contact with/learning about creatures is often cited as a pro. This is not a good enough reason to keep these animals in circuses when the primary objective is not education, but entertainment. The Internet/documentaries can also provide much better substitutes, where motives are much more in line with conservation, empathy and education." (Individual Respondent)

"People would say that children will not know what certain animals look and act like unless they go to the circus. What is asked of animals there is not normal and not seen in the wild anyway. Let the children go to wild life parks etc and see the animals in a more natural state." (Individual Respondent)

"Quite the opposite. Wild animals in circuses are counter-productive in terms of educating the public and increasing awareness of diminishing numbers of wild animals due to loss of habitat and poaching.

If the public think that wild animals live happily in circuses they will not see a need for protecting habitats." (Individual Respondent)

"There are absolutely no benefits to the animal and certainly no educational benefits to the human audience in having wild animals in travelling circuses." (Individual Respondent)
There are plenty of ways to find out about wild animals: excellent films and narratives by naturalists, books, internet sites etc. Circuses do not teach about wild animals in their natural environment. They may entertain people but the cost to the animals is not, in my opinion, justified. There are many alternative entertainments which do not involve subjecting wild animals to circus life. (Individual Respondent)

“Anything that is learned from an animal in confinement, is completely different when applied to that animal in the wild and in their natural environment. So I believe that anything learned from the animals in circuses is completely invalid.” (Individual Respondent)

The popularity of circuses without wild animals

5.22 Many respondents commented that the most successful circuses did not have any animals. They believed that circuses could be extremely entertaining without the inclusion of animals, highlighting the Cirque du Soleil as an outstanding example; skilled human performers could choose to make a career in this different kind of circus and captivated audiences could attend with unreserved enjoyment.

“There are no benefits. Circuses can be fun for the old and young without the use of animals.” (Individual Respondent)

“A circus is for show. There is NO benefit to forcing an animal to be part of this. Human skill and acrobats are a completely different circus and one that the humans can choose to make their career!” (Individual Respondent)

“Benefits to who? Certainly not the animals. The only people who may feel they benefit are the circus people who may believe that the animals are necessary to persuade the public to buy tickets. I would have thought in this day and age of enlightenment, animals were more likely to put people off going to the circus. I certainly would not go to a circus with wild animals, and I know several people who would share my views. In contrast to travelling circuses featuring wild animals, look at the success of Cirque du soleil - the prices they can charge and the sell-out audiences they play to.” (Individual Respondent)

“In my experience, a great many people - on ethical grounds- are boycotting circuses which use wild animals. On the other hand, circuses without animal performers - such as Cirque de Soleil- seem to be very popular.” (Individual Respondent)

Breeding and conservation benefits

5.23 A few respondents commented on breeding all agreeing that, although some people may suggest that breeding and conservation was a benefit of having wild animals in circuses, they did not believe this was the case. In their opinion, circuses were not contributing to any breeding programme to help falling numbers in the wild or to any animal studies that could assist with learning about the species. Respondents actually considered that, in an ideal world, wild animals would be supported in their natural habitats but, until that time arrived, the preservation of species should only be done through regulated zoos, wildlife parks and conservation centres.

“There are no benefits. It does not contribute to a breeding programme or any studies of these animals which could help the species.” (Individual Respondent)
“Don’t believe in the argument of breeding such animals are beneficial; not the right way to address the extinction problem that WE have caused.” (Group Response - Teacher and AS pupils in RS Ysgol Gyfun Gwyr)

“None. These animals are being kept purely for entertainment. We are not learning from them or breeding to help falling numbers in the wild.” (Individual Respondent)

“None. The preservation of species should only be done through regulated zoos and wildlife parks. In an ideal world we would not have to take wild animals from their natural environment but until that day zoos and parks are the best that we can do.” (Individual Respondent)

“I cannot see any benefits at all. If a species needs to be protected from falling numbers or risk of extinction this should only be done through conservation centres with a commitment to helping provide animals with a life that allows them to partake in natural behaviours and to ensure good quality of life.” (Individual Respondent)

Other potential benefits

5.24 A couple of respondents commented that there was a financial benefit to local authorities for allowing circus owners to set up camp and tents on their land; this, however, would apply to any circus, not just circuses with wild animals. Another respondent suggested as a possible benefit that wild animals in a circus were safe from poaching but considered that the training the animals had to go through in order to perform was not really a nice alternative.

Sample of respondents’ quotes

“No benefits for the animals concerned. Financial gains is no excuse for cruelty.” (Individual Respondent)

“Travelling circuses primary focus is on making money; not the welfare of animals. Compare the mindset of zoos today with that of 20 years ago and you can see how they have evolved into establishments where the public are educated but circuses simply cannot afford to go down that route because they must put on the most spectacle to make the most money.” (Individual Respondent)

“uneducated people may say that is is nice for their children to actually see a wild animal – hah” (Individual Respondent)

“The circus’ only exploit the animals for entertainment. Some may argue that they provide an educational benefit to the public, well that the jobs of zoo’s who provide much larger enclosures and have to equipment to house such animals in acceptable conditions, but even they are not without their faults.” (Individual Respondent)

“A circus is a circus and to be honest when children think of them nowadays it’s all about clowns, tightropes and pie in the face! Animal circuses are a past time, and they ALL need to be in the past.” (Individual Respondent)

“The only benefit is to the handful of circuses who have refused to modernise and, instead, stick rigidly to an outdated and unpopular ‘tradition’. If they did modernise, however, and replaced their use of animals with human acts, they may find that visitor numbers increase. Society has, for the main part, moved on and now finds the use of wild animals in circuses grotesque.” (Group Response – Animal Aid)
Respondents who answered ‘Yes’ there are benefits from having wild animals

5.25 A total of 66 respondents answered ‘yes’, including 4 of the groups that affiliated themselves with the circus industry, and 57 provided comments. In support of their consultation response, the Classical Circus Association provided an open letter from film producers, directors and professionals representing members of the audio-visual community in the UK and the USA. This letter addresses concerns raised about the use of animals in their industry and is discussed in some detail in the Introduction to Section 3. A full copy of the letter can be found at Annex 1.

Key points

5.26 Key points:

- The use of wild animals in circuses produces no benefits for the animals.
- The use of wild animals in circuses may provide financial benefits for circus owners but at a cost to the animals.
- The use of wild animals in circuses provides entertainment benefits to the paying public.
- The use of wild animals in circuses provides the public with educational benefits and opportunities to interact.
- The use of wild animals in circuses increases respect for these animals, raises awareness of conservation issues and makes the public appreciate them more.
- Circuses, including animal circuses, are a cultural event and part of the UK’s cultural heritage.
- Circuses breed animals with care, attention and planning.
- Circuses are a valuable resource for the supply of animals for use in film and television.
- Circus animals are protected from extinction and poachers.

Benefits to circus owners

5.27 A total of 22 respondents stated that the animals had nothing to gain from circus life; the only benefit was to circus owners who anticipated increased revenue although one respondent thought it possible that financial benefits may not actually exist because there were so many activists in the UK who would boycott circuses using wild animals. Another respondent thought that the circus trade could diminish without the animals. A few respondents felt strongly that it was not ethical for circus owners to benefit financially in this way; in their opinion, no amount of money was worth the suffering of animals.

“The only benefit to wild animals in a travelling circus is monetary. No money is worth the suffering of animals.” (Individual Respondent)

“Revenue for the circus - that is the only benefit, but at the cost of the welfare of these animals.” (Individual Respondent)
"There may be financial benefits for the circuses, but the animals have no benefits. In the UK there are so many activists that would boycott a circus using wild animals, that the financial benefits may not exist." (Individual Respondent)

Public entertainment

5.28 A small number of respondents considered that the greatest benefit of having wild animals in circuses was the fun, enjoyment and wonder it brought to people of all ages, particularly children (although one respondent did think that fun for the public was at great expense to the animals). The sheer pleasure of observing animals in circuses could nurture wonder and be inspiring. According to the Classical Circus Association, animal circuses were entertainment at its best and probably the last place of entertainment where all ages could enjoy the whole show.

5.29 The Federation Mondiale du Cirque stated that the very existence of the Festival International du Cirque de Monte-Carlo demonstrated the ongoing interest in and public support for circuses of all forms, including classical circuses featuring performing animals. According to the Federation, the public had overwhelmingly voted for an animal performance as the top act for the last few years. The European Circus Association pointed out (see quote below) that a representative survey in Germany had indicated that a large percentage of the public liked to see animals in circuses, preferred animals being lions, tigers, elephants and horses. One respondent considered that seeing wild animals in a circus was a benefit because it was such a rarity in Scotland nowadays and was of the opinion that a circus without animals was merely a ‘variety show’.

"It is fun for people but it is at great and indefinite expense to the animals." (Individual Respondent)

"The greatest benefit is the enjoyment it brings to children of all ages. For example, a representative survey in Germany has given a voice to the silent majority: 85.5% like to see animals at the circus! And which animals do they prefer? Front runners are lions and tigers, elephants and horses. This result is also underlined by the number of visitors. The vote takes place at the box office: Every day millions are streaming into the performances of circuses with animals around the world. And if the circus offers rides on ponies, horses, camels and maybe elephants, the kids line up in long queues to get in touch with their favourite animals." (Group Response – European Circus Association)

"The greatest benefit is the enjoyment it brings to people of all ages. It is not to be forgotten that the activist standpoint is based on another cultural misinterpretation: seeing nature as a total entity in which everything ends in a harmonious and painless way, a sort of literal rather than real "Arcadia". In fact, nature means fighting, contradictions and stress to animals; all these concepts must not be forgotten when evaluating the presence of subjects that have been born in captivity and have lived in circuses for generations, and that undergo the principle of positive reinforcement in daily training." (Group Response – Club Amici del Circo)

Educational benefit

5.30 A few respondents thought there was an educational benefit, particularly for children, to having wild animals in circuses because it introduced people to animals they may never otherwise get a chance to view in the flesh (although according to two respondents, not in the best of conditions and the cost to the animals was high).
Circuses could promote and teach respect for wild animals and endangered species and people could see the beauty and natural behaviours of the animals, interact with them, appreciate them more as a species and have a greater understanding of their place in society.

5.31 One respondent pointed out that not all members of the public could afford a day at a zoo or safari park to see wild animals close up and television was simply not as good as seeing them in real life; but it would be possible for people to go to the circus. Another respondent considered that being able to see these animals up close increased consciousness about conservation issues and promoted interest which would help to preserve the species for future generations; exotic animals left in a disappearing wild would simply be forgotten and go the way of the dodo. One respondent thought, however, that there would be more value in using wild animals in circuses if there was increased emphasis on education and less on entertainment; animals should be presented as creatures to be respected, with facts and information about the species such as average sizes, special skills and conservation status.

“It is educational and let’s people see the animals natural behaviours.” (Individual Respondent)

“Not all members of the public have access to the internet to watch animals in the wild, not everyone can afford a day at the zoo or safari park to see wild animals close up. At a circus, not only can you see the animals during the show, afterwards you can see them at close range, you can feel them, touch them, smell them, you can see the huge size of an elephant or the size of a lion/tiger’s foot or teeth. You can’t do that in any other captive environment. This is something uniquely that only circuses can do. If there is big cats for example, you can see them jumping effortlessly and see the shine on their coats. TV with the best will in the world, cannot show you this clearly enough.” (Individual Respondent)

“At least a child might see an animal that they might never ever see in the wild.” (Individual Respondent)

Preserving cultural history

5.32 The Federation Mondiale du Cirque and one other respondent also thought of circus as a cultural event. The Federation stated that a few years ago the European Parliament called for further support and recognition of the classical circus, including the presentation of animals, from Member States as part of Europe’s cultural heritage; in addition, according to the Federation, as the modern circus was invented by Philip Astley in London in 1768, the recognition of classical circus as part of cultural heritage was even more compelling for the United Kingdom.

“The very existence of the Festival International du Cirque de Monte-Carlo demonstrates the ongoing interest in and public support for circus of all forms, including classical circuses featuring performing animals. Now preparing for its 39th season since its founding by Prince Rainier of Monaco in the early 1970’s the Festival is the world’s preeminent international competition for circus acts. Each of the past several years, the public has overwhelmingly voted for an animal performance as the top act. The more recent formation of the Federation (December 2008) and its growth in the last four years is more evidence of the continuing public support for all forms of circus. The recent celebration of the Fourth annual World Circus Day saw celebrations by circuses and circus enthusiasts in 47 countries, including open animal training sessions and other
animal-focused events. Even youth and social circuses, which focus exclusively or predominantly on performance by humans, sometimes work with animals. As one social circus founder and teacher has explained: working with an animal in the circus setting may be the only opportunity for some (disadvantaged) children to have a positive interaction with an animal.

European Union law requires that EU countries pay full regard to the welfare requirements of animals. At the same time, EU countries must respect customs "relating in particular to religious rites, cultural traditions and regional heritage." A number of EU countries (e.g., France, Italy, Spain) officially recognize and/or support the classical circus as part of their national culture and traditions. The Arts Council of England, which oversees public funding of the arts, also recognises Circus as an art-form. Importantly, its policy states that funding decisions will not discriminate on the basis of inclusion or exclusion of animals. Similarly, the Irish Arts Council supports circus and created guidelines for funding of circuses with performing animals to ensure that welfare requirements are met.

On 13 October 2005, the European Parliament adopted by a large majority a Resolution proposed by its Culture and Education Committee calling for further support of the classical circus as part of Europe's cultural heritage. This Resolution explicitly highlights the desirability of recognising the "classical circus, including the presentation of animals," as part of European culture and calls upon Member States that have not already done so to recognise the circus as part of culture. It should be noted that as recently as December 2013, the Netherlands inscribed the traditional circus on its national list of intangible cultural heritage.

As the modern circus was invented by Philip Astley in London in 1768, the recognition of classical circus as part of cultural heritage is even more compelling for the United Kingdom. (Group Response – Federation Mondiale du Cirque)

Conservation role

5.33 The Classical Circus Association claimed that, in addition to the benefits of public enjoyment and education, the use of wild animals in circuses provided other benefits relating to animal breeding and supply of animals. According to the Association, circuses were very careful not to inbreed their animals, breed them with animals with genetic defects or, unlike zoos, permit unplanned breeding.

Supporting wider industries

5.34 Circuses, claimed the Association, were also a valuable resource for the supply of animals to the wider entertainment industry for use in film and television. These animals were desirable commodities because they were biddable, used to working, did not mind lights and noise, travelled without stress and adapted to locations without problems.

Animal protection

5.35 Another respondent commented that, in the circus, animals were protected from extinction and poachers and received the highest of medical care.

Sample of respondents’ quotes

"There are many benefits with regards to having wild animals in circuses. Firstly the enjoyment it brings to families and in particular children who love to see these wonderful animals, it is entertainment at its best and it is probably the last place of entertainment whereby all ages can enjoy the whole show. There is no swearing, no rude content, no shouting or aggression. Circuses are fun to visit and they provide wholesome
entertainment for all the family. There is a case that entertainment for entertainment's sake is not a bad thing in this very difficult world. Secondly circuses are very careful not to inbreed their animals or breed with animals with genetic defects. Unlike zoos they also know how to keep female animals separated when in season so to avoid unplanned breeding. Thirdly the circus is a place of educational resource, even if the children do not know they are being educated. Their view on how to preserve animals in the wild is awakened after a circus visit where they have seen lions, tigers or elephants. It is far more real than watching a television programme and has a far more lasting effect on children about our planet and how we treat it. Fourthly circuses are a valuable resource to the wider entertainment industry for use in film and television. Zoos will not provide animals for this work and in any event if they did it would be stressful for the animals. Whereas circus animals are use to working, they don't mind lights and noise, they travel with no stress problems and also are more biddable and adapt to other locations with no problems.” (Group Response – Classical Circus Association)

“many people who visit circuses with wild animals at there own choice and cost obviously think so .I often visit animal circuses when I can .as you can get close to appreciate the beauty of them and watch there behaviour.in the not too distant future circuses and zoos may be the only place some animal species will be seen” (Individual Respondent)

Respondents who answered ‘Don’t Know’ whether there are benefits from having wild animals

5.36 A total of 11 respondents answered ‘don’t know’ and 4 provided comments; 2 stated that there could be an educational benefit associated with the use of wild animals in travelling circuses - a possible opportunity for people to widen their knowledge about various animals; however, one of the respondents did not think this was a positive way of learning and the other did not feel that the educational benefit could be properly assessed without statistically significant research data. The third respondent commented that wild animals in circuses allowed people to see the animals up close but did not consider this a good enough reason for them having to travel and thought that people would learn more from watching the animals in their natural environment. The remaining respondent commented that the circus probably had a greater profit from having wild animals on show.
CONSULTATION QUESTION 8: Do you believe that there are sufficient benefits to justify the potential compromise to the wider well-being of wild animals kept in a travelling circus? Why?

Table 5.2: Overview of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%.

5.37 A total of 2020 respondents (98.9%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, the vast majority, 1913 respondents (93.6%) answered ‘no’ indicating that they did not believe there were sufficient benefits to justify the potential compromise to the wider well-being of wild animals kept in a travelling circus; 48 respondents (2.3%) answered ‘yes’; 59 respondents (2.9%) answered ‘don’t know’.

5.38 The remaining 23 respondents (1.1%) left this question blank even though 15 offered comments; 1 of these respondents stated that there was no evidence to support the premise that circuses by their nature compromised the welfare of animals so banning the use of wild animals in circuses seemed a disproportionate measure towards this form of entertainment; 6 respondents stated that there were no (or in the case of one respondent, insufficient) benefits for wild animals in circuses; 1 respondent considered that a circus was a most unnatural environment for wild animals and that cruel training was often involved; the remaining 7 respondents stated that they did not understand the question or found it confusing.

5.39 In total, 927 respondents (45.4%) offered comments at Question 8.

Respondents who answered ‘No’ there are not sufficient benefits

5.40 A total of 1913 respondents answered ‘no’ and 859 provided comments.

Key points

5.41 Key points:

- There are no benefits to keeping wild animals incarcerated in circuses for human amusement that makes compromising their wellbeing acceptable.
- Any benefits to circus owners or attenders due to the use of wild animals in traveling circuses are morally unjustifiable in view of the harm to the animals.
- There are many other ways of learning about wild animals that are realistic and informative and do not send out the wrong messages to children.
- Wild animals should be allowed to express their normal behaviour which is impossible in a travelling circus environment.
• Wild animals may have shorter lives in the wild but their quality of life would be considerably improved.
• Circuses do not need to use wild animals because human-only circuses are excellent alternatives.
• Animal circuses are an outdated tradition and no longer applicable to our society.
• Circuses subjugate wild animals for profit rather than promote the welfare and protection of animals.

General points

5.42 Nearly three quarters of these respondents who commented in support of their ‘no’ responses stated that, in their opinion, life in a circus environment in no way benefited the animals but, even if it did, the negatives attached to the animals’ lives would still far outweigh any benefits. Respondents were adamant that compromising the quality of life and wellbeing of wild animals in circuses for human entertainment was completely unacceptable on every level. Wild animal acts were an outdated tradition and it was considered by many respondents that circuses could do very well, or even better, with only human entertainers, particularly as humans could choose this life rather than have it forced upon them.

5.43 Many respondents recognised that using wild animals in circuses provided financial benefits to circus owners and entertainment for attenders but declared that these “benefits” were morally unjustifiable in view of the harm to the animals. As in previous questions, a number of respondents once again denied that there was any educational value associated with the use of wild animals in circuses, stating that there were many other and better ways of learning about such animals that did not send out the wrong messages to children. One respondent even felt that circuses subjugated wild animals for profit as opposed to promoting the conservation and protection of the species. Once again many respondents reiterated that these animals should be in the wild and not in the unnatural environment of a circus.

Sample of respondents’ quotes

“There are no benefits to the animals forced to live in this sort of cruel industry. If zoos in the UK behaved like this towards their animals they’d be shut down.” (Individual Respondent)

“Circuses are for entertainment only, why should animals be compromised for entertainment?” (Individual Respondent)

“No you cannot compromise welfare. There is more to treating animals in an appropriate way than keeping them (bodily) healthy. Animals will always suffer the negative effects of living and performing in a circus.” (Individual Respondent)

“Money and more trade no matter how lucrative should not justify the potential for suffering in creatures that cannot speak for themselves.” (Individual Respondent)

“Human gain and selfishness does not justify any reason for the “potential compromise to the wider well-being of wild animals”. Travelling circuses do not provide any benefits as they are purely for entertainment.” (Individual Respondent)
“The "wider well-being of wild animals" is put back into the dark ages by their use and abuse at a circus. It's time we stopped trying to justify inappropriate use of animals as benefitting them. It is simply not true.” (Individual Respondent)

“Circuses should adapt with the times. It is no longer acceptable to have wild animals caged in a circus.” (Individual Respondent)

“Just keep animals out of the picture entirely. Circus entertainment is for people, so let people be the entertainers.” (Individual Respondent)

“No compromise, animals are not entertainment. Leave that to people who have a choice.” (Individual Respondent)

“No never. Human circuses are amazing, for example Cirque De Soliel, to name but one. Anyone who goes to see them for the first time, knows for ever more that animal circuses are outdated. Children coming out of the human circus want to go and get fit and learn to trapeze. Children coming out of an animal circus are either in shock at how cruel and undeveloped some adults are, or they want to go home and make their dogs do tricks.” (Individual Respondent)

“No benefits for the animals. And it doesn't do young children any good to see them as it gives the wrong messages to them about caring for and respecting other living creatures.” (Individual Respondent)

“There is only negative education - that our fellow creatures are there for us to use and abuse - just because we can. I don’t think this is a healthy message for our children and the planet.” (Individual Respondent)

“I think it is a poor argument to try and use conservation as an excuse to use animals in circuses. There are much better ways to help wild animals than by using them in circuses, such as conserving their natural habitat and implementing breeding programmes for example.” (Individual Respondent)

“None at all. The wider benefit to the animal would be to leave them in the wild where they should be living their own circle of life as it was meant to be.” (Individual Respondent)

Respondents who answered ‘Yes’ there are sufficient benefits

5.44 A total of 48 respondents answered ‘yes’ and 30 provided comments; however, the comments of 16 did not support their “yes” responses. One respondent did not believe that there was any potential threat to the wider wellbeing of wild animals. Another respondent was concerned about what would happen to wild animals already committed to circuses if there was a ban on their use, stating that these animals needed to be looked after humanely until they died naturally rather than be put down if surplus to requirements if and when a ban came into force. Yet another respondent thought that concerns about circus animals could be easily resolved with proper policing and monitoring of circuses.

Key points

5.45 The remaining 10 respondents thought that wild animals in circuses had, or provided, the benefits listed below:
• Animals are well cared for in the circus so there is no compromise to their wellbeing even though they must adapt to their surroundings.
• The appeal of wild animals is a benefit to the circus and their customers, who ask to see wild animals perform.
• Animals are safe in the circus and not being hunted to extinction in the wild by poachers and trophy hunters.
• It is exciting and instructive, especially for children, to get to know the most diverse animals at close range in a circus.
• Seeing wild animals in the circus inspires and nurtures wonder and respect and encourages empathy for other creatures.
• Wild animals in circuses benefit from balanced feed, mental stimulation, training, medical care, human contact and constant medical and physical attention when grooming.
• In the wild, animals may be subject to blood sucking flies, drought and disease or killed to make way for new plantations so the circus is a better option.

Biased question

5.46 Four of the groups that aligned themselves with the circus industry were unhappy with question 8; 2 of the groups stated that question 8 was biased because, in their opinion, it suggested that detriment to the wellbeing of animals was inherent in the circus environment; 1 group stated that they opposed the underlying bias in the question because they did not agree with the assumption that the travelling circus meant a “potential compromise to the wider well-being of wild animals” in the first place; and the remaining group stated that the question was loaded as it assumed there was compromise which was harmful to the wellbeing of the animals.

Sample of respondents’ quotes

“Animals in the wild are being hunted to extinction all the time. At least these animals are safe.” (Individual Respondent)

“We don’t know enough about what they need and many animals need care to avoid extinction, that should be our focus.” (Individual Respondent)

“The appeal of wild animals is a benefit to circus and their customers, the public ask for animals and therefore circuses tend to satisfy that request and providing circuses care for their animals correctly and how the public think they should, their will be no compromise to the animals well being. As soon as animals are not looked after correctly, that’s when the public walk away.” (Individual Respondent)

“Due to urbanization, more and more people are losing every relationship to animals. Thus it is exciting and instructive, especially for children, to get to know the most diverse animals at close range. Only the circus can provide this contact and show the confidential relationship between man and animal. Even youth and social circuses sometimes work with animals, because working with an animal in the circus setting may be the only opportunity for some children to have a positive interaction with an animal. The ongoing discussion about animals in human care is caused by several factors. One of these is that our era seems to be strongly characterized by the distance, the almost absolute separation between the world of men and the world of animals (pets are considered another proper universe, a limbo that is not subject to the strict protocol of the freedom theory implemented by a certain kind of activism). This means that almost nobody any longer is actually familiar with the animal world; all the more the latter is celebrated and deified. In this framework, training of animals becomes rare and hard to
understand because it entails the maximum sharing between trainers and learners, between "tamers" and "tamed". (Group Response – European Circus Association)

"Of course any animal in captivity has to compromise or adapt to its surroundings. And if you are talking normal then you should read "Normal" behaviour of the legal animal is more than just "what they do in the wild" Ian Robertson and Lindsay Matthews. International Animal Law and School of Law, University of Leeds. (attached document annexe 4) This paper argues that "it would be inconsistent for the judiciary to define "normal" in a manner that excludes the human caregiver". Also please see answer to Question No 7." (Group Response – Classical Circus Association)

Respondents who answered ‘Don’t Know’ if there are sufficient benefits

5.47 A total of 59 respondents answered ‘don’t know’ and 22 provided comments; 15 respondents stated that they did not understand the question and 1 respondent was unsure; the comments of the remaining 6 respondents did not provide any new information for analysis but 5 indicated they had concerns about wild animals in circuses; the comments of the remaining respondent were unclear.
CONSULTATION QUESTION 9: Do you consider that the potential conflict between compromising the well-being of wild animals and obtaining any benefit could be resolved without banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses. If so, how?

Table 5.3: Overview of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

5.48 A total of 2024 respondents (99.1%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, the vast majority, 1975 respondents (96.7%) answered ‘no’ indicating that they thought the potential conflict between compromising the well-being of wild animals and obtaining any benefit could not be resolved without banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses; 25 respondents (1.2%) answered ‘yes’; 24 respondents (1.2%) answered ‘don’t know’.

5.49 The remaining 19 respondents (0.9%) left this question blank even though 10 provided comments; 1 of these respondents stated that the wellbeing of the animals was enhanced, not compromised; 3 respondents thought that there were no benefits for the animals so a ban must be imposed; 2 respondents stated that wild animals did not belong in a circus and another respondent thought the animals should be reintegrated into the wild; 1 respondent stated only humans would benefit from wild animals in circuses and 1 respondent considered that the question needed to be reworded; the comments of the remaining respondent were unclear.

5.50 In total, 736 respondents (36%) offered comments at Question 9.

Respondents who answered ‘No’ potential conflict cannot be resolved without a ban

5.51 A total of 1975 respondents answered ‘no’ and 700 provided comments.

Key points

5.52 Key points:

- Circuses can do nothing to benefit the well-being of wild animals so no conflict exists because no compromise is possible.
- Animals do not belong in today’s modern circus, particularly when their welfare is compromised.
Wild animals should be free and left alone not exploited for money outwith their natural environment.

Wild animals in circuses do not provide any educational or conservational value.

Inherent concerns

5.53 As with question 8, a large number of these respondents stated that, in their opinion, the use of wild animals in circuses had to be banned because circuses did nothing to benefit the well-being of the animals. Some respondents specified that there were no conservation or educational benefits associated with the use of these animals in travelling circuses and that it was clearly not in the animals’ best interests to be confined and trained to do tricks. Many respondents also considered that the welfare problems (excessive confinement in small enclosures, constant travelling, ‘abusive’ training methods etc.) of wild animals in circuses were inherent so could not be corrected by any change in practice. All thought that no actual conflict existed between compromising the well-being of wild animals and obtaining any benefit because no justifiable compromise was possible; the only possible solution was a ban.

Modern alternatives

5.54 Respondents also stated that they saw no need for compromise; the potential benefits to circus owners (money) and the paying public (entertainment) were not exclusively based on the use of wild animals. Some respondents thought that by introducing the techniques and special effects used by more modern travelling shows, circuses could ensure their long term success and profitability without using animals of any kind and the paying public could continue to be hugely entertained by circuses performances that did not compromise the welfare of animals. Some respondents thought that this would actually create additional benefit for circus owners because everyone would enjoy human-only circuses, even people who currently boycotted animal circuses, so there would be increased demand to attend shows and more profit as a result. Wild animals could then be free in the wild and left alone, or sent to sanctuaries to live out the remainder of their lives in peace.

Sample of respondents’ quotes

“There is no benefit, so the question of compromise is irrelevant. The welfare problems associated with a circus environment are inherent to that industry, and a ban that prohibits circuses from using animals is the only way to solve them.” (Individual Respondent)

“Well-being and compromise are not bedfellows.” (Individual Respondent)

“The well being of wild animals and the continuation of circuses which keep them captive are mutually exclusive.” (Individual Respondent)

“Any guidelines are subject to abuse. A ban is clear and defined. No grey areas to be abused.” (Individual Respondent)

“These animals would have joined the list of domesticated animals along time ago if they were suitable to be kept in captivity.” (Individual Respondent)
"I do not see the benefit that having wild animals in circuses brings, be it monetary or educational. The circuses could earn more without & the viewing public learns nothing."
(Individual Respondent)

"We probably have better standards of care for live export of animals for slaughter than we do of circuses! And inspection of each circus does not happen in transit. There is no benefit to this! Intrinsically, transporting animals and making animals perform, for human entertainment is wrong, unjust and cruel. How to resolve this is to ban each circus, not look for some possible 'sticking plaster' solution to a massive moral problem in the first instance."
(Individual Respondent)

"No because circuses still own the animals. The animals have no freedom, and are bound by a contract they can't even sign."
(Individual Respondent)

"I and many others around the word actively boycott circuses that use wild animals in their performances. However, many of these people would attend the same circuses when and only when they stop using wild animals. This would create benefit due to higher demand and the money used for animal upkeep could be put into the other performances thus creating a more impressive show. The public are becoming more and more aware of animal welfare issues. Conclusively it is inevitable that more and more of the public will decide not to support circuses that use wild animals. Therefore, it is best for the government and circus companies to make changes now to show that they are moving with the times and in favour of supporting respect for animals."
(Individual Respondent)

"Like other industries that have come and gone, the circus has had its day. Let it die a death. People love seeing circuses without wild animals. Cirque du Soleil and the like are so popular. The Scottish people will not miss the wild animals. If they were banned, people would accept that this change was needed and the correct thing for a civilised society in the 21st century."
(Individual Respondent)

"No. And as already stated, like bear baiting, hunting with dogs, lamping and other banned brutality, it has no place in this century."
(Individual Respondent)

"There is conflict in banning drugs trafficking - up to now this hasn't been cited as a reason to allow it to flourish. If circus people have not got the wit to diversify into humane acts or find better jobs it should not be the animals suffer for their failings"
(Individual Respondent)

"The only rightful thing is for the animals to be left in the wild. Those pushing for a compromise would only be the circus owners who are trying to attract the public to their circus and preying on members of the public who are not fully conservation and animal welfare aware. It would only be for monetary gain to the circus owner, no benefit or gain for the animal."
(Individual Respondent)

Respondents who answered ‘Yes’ potential conflict can be resolved without a ban

5.55 A total of 25 respondents answered ‘yes’ and 18 provided comments although the comments of 2 did not support their “yes” responses.

Key points

5.56 The remaining 16 respondents, including the groups representing the interests of circuses, were fairly united in their views and focused on the following key points:
No conflict

5.57 Eleven respondents, including the groups representing circus interests, stated that they did not believe there was any potential conflict between compromising the well-being of wild animals and obtaining any benefit from their use in circuses; a few respondents blamed animal rights extremists for creating public opposition to the use of wild animals in circuses, one individual respondent going so far as to say that this was a giant myth and that circuses should be praised for their good animal husbandry.

5.58 Three of the groups that affiliated themselves with the circus industry cited the Radford Report as a scientific basis for their stated belief that no potential conflict existed. They pointed out that if, in accordance with their interpretation of the Radford Report, animal welfare was not an issue in travelling circuses, why should the wellbeing of so-called ‘wild’ animals in travelling circuses be compromised any more than in other forms of keeping animals in human care. In additional support of its stated belief that no potential conflict existed, one of the circus groups also cited the research and teachings of Dr. Marthe Kiley-Worthington and Dr. Ted Friend who, according to the circus group, concluded after copious research of animals that the welfare of circus animals was satisfactory.

“Again, we don’t believe there is a conflict. If animal welfare is not an issue in travelling circuses - as seen in all scientific studies, e.g. the Radford Report, why should the well-being of so-called “wild” animals in travelling circuses be compromised any more than in other forms of keeping animals in human care? In any case, if clear regulations guarantee the animals’ welfare, the benefits of the unique meeting place between man and animal that only the circus can provide by far outweighs any potential compromises to the animals’ ethical well-being.” (Group Response – European Circus Association)

“The real opposition to animals in circuses is coming from a very specific group of extremists who would also like to ban people having pets of any kind. There is a lot more to it than just banning animals from circuses. The public who are duped into supporting them don’t realize where this is going.” (Individual Respondent)

Regulatory approach

5.59 One individual respondent thought that circuses should be allowed to tour Scotland if they wished to do so but should have to meet certain standards of animal welfare. Other respondents, including two of the circus groups, thought that a strict licensing and enforcement scheme, similar to the scheme that operated in England, should be put in place, following a formal review of circus practices by experts. It was considered that such a scheme would completely safeguard the animals and negate the need for any ban.
Another group considered that there should possibly be a coordinated approach to enforcement of animal health and welfare in circuses where all interested parties (Local Authority, Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories Agency (now called Animal and Plant Health Agency), Scottish Government, police etc.) assessed the suitability of arrangements prior to any circus being permitted to travel in Scotland. The group considered that good enforcement could also be achieved by specifying which species were not suitable to be kept in a circus environment (see quote below).

“Here you go again..... stating a scenario that is not the case. The easy answer is a big yes, a system is already in place that is fit for purpose and working just fine. So listen to the experts and just adopt a similar licensing regime, and stop trying to create scenarios that do not exist. I get a distinct feeling that you got the Animal Rights Activists to author some of these questions ???” (Individual Respondent)

“Possibly through the coordinated approach to enforcement of animal health and welfare and a national licensing regime where all parties (LA, AHVLA, SG, police etc) assess the suitability of the arrangements, prior to being allowed to travel in Scotland. This could be supported by on-site enforcement. This could also be achieved by specifying which species could NOT be kept in this environment. This would be a very defensible position. E.g. a zebra can be tamed and trained to act in many ways very similar to domestic equines. Exercising such an animal does not present great difficulties. The same is not true for the large cats.” (Group Response – Argyll and Bute Council)

Respondents who answered ‘Don’t Know’ whether potential conflict can be resolved without a ban

A total of 24 respondents answered ‘don’t know’ and 6 provided comments; 1 respondent did not understand the question, 1 thought the question was unclear and 1 was unsure. The comments of the remaining 3 respondents did not provide any new information for analysis; 1 respondent thought that possibly horses could be used by circuses instead of wild animals; 1 thought if all animals were used for education rather than entertainment it could potentially be justifiable to use animals in travelling circuses; and the remaining respondent considered that communication with the circus community was required to discuss policies and possibilities.
6. FINANCIAL IMPACTS OF A BAN

6.1 This section of the consultation document contains 6 questions relating to the financial impact of a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses.

Consultation Question 10 - As far as you are aware, how often have travelling circuses that use wild animals in performances or for exhibition visited Scotland in the last 5 years and in the last 12 months?

Consultation Question 11 - What effect do you think a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals would have on the revenue of such circuses? Why?

Consultation Question 12 - If a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals was imposed, do you think that such circuses would still visit Scotland without the wild animals? Why?

Consultation Question 13 - What effect do you think a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals in travelling circuses would have on the revenue of other types of circus (e.g. static or those travelling without wild animals)? Why?

Consultation Question 14 - What effect do you think a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals in travelling circuses would have on the revenue of circus venues? Why?

6.2 In question 10, respondents were invited to state, as far as they were aware, the number of times circuses that used wild animals had visited Scotland during the last 5 years and during the last 12 months; a ‘don’t know’ option was available for anyone who could not provide the requested information. Questions 11, 12, 13 and 14 were all multiple choice questions. In questions 11, 13 and 14 respondents could select ‘increase’, ‘no change’, ‘decrease’ or ‘don’t know’ in response to each; in question 12 respondents could select ‘yes’, ‘no’ or ‘don’t know’.

6.3 A selection of ‘increase’ for question 11 suggested that respondent thought a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals would increase the revenue of animals circuses; answering ‘yes’ to question 12 suggested that respondents thought circuses that used wild animals in performances and exhibitions would still visit Scotland without wild animals if their use was banned; selecting ‘increase’ for question 13 suggested that respondents thought a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals in travelling circuses would increase the revenue of other types of circuses; and any respondents selecting ‘increase’ for question 14 suggested that they thought a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals in travelling circuses would increase the revenue of circus venues. All respondents were invited to comment on their answers.

Consultation Question 15: Do you consider that a ban on wild animals in travelling circuses could have an impact on other industries? If so, which industries, what would be the effect and why?

6.4 This was a multiple choice question which gave respondents the option of selecting ‘positive impact’, ‘no impact’, ‘negative impact’ or ‘don’t know’ with regards
to specific categories of media industry. These were: Film, TV - Drama, TV - Documentary, TV – Children’s, Advertising – TV and Advertising – Other. Respondents were also given the option of providing suggestions of up to 3 other types of businesses they considered might be affected and in what way, and specifying their reasoning in the relevant comment section.

Overview of results

6.5 77.5% of respondents did not know how often travelling circuses that used wild animals in performances or for exhibition had visited Scotland in the last 5 years and in the last 12 months.

6.6 34% of respondents thought that a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals would increase the revenue of such circuses.

6.7 65.8% of respondents thought that if a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals was imposed, such circuses would still visit Scotland without the wild animals.

6.8 48.8% of respondents thought there would be no change to the revenue of other types of circus (e.g. static or those travelling without wild animals) in the event of a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals in travelling circuses.

6.9 32.8% of respondents thought there would be no change to the revenue of circus venues in the event of a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals in travelling circuses.

6.10 A detailed analysis of respondents’ comments for questions 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 is provided. However, it is worth noting that respondents appeared to find questions 11, 13 and 14 particularly challenging to answer. The three questions ask for views on what effects a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses might have on the revenue of:

1. Circuses that currently have wild animals.
2. Other types of circuses (e.g. static or those travelling without wild animals).
3. Circus venues.

6.11 Since questions 11, 13 and 14 were all interrelated, many of the points raised by respondents were repeated across the multiple choice selections of each individual question and also across the 3 questions as a whole. In other words, respondents were inclined to raise the same arguments for ‘increase’, ‘no change’, ‘decrease’ and ‘don’t know’, in some instances, even though they selected the answer to each individual question that embraced their personal viewpoints. The same or similar arguments cropped up at times in all 3 questions.

6.12 The analysis of question 15 showed that there were mixed views regarding the impact of a ban on the wider film and television industry. The majority of respondents felt that a ban on the use of wild animals in circuses would have a positive effect, at least in ethical terms, and could ultimately lead to fewer animals being used. However, a few respondents felt there would be irreparable damage to
the UK film and TV industries by the removal of a ready supply of trained wild animals.
CONSULTATION QUESTION 10: As far as you are aware, how often have travelling circuses that use wild animals in performances or for exhibition visited Scotland in the last 5 years and in the last 12 months?

Table 6.1: Overview of results

| Response | Groups | | | | | Total |
|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|          | No. | % | comments | No. | % | comments | No. | % |
| No. of respondents who entered figures for the last 5 years / 12 months | 18 | 32.1 | 14 | 436 | 21.9 | 260 | 454 | 22.2 |
| Don't Know | 37 | 66.1 | 14 | 1547 | 77.9 | 402 | 1584 | 77.5 |
| Blank | 1 | 1.8 | 1 | 4 | 0.2 | 4 | 5 | 0.2 |
| Total | 56 | 100 | 29 | 1987 | 100 | 666 | 2043 | 100 |

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

6.13 As can be seen from the table, a total of 454 respondents (22.2%) provided figures in response to this question and the results can be examined in the graphs provided in the relevant sections below. However, the vast majority of 1584 respondents (77.5%) answered ‘don’t know’. The remaining 5 respondents (0.2%) left this question blank even though 3 provided figures for circuses that had visited within the last 5 years, and all commented.

6.14 In total, 695 respondents (34%) offered comments at question 10.

Key points across all respondents

6.15 Key points across all respondents were as follows:

- Visiting animal circuses are uncommon which proves that banning wild animals from circuses will not have a negative financial impact on the wider community.
- Even one animal circus visiting Scotland is too many.
- Never go to animal circuses so do not take account of any visiting the area.
- Live outside Scotland, so cannot provide Scottish figures.
- Thought that animal circuses were banned already.
- Can only provide local Scottish figures.
- Human-only circuses are popular.
- Local figures are ‘zero’ because local authorities do not permit animal circuses on their land.
- Answer is an estimation or guess.
- Not certain if all visiting circuses used wild animals.
Figures Provided

General comments in relation to figures provided

6.16 Many respondents acknowledged that their answers were an estimate or a guess; it is possible, therefore, that some of the information provided is inaccurate. Many respondents who provided figures also pointed out that they could only provide local figures in relation to that part of Scotland in which they resided, so the national figure for Scotland could be higher. Some respondents recorded local figures as ‘zero’ explaining that their local authority did not permit circuses on their land. Some respondents also indicated in their comments that they were not certain if all the circuses that had visited their areas during the last 5 years had used animals, wild or otherwise, in acts and performances, so the figures they provided may not necessarily be applicable.

6.17 In addition, it is noteworthy that many of the respondents who appeared to have based their responses on wording suggested by the animal welfare organisation, PETA UK, may also have used the organisation’s figures without having any first-hand information of their own on the number of circuses that have visited Scotland in the last 5 years (see PETA UK quote below). Without PETA UK’s figures, therefore, more respondents may have provided different answers to this question or may even have selected ‘don’t know’.

Number of wild animal circuses that have visited Scotland in the last 5 years

6.18 As can be seen in the figures below, the majority of both individual and group respondents thought that there had been only 2 circuses with wild animals visiting in the last five years.

Table 6.2: As estimated by individual respondents
Table 6.3: As estimated by group respondents

Number of wild animal circuses that have visited Scotland in the last 12 months

6.19 The figures below demonstrate that the majority of both individual and group respondents thought that there had been no circuses with wild animals visiting Scotland in the last 12 months.

Table 6.4: As estimated by individual respondents

Table 6.5: As estimated by group respondents
Respondents who answered ‘Don’t Know’ how many circuses have visited Scotland

6.20 Over three quarters of respondents could not provide the requested figures so selected ‘don’t know’ as their answers; 416 provided comments. The 3 main reasons that respondents selected ‘don’t know’ were as follows:

- They lived outside Scotland.
- They only knew about circuses that visited locally.
- They did not know if the circuses that visited had wild animals or not.

6.21 The most repeated explanations provided by respondents regarding why they could not answer the question were that they lived outside Scotland so did not know, or that they would never go to an animal circus so did not take account of any visiting their areas. Many respondents who said they would never go to an animal circus also commented that any such circus visiting Scotland was one too many, or words to that effect. A few respondents did say that they had visited or would visit human-only circuses, however, and that these were quite popular.

6.22 Quite a few respondents commented that they thought circuses were already banned and expressed their surprise (and in some cases, shock) that this was not the case. A large number of respondents stated that few, if any, circuses visited their areas and, in their opinion, this proved that banning animals from circuses would not have a negative financial impact on the wider community.

Sample of respondents’ quotes

"The frequency with which animals are abused, neglected and forced to perform unnaturally for human entertainment is of no consequence. Abuse should be prevented before it occurs, and this can be done only by implementing a complete ban on the use of wild animals in circuses. Nonetheless, as no circus using wild animals has come to Scotland in the last 12 months – and only a small number have done so in the past five years – it is clear that the necessary ban on wild animals in circuses will actually have very little impact on businesses operating in Scotland, although it will have a very meaningful and positive effect on animal welfare in the country.” (Group Response – PETA UK)

“Any number other than zero is unacceptable.” (Individual Respondent)

“I would never visit a circus if they use wild animals” (Individual Respondent)

“I thought we had a ban here on animals being used in a circus. Please don’t tell me that they are still allowed in this day and age to do so.” (Individual Respondent)

“I live in Aberdeen and circusses with wild animals have already been banned here by the council so I don’t now how frequently they visit elsewhere.” (Individual Respondent)
CONSULTATION QUESTION 11: What effect do you think a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals would have on the revenue of such circuses? Why?

Table 6.6: Overview of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comments</td>
<td>comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

6.23 A total of 2008 respondents (98.3%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, a small majority of 695 respondents (34%) selected ‘increase’ indicating that they thought a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals would increase the revenue of animals circuses; 589 respondents (28.8%) selected ‘no change’; 319 respondents (15.6%) selected ‘decrease’; 405 respondents (19.8%) answered ‘don’t know’.

6.24 A total of 35 respondents (1.7%) left this question blank even though 21 provided comments; 9 respondents were in line with an ‘increase’ response and 8 respondents said they did not care. The remaining comments were not relevant to the question.

6.25 In total, 1481 respondents (72.5%) offered comments at Question 11.

Summary of main points across all respondents

6.26 This is a collective summary of the main points raised by respondents who commented in support of their various answers to this question.

Alternative circuses

6.27 Many respondents felt that the majority of the population who currently shunned circuses due to ethical concerns relating to animal welfare, would attend many animal-free circuses in the aftermath of a ban and these new customers would easily outnumber the small minority who would possibly no longer attend because wild animals would no longer be part of the show, so profits would increase.

Business planning

6.28 Other respondents felt that there would be no or minimal change to the profits of wild animal circuses in the event of a ban so long as circus operators took the necessary steps to safeguard their businesses. These respondents considered that the popularity of circuses, whether they had wild animals or not, depended on social
trends and currently these indicated that it was necessary for circuses to re-evaluate their business models and evolve.

6.29 Other respondents felt that, in the beginning, there could be a small decrease in revenue from ticket sales because some people who particularly liked going to see wild animals perform could be disappointed in the aftermath of a ban and stop going. Many respondents did not share this view, however, being of the opinion that most people do not expect or want to see wild animals in circuses anymore, and the few who did would soon adjust. Some respondents disagreed with this, being of the opinion that revenue would decrease irretrievably because many people would simply not visit the circus without the lure of animal acts. Other respondents stated that they did not know enough about a circus’s customer base, its monetary inflow and outflow, the savings from no longer keeping animals and whether or not these would offset wages for additional human performers, to be able to formulate an opinion.

**Innovation**

6.30 Several respondents were of the opinion that a ban would force circuses to be more innovative with regard to their acts and this would also keep circuses alive, ultimately make them much more successful and increase revenue. Respondents felt that circuses that failed economically would deserve to fail if they were unable to move with the times. A move to ‘ethically sound’ human-only shows would generate a newfound respect for circuses, attract good press and renew interest in this type of entertainment; this, in turn, would encourage even more new visitors to attend.

**Resource re-direction**

6.31 A few respondents considered that circuses would do better economically without the expense of having to keep wild animals; the removal of these animals would open up more job opportunities in the circus industry and the money saved from keeping the animals would pay for new human acts.

**Natural decline**

6.32 Overall, respondents felt that attitudes towards travelling, wild animal circuses were changing and, regardless of whether a ban on the use of wild animals was put in place or not, the public’s raised awareness of perceived animal welfare issues coupled with an increasing distaste for ‘archaic’ and ‘unethical’ performing animal acts would result in a continuing decline in popularity and revenue for these types of travelling shows.
Respondents who selected ‘Increase’ to revenue of wild animal circuses

6.33 A total of 695 respondents selected ‘increase’ and 609 provided comments.

Key points

6.34 Key points:

- Many people who currently boycott circuses for ethical reasons would be happy to attend animal-free circuses in the event of a ban.
- Human-only circuses, most notably Cirque du Soleil, are extremely successful and are becoming increasingly more popular.
- In contrast, the declining popularity of wild animal circuses shows that economic growth is possible without the use of animals.
- A ban on wild animals would force circuses to modernise their acts and bring about an opportunity for new innovative and skilled human performances.
- Travelling circuses with animal shows are archaic and outdated and will have to reinvent themselves to ensure success in a modern society.
- A ban on the use of wild animals would be a way for circuses to reboot, become modern, animal-friendly, human-only circuses and rebuild their image through positive publicity.
- Circuses would save on costs and generate higher profits if they did not keep wild animals, as humans are cheaper to accommodate.
- Without animals, circuses would have fewer restrictions on the venues at which they could perform.

Release from ethical concerns

6.35 Over three quarters of respondents who commented felt that the majority of the population who currently shunned circuses due to ethical concerns particularly relating to animal welfare, would begin to attend many animal-free circuses in the aftermath of a ban. New patrons of the circus would actively encourage other family members and friends to go as well, thus widening the current customer base of circuses and generating more revenue. Several respondents used themselves and their immediate family as examples of members of the public who would enjoy a circus show and attend as a family unit if they could be sure the show was animal-free. Additionally, respondents believed that, with increasing levels of awareness regarding animal welfare, society would continue to boycott circuses that used wild animals whether or not a ban on their use was put in place.

6.36 It was clear from the comments that respondents were not against the concept of circus performances and, in general, had no qualms other than the wild animal performances. In fact, quite the contrary; the only issue was that they did not wish to support an industry which, in their opinion, mistreated animals and this is what kept many members of the public away. Many respondents made the point that animal lovers would be part of the new circus customer base and respondents overwhelmingly felt that these new customers would vastly outnumber the small minority who would possibly cease to attend if wild animals were no longer part of the show.
“It may increase. I will not take my child to a circus with wild animals but I will take him to one without these animals. If others share that view then revenues will increase.” (Individual Respondent)

“Such is the overwhelming view that wild animals should not be in circuses, many people (like me) will not visit a circus on principle. Therefore a new and wider audience could be the result of the ban on the use of wild animals” (Individual Respondent)

“This will increase as the number of vegans and vegetarians will start going to circuses that didn't go before as they didn't want to support animal cruelty.” (Individual Respondent)

“If there was a ban people could go to the circus without worrying they are going to be supporting something they disagree with or they don't want their child to see.” (Individual Respondent)

**Human circuses popular**

6.37 Around a third of respondents felt that the increasing popularity and success of human-only circuses such as Cirque du Soleil, Moscow Circus and the Chinese State Circus, illustrated that circuses without wild animals were an economically viable venture. Furthermore, several respondents felt that, in view of the declining popularity of animal circuses, if a circus wanted to survive it would have to consider becoming animal-free regardless of whether a ban on the use of wild animals was imposed or not.

“The popular Cirque du Soleil is testament that animal-free circuses are financially viable and more popular than those that have animals performing in them.” (Individual Respondent)

“There are many marvelous and wonderful travelling circuses making a very good living using talented and funny performers. I never took my child to the circus until the Cirque Du Soleil came to our part of the world. No wild animals, loads of talented young performers and every seat taken. The revenue of a circus without dejected animals will always be far and above the income of a circus that clings to abusing wild animals.” (Individual Respondent)

6.38 Another third of respondents were of the opinion that the public as a whole regarded human acts, such as trapeze, tightrope walking or gymnastics, to be far more interesting, entertaining and worthy of an audience’s respect than animal acts, which were perceived by today’s society to be ‘archaic’, ‘cheap’ and ‘outdated’, as well as ‘cruel’ and ‘unethical’. Respondents made the argument that, although children would probably be entertained regardless of the nature of the show, adults would be more willing to attend performances that were demonstrations of human skill and, ultimately, the adults would be dictating the choices because they would be the ones paying for the tickets.

**Boost innovation**

6.39 Several respondents were of the opinion that a ban would force circuses to be more innovative with regard to their acts and demonstrate more creativity in performances in a bid to ‘out-do’ other circuses; this would create an enjoyable
experience for the public but it would also keep the circus fresh, current and ultimately make it much more successful. Respondents felt that circuses that failed economically would deserve to fail if they were unable to ‘move with the times’ and ‘give the public what they wanted’.

“I don’t feel animals particularly attract people to a circus, the main draws are the human athletes and entertainers.” (Individual Respondent)

“There is huge potential for circuses to increase their revenue by evolving into exciting, modern entertainment shows. So many people shun circuses nowadays as they see it as old-fashioned, even if some are unaware of the tremendous cruelty involved. Inevitably, as awareness of this grows, circuses will go the way of the dinosaur if they fail to take the opportunity to change and offer exciting new products.” (Individual Respondent)

“A vast majority are opposed to the use of animals in circuses so refuse to go. Human-only circuses are flourishing around the world and they heavily advertise the fact that no animals are used because they know that this will encourage more people to attend. From my own research, even people who have no opinion on the animal welfare aspect of circuses, don’t go because they find them boring and outdated. Human circuses showcasing acrobatics and stunts are far more exciting and appeal more to a modern audience.” (Individual Respondent)

Circus reboot

6.40 Respondents felt that a ban would be the perfect way for travelling wild animal circuses to dispel the bad reputation they were perceived to have earned to date. They could move to a human-only type of show which would reboot their circus in the public eye and generate positive media attention and newfound respect. According to respondents, circuses would also then be viewed as ‘good’ in the eyes of animal rights’ activists who may even ‘reward’ them for becoming more ethically sound by generating additional good press and encouraging even more new visitors to attend.

“more people would go and it would update thier image to a one which is more modern and compassionate” (Individual Respondent)

“Circuses could develop more interesting human acts which would draw people. Once they had ceased tarnishing their image by the now quite discredited use of animals, they would be perceived in a fresh modern light, and ticket sales could well increase.” (Individual Respondent)

“They can use the banning as a marketing tool, they are cruelty free and start looking for more innovative acts” (Individual Respondent)

Re-allocation of resource

6.41 Another point raised by a few respondents was that animals were expensive to keep, train and transport and circuses would do better economically without these costs. Respondents also felt that the removal of the wild animals would open up more job opportunities in the circus industry for human performers and since circus employees often performed multiple tasks, jobs would not necessarily be lost as a result of circuses becoming animal-free.
"Definitely increase. More appealing without animals. Less cost to the circus as they do not have to house, feed, train, vet bills re the animals." (Individual Respondent)

"The upkeep of these wild animals is very expensive. feed, veterinary care and travelling costs would no longer be an issue." (Individual Respondent)

"less cost associated with care and acquisition" (Individual Respondent)

**Currently popularity declining**

6.42 Overall, respondents felt that attitudes towards travelling, wild animal circuses were changing and, regardless of whether a ban on the use of wild animals was put in place or not, the public's raised awareness of perceived animal welfare issues coupled with an increasing distaste for 'archaic' and 'cheap' performing animal acts would mean a continuing decline in popularity and revenue for these types of travelling shows. Therefore, if a ban was instigated and innovation was subsequently pushed on such circuses, the industry would benefit economically from the public's renewed interest, and grow.

**Additional quotes**

"More and more people are now becoming aware of the barbaric way animals are treated in circuses and this undoubtedly is driving people away. Also, more countries are now implementing bans on circuses with animals and so the scope for these circuses to put on events and shows is decreasing as time goes by thus decreasing their revenues. If all circuses had a complete ban on wild animals from their shows there would be no restrictions put on them in terms of where and when they perform. There are many other ways a circus can be successful without using animals. Cirque du Soleil is a prime example. This is the only way forward." (Individual Respondent)

"More people would go to a circus that didn't use wild animals. The circus would be able to travel to, and perform in any county or area, therefore gaining more revenue." (Individual Respondent)

"I think the majority of the general public are avoiding going to circuses etc to boycott those that still use animals. People in my opinion prefer to go to circuses where its just performing human artists. Billy Smarts circus no longer has animals and they seem to be managing OK." (Individual Respondent)

"Audiences not only want to be entertained, but they want to FEEL good about the choices they choose for entertainment. For the thousands of people like me who boycott venues that include animals, we would all gladly support other acts. We would buy the tickets for our families and friends and return to enjoy the shows. The event people would see a spike in ticket sales without a doubt!" (Individual Respondent)

"Human acrobatics and more inventive ways of entertaining people in a circus would be far cheaper and raise far more interest than seeing a frustrated tiger jump through a hoop. The feed and vet costs would be eliminated overnight, giving a huge boost to resources and searching for real human talent to entertain. It would create more jobs, too." (Individual Respondent)

"There will be a lot more room for creativity. using people instead of animals will reduce the cost of running the circus, not to mention create more jobs! Also, by employing more people a circus has space to gain a wider variety of skills. While sticking your head in a
lions mouth or parading an impressive animal may be exciting for small children, adults will be much more intrigued to see humans performing extraordinary skills. A child would still enjoy the day to the circus regardless and bearing in mind that the adult is in charge, I anticipate much more attendance. Furthermore, all those people concerned with animal welfare will be able to stop boycotting them and probably 'reward' them for the change with their visits.” (Individual Respondent)

“Many other businesses over the years have had to change to survive. There are many other things circuses can do to draw in the public.” (Individual Respondent)

“Circus owners will have to use their imagination and inventiveness to come up with shows people will want to see. I have no problem with humans impersonating animals; look at what hit ‘Warhorse’ has been on both the English and American stage because of the remarkable costumes.” (Individual Respondent)

Respondents who selected ‘No Change’ to revenue of wild animal circuses

6.43  A total of 589 respondents selected ‘no change’ and 406 provided comments.

Key points

6.44  Key points:

- Circuses will have to substitute human performers for animal acts and, if they are good enough, takings will not fall.
- People do not just go to circuses to see wild animals so they would probably adjust and still go if the use of wild animals was banned.
- It is possible to provide entertainment without using wild animals and many good, popular and successful circuses do just that.
- As people become more and more tuned in to animal welfare they will increasingly make the ethical choice to only visit circuses not using wild animals.
- Circuses have to move with the times, re-evaluate their business models and evolve.
- Circuses with skilled human entertainers are more enjoyable and creative than wild animal acts.
- Circuses that stopped using wild animals may save on costs and the money could help pay for human performers.
- Human performers choose to entertain, animals do not.
- The removal of wild animals from circuses would generally improve the reputation of circuses.
- Nowadays people who want to see wild animals are more likely to visit a wildlife park or zoo.
- Domestic animals could appear in circus shows in place of wild animals because they love performing and their needs are very different to that of wild animals.

Business planning

6.45  Most respondents in this category felt that there would be no change or minimal change to the profits of wild animal circuses in the event of a ban on the use of wild animals so long as circus operators took the necessary steps to safeguard
their businesses. It was considered that the popularity of circuses, whether they had wild animals or not, depended on social trends and many respondents thought that current social trends indicated that as people become more enlightened about animal welfare, they would increasingly make the ethical choice to only visit circuses not using wild animals. It was therefore necessary for circuses to move with the times, re-evaluate their business models, and evolve.

"People go to circuses to be entertained - they can make do with clowns and acrobats etc., just as people had to adjust to having servants instead of slaves. Revenue should NOT compromise the right thing to do." (Individual Respondent)

"There are plenty of talented humans who could fill the gap and you would find that more people who avoid circuses if they used animals, would attend ones that didn't." (Individual Respondent)

6.46 Most respondents were in no doubt that animal circuses, like any well-run businesses, were capable of adapting to the new circumstances in the event that a ban on the use of wild animals was imposed. In line with respondents who selected 'increase' respondents felt strongly that it was possible to provide entertainment without using wild animals. Circus programmes might have to change but, if wild animal acts were replaced with human performers, the new 'ethical' circuses would, in the opinion of respondents, draw in the same size audiences as before. One respondent commented that non-animal circuses regularly formed part of the Edinburgh Festival and generated large attendance figures.

"I would hope that the circuses would learn to look at other potential income streams arising from using human acrobatics such as those used in Cirque de Soleil. Certainly a much more ethically sound way to secure revenue and potentially far more profitable than using wild animals. They need to see they have options and other ways to make money. The public needs to see them stop using wild animals and demonstrate more responsible ownership." (Individual Respondent)

"If they use people as acrobats and other entertainment such as fire eating, magic, dancing there would be just as much revenue to be gained. People are attract to the whole event, the big top, the show, the colour, the performance. Not having animals would not deter people from visiting." (Individual Respondent)

"Their is true entertainment in the skills of people who can perform extraordinary feats. The draw to see animals perform has diminished and many will avoid going to the circus where wild animals are still being exploited for entertainment purposes. Those circuses willing to improve the quality of their performances without wild animals could see an improvement in their revenue. Take Cirque du soliel and the Russian circus as prime examples of the revenue that can be earned through great performances from talented people" (Individual Respondent)

"There are many circuses now which do not have animals performing, and they do well. For heaven's sake, there are magical MEN and WOMEN performers who make audiences gasp at their stunts. Have Bolivia and Greece been at a loss re circuses (they have banned ALL animals, and good for them)." (Individual Respondent)

Lure of wild animals

6.47 A few respondents felt that, in the beginning, there could be a small decrease in revenue from ticket sales because it was possible that some people, children in
particular, who particularly liked going to circuses to see wild animals perform could be a little disappointed and stop going.

6.48 A large number of respondents did not share this view, however, being of the opinion that people do not expect to see wild animals in circuses anymore and that children would be more interested in having fun and being entertained than bothered about a lack of wild animals. In any case, respondents pointed out, many children did not go to animal circuses because their parents were against this form of entertainment and would not take them. Other respondents considered that the novelty of seeing wild animals in circuses was not so great these days with the increased popularity of zoos and wildlife programmes on television and that people were more likely to visit a wildlife park to see wild animals.

6.49 A great many respondents stated that people did not go to circuses just to see wild animals so they would still go if their use was banned. In fact, many respondents felt that even if a few people were disappointed they would very soon adjust if such animals were no longer available and the demand to see them would soon die down.

Release from ethical concerns

6.50 It was also thought by many that if there were a few people that stopped going to circuses in the event of a ban on the use of wild animals, this would be balanced out by the many people who avoided going to wild animal circuses but would start attending and supporting these new ‘ethical’ circuses. It was considered that circus takings, if there had been a slight initial decrease, would start rising again and, over time, could even end by being an overall increase.

"Initially there may be a decrease in revenue for these circuses but there are plenty of circuses out there who do not exploit animals and still have success. The benefit for these animals far outweighs any initial decrease in revenue. Circuses should use the challenge to come up with new and innovative ideas to counteract the fact that they no longer use wild animals." (Individual Respondent)

6.51 Some respondents also considered that a ban on the use of wild animals in circuses would bring Scotland more in line with public sentiment and believed, in line with the views of some respondents who selected ‘increase’, that this would greatly improve the circus industry’s reputation.

Human circuses popular

6.52 One respondent thought that circuses were unique within the entertainment industry so, by having only human performers who chose to entertain rather than wild animals that did not, they would be moving forward with the times and could generate enough public support to keep them in business for some time to come. Another respondent stated that fantastic human acrobats could be excellent, inspirational role-models for children, encouraging them to exercise and be just as fit and healthy as they were. In fact, many respondents thought that ‘ethical’ circuses could become a much loved and well attended type of entertainment.
Realistically this will have a decrease until the public are used to this, then hopefully an increase due to the public understanding why this has been done. Maybe the government should work with the circus people to get them shows and things around the country so that their livelihoods are not compromised, as I understand that these people will also have families and need to make a living.” (Individual Respondent)

Re-allocation of resources

6.53 Again in line with the views of respondents who selected ‘increase’ a few respondents felt that circus operating costs could drop without wild animals to maintain and the money saved could be used for additional human acts. A few respondents suggested that domestic animals such as dogs could appear in circus shows in place of wild animals if they were well looked after because they loved performing and because their needs were very different to that of wild animals, and quite possible to meet.

“I go to circuses for entertainment, not just animal entertainment. I see nothing wrong with domestic animals in them, such as dogs because dogs love their owners and a lot of breeds love to perform for their owners and for treats, and their needs are nowhere near what a wild animal is.” (Individual Respondent)

“Any circus worth it’s salt should be able to adapt. There is plenty of entertainment to be found using people (clowns, acrobats etc) and/or domesticated animals such as dogs and horses, provided they are well cared for.” (Individual Respondent)

Alternative venues

6.54 Finally, one respondent thought that there would be minimal or no change because circuses would simply move on to a country in which the use of wild animals in circuses was still permitted.

Respondents who selected ‘Decrease’ to revenue of wild animal circuses

6.55 A total of 319 respondents selected ‘decrease’ and 197 provided comments.

Key points

6.56 Key points:

- Revenue may decrease initially as the circus adjusts to being without wild animals, particularly if this is the circus’s main showpiece, but will begin to increase again once the circus creates new, innovative, human-only acts to attract audiences.
- Revenue will probably decrease but this should not be justification for allowing the continuing suffering of wild animals in travelling circuses.
- Revenue will decrease because many adults and children enjoy seeing wild animals in the circus and will not attend shows without them.

6.57 In the main, comments fell under one of the three points above.
Business planning

6.58 In line with some respondents who selected ‘no change’ almost half of the respondents who commented felt that the circus would suffer an immediate decrease in revenue after the ban because their previous audiences would now be disinterested in visiting an animal-free circus. This would have a particularly negative impact on the revenue of circuses that used animals in the majority of their shows. However, respondents felt that, as long as the circus was willing to adapt and could implement creative ideas for new, human-only shows, they would begin to attract a much wider audience and revenue streams would once again increase.

“It would probably decrease initially but it would be up to the circus owners to bring in other acts that would attract the public.” (Individual Respondent)

“Decrease to begin with, but circuses need to evolve and realise that the public don’t want to be entertained at the cost of animals welfare. There are heaps of amazing circuses without animals.” (Individual Respondent)

“Decrease initially, as the people who liked seeing animals exploited and degraded lost interest. Then, when animals are replaced with varied and exciting human acts, revenue will climb...as has been shown by the very popular and massively attended non-animal circuses in the UK and world wide!!!” (Individual Respondent)

“Unfortunately people go to circuses to see primarily the wild animals, therefore I can envisage a downturn in revenue for the circus owners initially. But many circuses who no longer use animals have successfully diversified their performances with great success.” (Individual Respondent)

Lure of wild animals

6.59 About a quarter of respondents who commented, however, felt that revenue would decrease irretrievably because they believed many people simply would not visit the circus without the lure of animal acts. Some of the groups affiliated with the circus in particular noted how animals were still in big demand from paying customers.

“Obviously animals bring in audiences or circuses would have stopped using them years ago.” (Individual Respondent)

“These circuses are manufactured around the animals. For the most part the rest of the “show” would be considered dull” (individual Respondent)

“I expect that people visit these circuses to see animals from places they may never be able to visit, and this offers entertainment value. Without wild animals, people may be less inclined to go.” (Individual Respondent)

“For traditional touring circuses, the number one question asked by the public is “Which animals do you have?” The desire to see traditional circus cannot be meet with a circus without animals (which attracts different patrons).” (Group Response – Federation Mondiale du Cirque)

“The welfare groups report a rise in people wanting to see circuses without animals but in reality this is completely untrue. Non animal circuses are struggling to earn a living whilst
circuses all over Europe which travel with wild animals are flourishing. So of course this will decrease their income." (Group Response – Classical Circus Association)

“For some people animals are an important aspect of the circus performance and for some people, they would only attend a circus with animals. If a large enough portion of the public have this thinking, in some towns any circuses visiting without animals would lose business. There is also other options open to circuses who have wild animals, such as film work etc, if there is no wild animals in circuses, they also loose this revenue.” (Individual Respondent)

“We have seen in many countries all over Europe attempts to run circus without so called “wild” animals. With very few exceptions none of these attempts has been very successful. As pointed out above, the majority of the family audiences expect these animals, because the kids love them. Last example from the netherlands: The leading Dutch circus Herman Renz stopped to present so called “wild” animals in their show last year waiting for the decision of Netherlands government about the use of wild animals. Now the circus is only half the size of what it used to be, because audience and revenues dramatically decreased.” (Group Response – European Circus Association)

“Despite the LIES in falsified animal rights statistics, many people will NOT go to a show that is called a circus if it contains no animals wild or domestic because that is a mere variety show. It is disgusting to put dedicated animal trainers and grooms out of work and rob them of their way of life passed down the generations to appease the corrupt violent and vociferous yet minority animal rights movement.” (Individual Respondent)

Ethics before revenue

6.60 A third of respondents who commented felt that, although revenue would surely decrease for the above reasons, this should not be seen as a point of contention when considering a ban on the use of wild animals because the welfare of the animals involved should be paramount.

“I am sure banning slavery didn't benefit the profit of the plantation owners - but some things have to be done for the greater good and because they are simply the right thing to do.” (Individual Respondent)

“Of course, circuses would lose revenue but animals would gain a better life. Is it fair to make money at the expense of another being?” (Individual Respondent)

“I have no interest in the circuses retaining their revenue I am only interested in the wellbeing of the animals. Circus people have made more than enough money from the suffering of animals in the past and this needs to stop if we are to consider ourselves a compassionate and caring nation.” (Individual Respondent)

“The animals welfare is more important than a company’s revenue, these are lives we’re talking about!” (Individual Respondent)

“Whilst it’s unfortunate that somebody might lose their livelihood, the financial argument should not be a consideration. I can’t justify throwing my litter on the floor on the grounds that it keeps a road-sweeper in a job and this is no different.” (Individual Respondent)

“I think economically there will be a decline because unfortunately there are still uneducated people out there willing to pay to see these shows. However, the benefits of animal welfare far outweigh the disadvantage. greatly.” (Individual Respondent)
Natural decline

6.61 A few respondents mentioned other points, including their perception that instigating a ban in Scotland would encourage other countries to follow suit, thus leaving the travelling circus with animals nowhere to go; and the idea that circus was a dying industry with decreasing revenue streams and that this would continue regardless of whether a ban was implemented or not.

“Of course if a circus could not come to Scotland and perform then it would not be generating revenue here. It would take time to adapt, but they could do so, and continue touring circus acts with no animals involved. The decrease could be temporary. Also I think a ban like this is part of wider public recognition that this practice is generally unsavoury. It reflects a declining public support for such circuses which also means a fall in revenues, even outwith Scotland and even if this ban does not come into place.”

(Individual Respondent)

Respondents who selected ‘Don’t Know’ what the impact will be on the revenue of wild animal circuses

6.62 A total of 405 respondents selected ‘don’t know’ and 246 provided comments.

Key points

6.63 Key points:

- Don’t know, don’t care; respondent’s felt that the revenue streams of the circus were irrelevant when the real issue is animal welfare.
- Depends fully on the subsequent business model of the circus in the event of a ban – their attitude to change and their ability to adapt and remain fresh.
- Various reasons given for potential increase or decrease in revenue in line with those discussed above, however ultimately respondents were unsure.
- Respondents were unsure as to how many people visit the circus specifically to see the wild animals versus those who boycott it, and were therefore unsure of the economic impact a ban would have.
- Respondents were unsure if the savings made from not keeping wild animals would be enough to balance the economic loss from having fewer customers.
- Respondents felt that the circus was declining in popularity regardless, so were unsure if a ban would be enough to significantly boost or lessen revenue.

Ethics before revenue

6.64 Just over half of the respondents who commented felt that the issue of circus revenue after the implementation of a ban was wholly unimportant. Several respondents said they personally did not care about the financial impact of a ban and said that the welfare of the animals and halting an archaic practice should be the Government’s main concern no matter the consequences for the circuses in question.

“My concern is for the exploitation of animals, not for the people who exploit them.”

(Individual Respondent)
“The impact on the circus is not my concern. I do not care. I care that animals are being abused and exploited.” (Individual Respondent)

“I would hope that money concerns were last on the agenda. The owners of circuses should not be allowed to treat wild animals in this way for personal gain. Time to change.” (Individual Respondent)

“I expect they would lose some customers who simply want to see wild and exotic animals up close, and who are perhaps unaware of their suffering. But I am sure they would gain customers who would otherwise have avoided the circus due to the well-known animal cruelty.” (Individual Respondent)

**Business planning**

6.65 Around a third of respondents who commented felt, in line with comments in previous sections, that it was completely down to the circus whether or not it lost revenue as a result of a ban; circuses that did not create new, human-based acts would fail economically, whereas circuses that embraced and promoted the change might flourish. It would all depend on the circus’s business model, the skill of the human performers and the overall quality of the new entertainment.

“This all depends on the legitimacy of the other acts in the circus. If they are relying solely on animal performance, then they will lose money. If they have other creditable act's performed by humans then they should not expect much of a decrease.” (Individual Respondent)

“This is an impossible question, as it depends entirely on the business acumen and intelligence of the circus operator. Clearly there are numerous and globally famed circuses who don't use wild animals which pull in millions through their shows and merchandise.” (Individual Respondent)

“It's all relative to the way every single circus react to a ban. Some circuses could even get an increased revenue if they are willing to shift their old unethical business toward a more ethical one which would bring new compassionate customers on top of the usual ones.” (Individual Respondent)

“Their income is not the issue - had they been acting strategically as ANY sound business should , they would have started thinking of phasing out animals decades ago and phasing in new acts - they have been behaving in a market-insensitive way and now insist that their businesses will suffer? When they had not done proper business planning but instead relied on the same old traditional way. Institutions like Cirque du Soleil have been pro-active and are flourishing, why had these circuses not done the same? The animals cannot pay for their bad business acumen. Businesses who do not adapt with the times go bust, that is the nature of business, and no one bails them out.” (Individual Respondent)

“But must assume that basic economic theory would suggest that circuses would not go to the expense of owning, transporting, feeding etc. without considering their profit margins. Circuses, if animals were banned, would have to ‘re-tool’ their attractions in order to attract customers. Thus, I would suspect a loss would be incurred until/unless another attraction could be offered.” (Group Response – Perth and Kinross Council)

**Complexity of factors**

6.66 Just under a quarter of respondents who commented provided definitive reasons for either an increase or decrease in revenue, in line with points discussed
in the previous sections; however many stated that they could not speak with certainty as they simply did not know enough about the subject. Some respondents said it would depend on the customer base and whether the number of new visitors that an animal-free circus could attract would outweigh the number that would stop going; others felt it would depend on the circus’s own monetary inflow and outflow and whether or not the savings made from not keeping animals would compensate for a loss of visitors and the cost of wages for human performers.

"Assuming these circus have many aspects to their performance, aside from the wild animals, I think it is unlikely that people would be going based ONLY on its use of wild animals, so unlikely then that they would lose much if any custom. However I do not feel I know enough about these circuses to state no change." (Individual Respondent)

"Other non-animal acts would have to be employed to replace animal acts. I do not know whether it would be more expensive to fund a human circus act against the upkeep and feeding of a wild animal? Maybe worth doing the maths." (Individual Respondent)

"Depends on how they adapt—if all wild animals in circuses are banned then it’s not likely people will go to other circuses instead so it shouldn’t lower revenue if entertaining alternatives are provided, especially when you factor in the savings on keeping and feeding and transporting and insuring the animals." (Individual Respondent)

"I would hope in this day and age that not using animals would help their revenue as ethical people would be willing to visit the circus. However, there is obviously a reason they want to keep the animals performing, and the only reason is money, so they must believe it is helping their revenue." (Individual Respondent)

Circus reboot uncertain

6.67 A few respondents felt that the circus, with or without animals, was seen by many as an outdated form of entertainment and were uncertain as to whether or not a ban would be enough to revive the circus’s image.

"As more people become aware of the plight of captive animals, I think that the popularity of the circus is on the decline anyway. It is hard to gauge the financial increase or decrease of the circus a ban would have." (Individual Respondent)

"These circuses are outdated and decreasing in popularity as it is and have been for many years now. Watching documentaries on the Bobby Roberts case they were in no strong financial position before the prosecution. Clearly these animals were not holding the circus together and with ever growing anti-circus animals movements there will soon be no financial benefit to the circuses keeping the animals anyway. I can't imagine it would have much negative effect." (Individual Respondent)
CONSULTATION QUESTION 12: If a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals was imposed, do you think that such circuses would still visit Scotland without the wild animals? Why?

Table 6.7: Overview of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%.

A total of 2020 respondents (98.9%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, a large majority of these, 1345 respondents (65.8%) answered ‘yes’ indicating that they thought that circuses that used wild animals in performances and exhibitions would still visit Scotland without wild animals if their use was banned; 124 respondents (6.1%) answered ‘no’; 551 respondents (27%) answered ‘don’t know’. The remaining 23 respondents (1.1%) left this question blank.

Summary of main points across all respondents

Respondents’ comments in support of their various answers to this question clearly show that they have differing trains of thought with regard to what a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses might mean for the circuses concerned. This is a collective summary of the main points they raised.

Animal disposal

Some respondents perceived that circuses would simply stop using such animals which would then have to be rehomed; some animal welfare organisations stated in their comments that they would assist with this endeavour to ensure the welfare of the ‘retired’ animals and, in particular, to ensure that they were not euthanased. These circuses would then have to ‘reinvent’ themselves and substitute human performers for animal acts.

Animal parking

Other respondents perceived that circuses would not, in fact, give up their wild animals. Instead, such circuses would visit Scotland but, before entering the country, they would ‘park’ their wild animals somewhere. A few respondents were extremely concerned about where the animals would be left and thought that the Government should provide suitable animal welfare accommodation; other respondents thought that the circuses would leave their animals at their winter quarters and travel to Scotland without them. However, in spite of the fact that they
would not be bringing wild animals with them, because they were still animal circuses some respondents thought it would be immoral to even allow these circuses into the country.

**Lure of wild animals**

6.73 Yet more respondents perceived that, regardless of whether circuses got rid of their animals on a temporary or permanent basis, there would be little point in them coming to Scotland at all with only half a circus; ultimately, any show they put on would be too lacking in acts to attract an audience so these circuses would fail and ultimately be forced to close unless they opted to amalgamate their remaining acts with other circuses in similar positions.

**Visits to Scotland**

6.74 Finally, some respondents perceived that travelling circuses with wild animals would simply stop visiting Scotland altogether if the use of wild animals was banned. These circuses would boycott Scotland and only visit countries where it was legal for them to use wild animals. Respondents were not particularly concerned about this because they felt that with animal circuses out of the way, other types of circuses would come to Scotland in their stead.

**Respondents who answered ‘Yes’ current wild animal circuses would still visit Scotland**

6.75 A total of 1345 respondents selected ‘yes’ and 995 provided comments.

**Key points**

6.76 Key points:

- A circus is a business and, like any good modern business, needs to be flexible and have the ability to evolve and adapt in line with changing public opinions.
- More people would respect human-only circuses so more people, particularly families, would attend so profits could rise.
- Circuses with genuine showmen would not turn away from the business of making money if the use of wild animals was banned.
- There are plenty of popular acts that do not require wild animals and new human acts would be exciting and more entertaining.
- There is still money to be made by circuses providing good and entertaining alternatives to wild animal acts - there is more to circuses than wild animals.
- Excellent, human-only shows like Cirque du Soleil have shown that wild animals are not required for circuses to be a success.
- Circus people are creative, intelligent and adaptable, have other skills and would devise new attractions that appeal to audiences.
- In the event of a ban it would be their choice whether circuses visited Scotland but it would be a pity and a lost business opportunity if they did not.
- Circuses want to earn a living so why should they not reinvent themselves and carry on with new, appropriate acts performed by humans who choose that life.
- Circus tours at old and new venues could continue with alternative acts and could be longer and more frequent.
• People love to be entertained and the Scottish people are no exception.
• A ban on the use of wild animals could provide an incentive and opportunity for more human employment.
• Circuses need to provide entertainment that attracts public support; if they depend solely on wild animals they are not at all secure.
• Circuses would be able to operate more easily and more cheaply without wild animals.
• In the event of a ban, if circuses with wild animals no longer visited Scotland other circuses would come.

Circus life

6.77 In the view of many respondents, circuses would not turn away from their trade and the business of making money if the use of wild animals was banned. Respondents felt that if people genuinely enjoyed entertaining in a circus they would carry on doing so under the maxim that ‘the show must go on’. It was, however, recognised that this was a traditional way of life for some circuses and that they might find it difficult to adapt to a changing world. Respondents thought circuses were just clinging to the past, however, and that it would be possible for them to move forward with the times even if circus owners needed support during any transitional period.

Business planning

6.78 Nevertheless, respondents were quite definite that change was required, many pointing out that a circus was a business and that any good, modern business needed to be flexible and have the ability to evolve and adapt to changing public opinions, society values and other circumstances, if it wanted to survive. It was simply progress. Circuses needed to provide entertainment that attracted public support and if they depended solely on wild animals they were not at all secure. Wild animals in circuses was a morally wrong, outdated business model that needed to be changed. If circus owners were serious about their businesses they needed to find other ways of putting on a spectacle without using wild animals which, in the opinion of most, were not required.

“It is still possible to be a successful circus without the use of wild animals. In this day and age, with the use of graphics, visuals, performance, media, computer generation, visual art and imagination. Circuses need to become 21st century.” (Individual Respondent)

“All businesses have to evolve. Entertainment businesses especially so as public taste changes along with their expectation. The nature of the game is constant new acts as people bore with the same thing, so circuses should have been evolving for years in order to remain fresh and current and entertaining in order to draw the audience in. This would continue into the future without the animal cruelty option.” (Individual Respondent)

“There are always new performers and always new great feats to accomplish, performers love to perform and it is there choice to do this, Circus needs to change for their own sake, Circuses were faltering with wild animals in the acts when I was with them, this started the alternative circuses, popularity increased and it breathed in a new age of circus performance and circus in general was revived” (Individual Respondent)
Circus reboot

6.79 Many respondents commented that they believed circuses wanted to stay in business and they also acknowledged that circus people needed to earn a living, so they considered that there was no reason why circuses with wild animals should not reinvent themselves and continue on with only human acts. Some respondents thought that any circuses worth their salt should grasp this as an opportunity to rejuvenate themselves with human-only performers which, in their opinion, would actually increase their profits. Respondents felt that circuses could still make a living without wild animals and, in the opinion of many, human acts would be better and more entertaining.

6.80 Many respondents thought that circus performers would be well equipped to entertain the public and did not require animals in order to be an entertaining art form. Circus people were creative, intelligent and adaptable and would devise other attractions, develop new skills and new strategies if a ban on the use of wild animals was put in place. Respondents considered that there were plenty of interesting and amazing things that performers could do to keep an audience entertained. In fact, such a ban could provide a golden opportunity for more employment and be a real incentive for talented people who chose to do so, to join the circus and use their skills to produce invigorating, creative and original acts that would bring awe and delight to their audiences.

"You only have to watch Britain's Got Talent to see the number of people who would be able to perform in Circuses. Animals are definitely not needed. They even teach it at University now I believe." (Individual Respondent)

"Scotland is a great place to visit for circuses, people here love to be entertained. More people would go if they did not have wild animals." (Individual Respondent)

Human circus popular

6.81 Many respondents were strongly of the opinion, therefore, that travelling circuses using human performers and not wild animals had a place in the entertainment industry. They were convinced that there was still money to be made by circuses providing alternatives to wild animal acts. People loved to be entertained, and Scottish people were no exception. The public would still visit to see acrobats, clowns, jugglers, trapeze artists, magicians, high wire acts, human gymnasts and many other human acts so long as the circuses put on quality shows. Circuses were very much an enjoyable, fun-filled family show and great, imaginative acts displaying human skills should still be enough to entice children and their parents through the turnstiles.

6.82 It was pointed out by many respondents that some circuses have already evolved well without the use of animals. Fantastic, highly successful human-only circuses such as Cirque du Soleil have shown that animal-free shows could reach new audiences. What human performers could do with their bodies was amazing and they did not need helpless animals to aid them. One respondent said that the human only circuses she had visited in the past were packed to capacity. The public were behind circuses that had no performing wild animals.
A large number of respondents also made the point that since people liked circuses without wild animals for the human entertainers who chose to be there, more would be inclined to visit a circus with only human acts and this could actually boost circus takings. Animal-free circuses could be excellent and a pleasure to watch and many respondents thought that any such circuses visiting Scotland would be considerably more popular because people previously boycotting circuses that used wild animals would then go. They also thought that discontinuing animal acts would allow circuses to retain and actually increase their traditional venues and, indeed, obtain new ones so longer circus tours would be possible. Respondents considered that there was nothing stopping circuses visiting areas where they had previously built up a following and trying out their animal-free acts. There was no reason at all why the banning of wild animals should stop a circus continuing to tour with alternative acts.

“Why wouldn’t they? there are thousands of people who enjoy circuses for the human entertainers who choose to be there, so why would a circus stop going to Scotland just because it had no wild animals. I think a circus with no wild animals has 100% more respect than a circus with wild animals.” (Individual Respondent)

“We like circus’ in Scotland without wild animals. We like the skill in the (human) acts, we like the candy floss and the family fun. So yes, they would still visit.” (Individual Respondent)

“Yes, why not? We have the Edinburgh Fringe Festival and The West End Festival that could accommodate such a thing.” (Individual Respondent)

“They would find an increased popularity and places at which they could perform.” (Individual Respondent)

“I believe their overall shows are entertaining enough to merit visits. Scotland loves a spectacular show!” (Individual Respondent)

“I think that Scotland would be a fair and welcoming country for human-only circuses to visit.” (IndividualRespondent)

A number of respondents felt that it would actually be less challenging for circuses to have all human acts. It would be cheaper and simpler for circuses to visit Scotland without wild animals to care for, feed and train and the logistics of travelling would be hugely simplified without having animals to transport. They considered that circus profits and circus reputations would actually improve considerably without wild animal acts.

Visits to Scotland

A number of respondents agreed that it would be their choice whether circuses visited Scotland without wild animals but thought that it would be a pity if they did not and a lost business opportunity for them. In their opinion there was money to be made. Scottish people still wanted to see circuses without animals so it came down to supply and demand. Many respondents thought there was absolutely no reason why circuses should not still come to Scotland following a ban; without wild animals they would have a hundred per cent more respect. However, if circuses that had wild animals no longer chose to visit Scotland following a ban then respondents thought that other circuses without wild animals would visit in their
stead. A small minority of respondents were of the opinion that, regardless, it was more important to do what was right for animal welfare.

“...This will be up to them of course but if they really are a genuine circus then the human factor to entertain should be what the show is all about.” (Individual Respondent)

“...There is a big market in Scotland they do not want to miss out on, and circuses without animals are more likely to attract many people such as myself who would not have attended their circus before.” (Individual Respondent)

6.86 Many respondents hoped that circuses without animals would indeed continue to visit Scotland – some respondents stated that they really liked circuses and it would be extremely disappointing if they did not. One respondent said that it was inconceivable to think that circuses would suddenly not bother to come to Scotland. A few other respondents said that they would even like circuses to tour for longer and more frequent periods of time and that this would be more feasible without wild animal acts.

Animal parking

6.87 Some respondents thought that circuses with animals might continue to come to Scotland but the perception was that they would not actually get rid of their animals. Rather, they wondered if they would park them somewhere and collect them again when they left and were concerned about where the animals would be parked. A few respondents thought that they could be left at the circus’s winter quarters if a ban was implemented. Then, if the animal-free circuses got good attendance at venues in Scotland this would encourage them to stop using wild animals altogether.

Respondents who answered ‘No’, current wild animal circuses will not continue visiting Scotland

6.88 A total of 124 respondents selected ‘no’ and 75 provided comments.

Key points

6.89 Key points:

- Circuses deem wild animals to be an attraction in their shows so would not consider it cost effective to visit Scotland without them.
- Circuses would go out of business without wild animals because they would have insufficient entertainment to draw an audience.
- There would be no point still coming to Scotland if half the circus acts had to be left behind.
- Circuses would only go to countries where they could lawfully visit with their wild animals.
- Circuses would have to find somewhere to leave their animals if they still came to Scotland following a ban and this could be a welfare issue.
- Most people associate circuses mainly with wild animal performances so circuses would not thrive without them.
• Do not care if circuses still came to Scotland following a ban on the use of wild animals.

Visits to Scotland

6.90 In the opinion of several respondents, circuses would no longer visit Scotland if the use of wild animals was banned. If they did, respondents thought that affected circuses would go out of business; consequently, animal circuses would only travel to places where they could operate lawfully. Several respondents pointed out that it would no longer be cost effective for animal circuses to come to Scotland.

6.91 A couple of respondents stated that in recent years there had been no circuses travelling to Scotland anyway so nothing would change; two other respondents commented that if circuses no longer visited Scotland in the event of a ban on the use of wild animals, this would be a small price to pay. Another respondent thought that new circuses without wild animals would visit Scotland. A few respondents hoped that circuses would no longer visit Scotland at all and a few others stated that they did not care if circuses no longer visited Scotland.

“When animals as main attractions are removed, these circuses will lose revenue. It would not be cost effective to continue traveling to Scotland or anywhere for that matter.” (Individual Respondent)

“Certainly not. If a circus show is well produced, there is no way to simply leave out some parts and still be as entertaining as intended. At the same time, such a ban would be in conflict with European law. The freedom of movement and the free choice of employment are some of the values of the European Union.” (Group Response - European Circus Association)

“Circuses would not travel to Scotland if the audiences were minimal and this has proved to be over recent times.” (Group Response - Classical Circus Association)

“Certainly not. An eventual ban will cancel a part of family entertainment history and working places and assistens.” (Group Response - Club Amici del Circo)

“I don’t think they would it depends on the costs incurred and if there was a profit at the end of the day.” (Individual Respondent)

Alternative destinations

6.92 A few other respondents commented that circuses considered wild animals to be an attraction and did not believe it to be cruel to keep them contained in a circus environment so they would not change their acts until a world-wide ban on the use of wild animals in circuses was in place. One respondent suggested that a wild animal circus deprived of its animals would simply close.

“Experience would indicate that classical circus banned from presenting the animals they own, care for and love, would close the circuses. This would also affect negatively animal trainers who are hired by circuses to present their acts for one or more seasons.” (Group Response - Federation Mondiale du Cirque)
Lure of wild animals

6.93 A small number of respondents thought that, for the most part, people probably associated circuses with wild animal performances; if animals as the main attraction were removed, therefore, owners could lose half their circus so would no longer be able to draw in an audience.

“Most people probably associate circuses mainly with wild animal performances.”
(Individual Respondent)

Animal parking

6.94 Other respondents stated that it made no sense to leave half a circus behind when visiting a venue when the whole point was to show off the wild animals. Additionally, a few respondents pointed out that any circus leaving wild animals behind when visiting a Scottish venue inevitably created issues regarding the care of the animals; in particular, concerns were raised about where the animals would be left.

“There would be an inevitable issue of care for the animals whilst they were performing in Scotland.”
(Individual Respondent)

Respondents who answered ‘Don’t Know’ if current wild animal circuses will continue to visit Scotland

6.95 A total of 551 respondents selected ‘don’t know’ and 220 provided comments. Many of the points made in these comments were also raised by respondents who answered ‘yes’ and ‘no’.

Key points

6.96 Key points:

- Circuses belong to a former era and can survive and remain financially viable only by changing their business model to provide entertainment that attracts public support.
- People would still go to the circus to see human performers so circuses have to become creative and build up interesting, entertaining human acts.
- Do not care if circuses still came to Scotland following a ban on the use of wild animals.
- Circuses without animals can be amazing so it would be to their advantage to adapt to being without wild animals following a ban.
- Concern about reduced profits for circuses or Scotland being boycotted by circuses is insufficient justification not to do the right thing for animal welfare.
- There is no reason why circuses with genuine showmen would not still come to Scotland.
- Following a ban circuses visiting Scotland that had wild animals would leave them behind somewhere which could be a welfare issue.
• Whether circuses would keep coming to Scotland following a ban would depend on how much of the show was based around wild animals.
• Whether circuses would keep coming to Scotland following a ban would depend on the quality of the remaining acts.
• Some circuses will still come to Scotland following a ban on the use of wild animals but will make less money and be enjoyed less.
• Circuses might have wider appeal without wild animals.
• Wild animal circuses will simply go elsewhere following a ban where wild animals are not banned.

Visits to Scotland

6.97 Several respondents stated that although it was up to the circus to decide whether or not to continue to visit Scotland if a ban on the use of wild animals was imposed, many thought they would in fact continue to come if it was financially viable for them to do so. However, in line with respondents’ views in the previous section, a few respondents thought that because the circuses would be leaving their wild animals behind and coming to Scotland with possibly only half their acts, they would make less profit or possibly even end up incurring a loss.

6.98 A few other respondents wondered if disgruntled animal circuses would boycott Scotland if a ban was put in place but, regardless, thought that protecting animal welfare was much more important than the economic future of animal circuses. Indeed, a few respondents stated that if any such circuses did continue to visit Scotland they should actually be boycotted by the Scottish people.

6.99 In line with comments in previous sections, several respondents hoped circuses would continue to visit Scotland if they could find a better way to entertain the public and thought that it would be a lost business opportunity if any did not. Some respondents thought, however, that human-only circuses that already existed could fill any gap in the market following a ban. One respondent thought that circuses not using wild animals would visit Scotland even more if a ban on the use of wild animals was imposed and widely publicised.

6.100 One or two respondents hoped that circuses that used wild animals would not visit Scotland at all because any business that included the captivity of wild animals should not be supported. Other respondents did not think it mattered if circuses no longer visited Scotland; circuses belonged to the past and Scotland had other, better and more appropriate forms of entertainment.

6.101 Several respondents did not care about the circuses and focused only on what they perceived to be ethical with regard to the animals. A couple of respondents simply thought that all circuses should be banned.

Re-allocated resources

6.102 A small number of respondents believed that some circuses made profits based on the lack of wages they paid the animals and considered that recruiting human acts in their place could be too expensive. Another respondent thought that
the average price for a bear, a lion or an elephant would far exceed the average annual salary of at least one or two performers.

Animal parking

6.103 As in previous sections, a few respondents were concerned about circuses leaving their animals behind if they visited Scotland following a ban. Some wondered where they would leave them and how the animals would be cared for; one respondent even considered that steps needed to be taken to ensure that circus owners did not abandon the animals or have them put down.

"Circuses which continue to keep animals would either have to leave their animals somewhere or not come in, and so it would make it more difficult for travelling circuses to visit Scotland. However this could be seen as positive as it may positively influence animal welfare outwith Scotland. If keeping wild animals does not make money for the circuses they are unlikely to continue. Other travelling circuses would still be able to visit Scotland." (Group Response - West Lothian Council)

Business planning

6.104 In line with comments in previous sections, some respondents pointed out that any successful business had to be able to adapt to changing circumstances and, although it was a decision for animal circus owners, they could see no reason why these circuses could not continue in business without wild animals. Many respondents believed that there was still a market in Scotland for such entertainment because it was fun. If circuses were forward thinking enough and flexible enough they could still fill their big tents. In particular, there would likely be more ticket sales from animal supporters who would never attend a circus to see wild animals. One respondent wondered if the consultation was assuming that people go to circuses because there were performing wild animals but was not at all convinced that this was in fact the case.

6.105 A few respondents said that they hoped a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses in Scotland would help encourage the travelling community to step away from animal performances and reconsider their programmes.

"I would hope that they would increase the content of human performance - trapeze artists, acrobats, clowning etc - which are art forms requiring a high level of human accomplishment and which would engender respect from the public as well as giving children excellent role models for attitudes to health and exercise." (Individual Respondent)

"Again it is up to the circus owner to create a show that will attract an audience. If they cannot do that without animals they perhaps do not have enough imagination to stay in the business." (Group Response - Animal Concern Advice Line)

"If they had a viable business then it should be able to continue without animals. If it solely relied on animals then it wasn't very good in the first place and deserves to close. All businesses in all sectors have to adapt to the current environment/legislation and survive or fail according to how well they are subsequently managed." (Individual Respondent)
Alternative destinations

6.106 One respondent commented that the use of wild animals was becoming unacceptable to more people at an ever increasing rate and several countries had already imposed a ban. At some point circuses would have to adapt to this wave of change whether they wanted to or not. Until then, however, rather than go to the bother and expense of removing their animals, some respondents thought that circuses would only visit countries where they could operate lawfully with them.

“I would hope they would use the opportunity to innovate with fresh ideas and acts to fill Scottish audiences with wonder, and to use the fact that they are cruelty free as a positive method of advertising, as I very much enjoy seeing skilled live performers, and surely I am not alone in this.” (Individual Respondent)

“Probably they would for the same reason they do now, to make money. Though some may decide not to, however then others will take their place to supply demand. The use of animals in circuses is becoming unacceptable to ore people at an ever increasing rate and several countries have already successfully imposed a ban. At some point soon the circuses will have to adapt to this whether they would like to or not.” (Individual Respondent)
CONSULTATION QUESTION 13: What effect do you think a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals in travelling circuses would have on the revenue of other types of circus (e.g. static or those travelling without wild animals)? Why?

Table 6.8: Overview of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

6.107 A total of 2005 respondents (98.1%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, 502 respondents (24.6%) selected ‘increase’ indicating that they thought a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals in travelling circuses would increase the revenue of other types of circuses; 997 respondents (48.8%) selected ‘no change’; 59 respondents (2.9%) selected ‘decrease’; and 447 respondents (21.9%) answered ‘don’t know’.

6.108 The remaining 38 respondents (1.9%) left this question blank even though 20 provided comments. From some of these comments it was clear that 4 respondents thought circus revenues for other types of circuses would increase; 1 respondent thought revenues for all circuses would increase; and 2 respondents thought there would be no change.

6.109 In total, 952 respondents (46.6%) offered comments at Question 13.

Summary of main points across all respondents

6.110 This is a collective summary of the main points raised by respondents who commented in support of their various answers to this question.

Competition

6.111 Many respondents thought that other types of circuses would probably gain more business and have less competition if the use of wild animals was banned because the circuses that used wild animals would simply go out of business; respondents considered these circuses were incapable of reinventing themselves and changing to human-only status.

6.112 Other respondents thought that although other types of circuses would probably gain increased business if the use of wild animals was banned, this would only occur initially; when circuses that used wild animals got their new human-only acts together there would be more animal-free shows for the public to choose from.
so there would be increased competition in the market which could mean less profit for some. These respondents perceived that all circuses would then be ‘other types of circus’ and all would be obliged to compete with each other on a level playing-field.

6.113 Some respondents thought that competition would be healthy and a good standard raiser for the viewing public; other respondents thought there were insufficient circuses around for competition to be an issue. A few respondents considered that human-only circuses were not as popular as animal circuses and circus revenues would decrease accordingly.

**Different patrons**

6.114 Many respondents thought that travelling circuses that had never used wild animals would be unaffected by a ban. If the quality of the show and the circus’s reputation was good before a ban was put in place it would already have its own audiences and there was no reason to suppose that this would change. Such circuses were what the public wanted so these businesses would remain steady or possibly increase because respondents thought that most people who previously went to circuses that used wild animals would simply turn to other types of circuses.

6.115 In the opinion of many respondents static circuses, with or without animals, were unlikely to increase or decrease their business following a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses, because such circuses would have established audiences that were unlikely to stop attending.

**Circus image**

6.116 Many respondents believed that the use of wild animals was casting a shadow over the entire circus industry and that a ban on their use would completely change its image and all types of circuses would benefit as a result. Many respondents thought that there was lots of room in the entertainment market for all types of circuses, if they were animal-free, and that there were enough audiences to accommodate all that were good enough, particularly as circuses did not visit very often.

6.117 One respondent thought that a ban could have a negative knock-on effect to static circuses with wild animals by highlighting the perceived unethical nature of this practice. A small number of respondents were concerned that a ban would force travelling circuses to become static circuses so thought that any ban should cover static circuses as well.

**Respondents who selected ‘Increase’ to revenue of other types of circus**

6.118 A total of 502 respondents selected ‘increase’ and 295 provided comments.

**Key points**

6.119 Key points:
- People who previously boycotted travelling circuses to avoid the possibility of supporting the use of wild animals would start going.
- Other types of circuses would probably gain opportunities if some wild animal circuses went out of business because they were incapable of adapting.
- If everyone knew that the use of wild animals in travelling circuses was banned, the reputation of circuses in general would improve and they would come back into fashion.
- If circuses advertised that they no longer had any wild animals they would attract a wider paying audience.
- A ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses would increase competition between other circuses because they would all be similar.
- Other types of circuses may initially gain an increase in business but only until the circuses that used to have wild animals got their new acts together.
- There could be a knock-on effect to static circuses with wild animals.

Circus image

6.120 Many respondents considered that the reputation of the entire circus industry would improve if the use of wild animals in travelling circuses was banned. The ‘bad name’ associated with circuses would be a thing of the past and this would have a very positive impact. Every type of circus would benefit and far better shows with talented human performers, who chose to do such work, would be presented for the public’s enjoyment. A large number of respondents stated that people who previously boycotted travelling circuses because they used wild animals in performances would support circuses following a ban. One respondent thought that a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses could have a knock-on effect to static circuses with wild animals by highlighting the perceived unethical nature of this practice but that static circuses without wild animals would be unaffected.

“I believe all circuses would benefit, as their overall reputation would be improved as an art that values animal rights and wellbeing, and are talented and resourceful enough to provide spectacular entertainment without the need for degrading animal acts.” (Individual Respondent)

“I think that non-animals circuses will eventually see a positive effect once the ‘circus industry’ as a whole has shaken off the negative reputation that it has had for decades thanks to its use of animals. People will stop viewing circuses as an outdated, archaic spectacle and begin to see it as modern entertainment.” (Individual Respondent)

“Speaking personally, my own distaste of patronising any circus that uses and exhibits wild animals is such that I tend largely to ignore ALL circuses as a possible entertainment option - not fair on those that do not, I admit, but that is what I have tended to do; if, however, I was confident that no such spectacle was possible, I would start to include "the circus" as a viable, and desirable, entertainment option. Given the level of public dislike of the use, and exhibition, of wild animals in circuses, “going to the circus” is possibly no longer as socially acceptable as it might be; with a ban on such, going to the circus would no longer bear such unpopular connotations, and ALL circuses would, I feel, reap the benefit.” (Individual Respondent)

“It is likely that people who currently avoid circuses for ethical reasons will be more willing to attend, and unlikely that many people will cease to attend because no animal
Human circus popular

6.121 Currently, many people would not even contemplate buying a ticket to see a circus show in case wild animals were one of the 'attractions'; if a ban was imposed, people would know that wild animals would not be in the show and, in those circumstances, many said they would be happy to attend with their families. Respondents thought that the paying public would soon get used to circuses without wild animals and would support them and circuses would increase their revenues because of all the additional custom they would gain from animal lovers, vegans and vegetarians. Some respondents said they would even pay extra to see an animal-free circus show. Many respondents emphasised, however, that it would be extremely important for circuses to advertise their animal-free status widely in the event of a ban.

Competition

6.122 A large number of respondents stated that other types of circuses would probably gain more business if the use of wild animals was banned in travelling circuses. Some thought the increased business would only occur initially, however, and things would even out again when the circuses that used to have wild animals got their new acts together. Others thought that wild animal circuses would go out of business following a ban because they were incapable of changing and the result would be a less competitive market for the 'modern performing circuses' that never had any wild animals in the first place. A few respondents took the opposing view stating that when travelling circuses that previously had wild animals reinvented themselves, there would be increased competition in the market; all circuses would then be on a level playing-field and would be under some pressure to produce bigger and better acts in order to compete with each other.

6.123 A few respondents pointed out that other types of circuses were already benefiting because many people were avoiding wild animal circuses right now. A small number of respondents commented that, in the event of a ban on wild animals in travelling circuses, 'other types of circuses' would be the only circuses able to visit Scotland so would soon be regarded as the 'normal form of circus entertainment'.

"Revenue could be displaced to other circuses. Revenue could even be increased at circuses that stop using wild animals due to people who have boycotted them in the past. An increase to income of those circuses that are already visiting Scotland that do not use wild animals could be seen as some people associate wild animal use in all circuses. Educate and promote this as a modern live entertainment format." (Individual Respondent)

"I would hope that they would increase. A circus (without the use of animals!) can be a very fun and positive experience for all the family. I would hope that the talented men and women, who choose not to exploit animal rights, of these circuses would be able to have a greater audience." (Individual Respondent)
Respondents who selected ‘No Change’ to revenue of other types of circus

6.124 A total of 997 respondents selected ‘no change’ and 476 provided comments.

Key points

6.125 Key points:

- The circus’s reputation is the main point – if the circus puts on a good show and is wild animal free it will have its own audiences so will not be affected.
- Circuses without wild animals that have visited in the past will still visit so there will be no change.
- Static circuses with wild animals are unlikely to increase their business because the use of wild animals is banned in travelling circuses so there will be no change.
- The general reputation of the circus industry will be improved if a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses is imposed.
- There may be a little healthy competition between other types of circuses if a ban on the use of wild animals is imposed.
- If the use of wild animals in travelling circuses is banned and these circuses no longer visit Scotland, other types of circuses may get more business.
- The number of circuses in the UK is small so if the use of wild animals is banned in travelling circuses other circuses are unlikely to be affected.
- A ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses would create a level playing field for all other types of circuses.
- There are insufficient circuses around for competition to be an issue.
- Some of the other types of circuses may lose a little business if their performances are all similar.

Different patrons

6.126 Many respondents thought that travelling circuses that had never used wild animals would be unaffected by a ban. If a circus’s reputation was good before a ban was put in place it would already have its own audiences and there was no reason to suppose that this would change. Respondents pointed out that there already was a range of wild-animal-free travelling circuses that attracted considerable audiences and that these circuses had already well-established reputations. Such circuses were what the public wanted so these businesses would remain steady; in fact it was even possible, according to several respondents, that business for these circuses would increase because it was felt, in the event of a ban, that most people who previously went to circuses that used wild animals would simply turn to other types of circuses.

6.127 In the opinion of many respondents static circuses, with or without animals, were unlikely to increase their business just because the use of wild animals was banned in travelling circuses; in addition, most of the respondents believed that it would not decrease their businesses either, since these circuses would also have
established audiences that were unlikely to stop attending. A couple of respondents did state that a ban might affect static circuses with wild animals but did not explain why they thought so. A few respondents thought that a ban on the use of wild animals should be imposed on static circuses as well as travelling circuses.

“It shouldn’t effect them. If they initially had no animals on display then the total ban will not directly impact them. They have obviously figured out how to put on an entertaining show without exploiting animals so they will continue to do just that.” (Individual Respondent)

“I wouldn’t foresee any change at all. Circuses who provide interesting acts, in suitable locations and who manage their promotions appropriately will continue to do well.” (Group Response – Animal Aid)

Circus image

6.128 Some respondents also stated that they would never buy a ticket to see a circus in case they inadvertently supported what they perceived to be the ‘abuse’ of animals; However, if the use of wild animals was banned, they thought they would be much more relaxed about the entire circus industry and would be inclined to attend any circuses that visited. In fact, many respondents believed that the use of wild animals was casting a shadow over the entire circus industry and that a ban on their use would completely change its image; in general, the reputation of the circus industry would be much improved and all types of circuses would benefit as a result.

“I cannot see why the cessation of this cruel practice should affect other circuses income. However, generally people would feel easier knowing that any circus they may wish to attend wouldn’t have degraded animals performing. It could possibly up the income of all circus entertainments.” (Individual Respondent)

“… In the wider context, the number of animals in travelling circuses in the UK has diminished over the years with no statutory restriction. Circuses from other EU states have come to Scotland in the past and at present there would be nothing to prevent such wholly undesirable incursions. Indeed, given that polls have consistently shown that the majority of people believe the use of wild animals in circuses is unacceptable ... such circuses might benefit financially through not using wild animals by appealing to a wider audience.” (Group Response – OneKind)

Competition

6.129 Many respondents thought that there was lots of room in the entertainment market for all types of circuses – the more the better – and that there were more than enough audiences to accommodate all that were good enough. Respondents pointed out that each circus was different because it had its own special features and people with children who liked circuses would continue to go to all of them when they were in town; circuses, after all, did not visit on a weekly basis. If the shows and timings were attractive, respondents thought there was no reason for a decrease in revenue, particularly as it was unlikely that even as many as 2 circuses would be visiting any area at the same time. Quite a few respondents stated that a ban would not affect static or other types of circuses because the number of circuses visiting Scotland was so low. A few respondents did think it possible, however, that following a ban more animal-free travelling circuses might come.
"I don't feel that there are enough circuses and we could do with some more (with out wild animals) I never see any circus advertisement where I live (Glasgow)" (Individual Respondent)

"there isn't a plethora of this type of traveling entertainment, so no change" (Individual Respondent)

"People who do not wish to visit a circus with wild animals, do not simply choose to see another circus on the same day. They see a circus when it is 'in town', or they visit a static circus as they were planning to do so anyway. A lot of people simply stay away from certain circuses that have wild animals, they do not choose another circus over it."

(Individual Respondent)

"People will go to a circus or not depending on the quality of the acts involved, the cost and the availability and location. Families don't just go to a circus because they want to see a performing animal; they go for entertainment and unfortunately the animal has been made to travel with that circus. Take away the animals and any circus offering good enjoyable entertainment will still be popular." (Individual Respondent)

6.130 In line with some respondents’ comments in the previous section, several other respondents thought that a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses would create a level playing field for all other types of circuses and could inject a little healthy competition between them. All circuses would be equal so it would be up to the individual circus to make their human acts exciting and creative and market their individuality while continuing to develop because they would all be judged on merit. Respondents considered that competition was a good standard raiser which would be good for audiences and that diversity within the trade was important in this modern day. Indeed, one respondent thought that other types of circuses could lose a little business if their performances were all similar. Another respondent considered that, without competition, circuses would not be worth seeing; however, a few other respondents considered that there were insufficient circuses around for competition to be an issue.

"I am not sure how much circuses are actually in competition with each other, as they never appear at the same place at the same time and there is sufficient time between appearances for most people to want to visit again. They will probably gain some audiences as the average skill on display in all circuses will increase and most people tend to talk about 'a circus' rather than a specific one. Then they may lose some customers as there are now more circuses around that provide similar entertainment." (Individual Respondent)

“All circuses would be on a level playing field if wild animals were banned. I don't believe the public are loyal to any particular circus company and as such would attend whichever one came to their town.” (Individual Respondent)

“There won't be a change because then all circuses will have no wild animals and they will just be competing against themselves, no one will have the use of wild animals to be the 'best'. There won't be 'other types of circuses'.” (Individual Respondent)

6.131 One respondent thought that if circuses reinvented themselves after a ban, other circuses without wild animals could lose out initially but that it would not adversely affect them for long. Another respondent thought that local circuses might combine to make bigger events in order to increase revenue; yet another respondent
thought that circuses would adapt and improve and that it would be an opportunity for Government and industry to get together to evolve a source of training and employment for young acts.

Respondents who selected ‘Decrease’ to revenue of other types of circus

6.132 A total of 59 respondents selected ‘decrease’ and 30 provided comments.

Key points

6.133 Key points:

- In the event of a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses there would be more animal-free shows for the public to choose from.
- Human-only circuses are not as popular as animal circuses.

Competition

6.134 A few respondents thought that, in the event of a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses, there would be more animal-free shows for the public to choose from; they would have to compete for business which would probably mean less revenue for some.

“People would have more choice so the circuses that travel would have to compete for business.” (Individual Respondent)

Human circus

6.135 A few other respondents stated that human-only circuses were not as popular as animal circuses and circus revenues would decrease accordingly. One or two respondents commented that the public did not want to see the same old human acts over and over again and that the human-only circuses were finding it increasingly difficult to get new acts to replace animals.

“People do not want to see the same old human act over and over again. The all human circus are finding it increasingly difficult to find new acts to replace animals. Likewise with legal uncertainty circus owners are finding it impossible to secure financing to facilitate expansion and or transition into themed style shows.” (Individual Respondent)

“Revenue of the circuses would decrease due to the fact they would lose money from not being able to exhibit or use wild animals.” (Individual Respondent)

Respondents who answered ‘Don’t Know’ impact on revenue of other types of circus

6.136 A total of 447 respondents selected ‘don’t know’ and 130 provided comments. Many of the points made in these comments were also raised by respondents who selected ‘increase’ or ‘no change’.

136
Key points

6.137 Key points:

- The effects of a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses are of no concern.
- A ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses might inject healthy competition into all human-only circuses to the benefit of the public.
- Animal-free circuses are popular, respected and successful and would generate audiences.
- People who object to wild animal use would, in the event of a ban, consider the circus appropriate entertainment for their families and attend so circus profits would increase.
- A good quality circus should be able to provide an entertaining show without the use of animals.
- Businesses have to be competitive, move with the times and find new ways to remain in the market; it is up to circuses to do the same.
- Whatever the effect a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses would have on circus revenues there is no justification for using wild animals in this way.
- A ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses would even the playing field.

Business planning

6.138 Some respondents considered that businesses had to be able to move with the times and find new ways to remain in the market; circuses were no different so should not be given any dispensation. Circuses should survive, however, because they could; any that relied heavily on wild animal performances would have to reinvent themselves. Respondents were of the opinion that if wild animals were banned, people would learn to appreciate human skills. Circuses with comedy, acrobatic and other innovations could begin a new era of local community live entertainment. A few respondents were uncertain if other types of circuses would benefit or not in the event of a ban on the use of wild animals.

“May depend on whether those travelling circuses previously using wild animals are able to offer sufficient attractions to maintain their business and whether there is sufficient demand for circuses without wild animals.” *(Group Response – Perth and Kinross Council)*

Competition

6.139 Other respondents thought, in the event of a ban, that only if those circuses that used to have wild animals went under would profits for other circuses increase because there would be fewer circuses, so less competition. Yet more respondents thought that, in the event of a ban, there would possibly be a slight increase for other types of circuses while those circuses using wild animals adapted their shows to animal-free status but this would apply only in the short-term; after the adaptation of the circuses was complete, the increase in number of animal-free circuses would result in a decrease in profits for the ‘other types of circuses’, a term which would no longer apply since all circuses would, from that point, be similar and equal which,
some respondents thought, would create considerable competition between them; not all respondents agreed with this view, however.

6.140 In line with some comments in previous sections, some respondents thought that competition was healthy and would benefit the paying public but pointed out that the more competition there was between circuses, the more it was going to impact. If all circuses were animal-free it would be up to each and every circus to perfect their acts and make sure that their circus was the one that people wanted to visit. In these circumstances it was considered possible that some smaller circuses could unite their acts to create a bigger, more competitive show. One respondent did not agree that competition between circuses would have any marked effect, however.

“It depends if the circuses which can now not use animals decide to convert to a different type of circus. This could create competition. If they close altogether i think it would increase the revenue of others.” (Individual Respondent)

“They will have more competition and there will be a greater spread of customers, so the revenues might go down. However it is hard to say - if the wild animal circuses decide to shut down rather than put on non animal shows, the revenues shouldn't change.” (Individual Respondent)

“It could make the circuses more competitive but some could join together to make a bigger better one. It's more important that the animals are ok.” (Individual Response)

Circus image

6.141 In line with respondents’ comments in previous sections, some thought that people who objected to the use of wild animals would consider the circus more appropriate entertainment for their families without these animals so more people would go and circus profits would increase.

Human circus

6.142 Quite a few respondents thought that the success of a circus depended on the quality of that circus. A good circus should be able to provide good entertainment without the use of animals and if novel and more exciting human acts were on offer, the circus would attract the attention of the public. One respondent stated that the popularity of a circus could depend on price, reviews and promotion; another respondent commented that different circuses played to different audiences. Yet another respondent thought that the spectacle of a circus even without animals was still enough of a different experience for children that they were likely to enjoy it without ever realising that circuses once used animals. In general, many respondents agreed that animal-free circuses were popular, respected and successful and would attract audiences if they toured Scotland.

“If wild animals were banned, people would come to appreciate human circus skills. Traditionally animals have been the main attraction of circuses. Time for a new, improved image!” (Individual Respondent)

“Circuses are like all shows - they need to be good, and a good show that people enjoy popularises similar shows. All shows that don't contain wild animals might benefit from a renaissance of circus going” (Individual Respondent)
Ethics before revenue

6.143 A minority of respondents were of the opinion that whatever the effect a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses would have on circus revenues, there was no justification for using wild animals in this way. Several other respondents commented that they were unconcerned about the effects of a ban.
CONSULTATION QUESTION 14: What effect do you think a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals in travelling circuses would have on the revenue of circus venues? Why?

Table 6.9: Overview of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>No. comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

6.144 A total of 2001 respondents (97.9%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, 631 respondents (30.9%) selected ‘increase’ indicating that they thought a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals in travelling circuses would increase the revenue of circus venues; 671 respondents (32.8%) selected ‘no change’; 170 respondents (8.3%) selected ‘decrease’; and 529 respondents (25.9%) answered ‘don’t know’.

6.145 A total of 42 respondents (2.1%) left this question blank even though 25 provided comments; 3 respondents thought a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses would increase the revenue of circus venues; 3 respondents thought there would be no negative economic impact; a few respondents thought that only the welfare of the animals was important and 1 respondent thought the questionnaire was slanted in support of the lobby in favour of wild animals in circuses. The remaining comments had no particular relevance to the question being asked.

6.146 In total, 993 respondents (48.6%) offered comments at Question 14.

Summary of main points across all respondents

6.147 This is a collective summary of the main points raised by respondents who commented in support of their various answers to this question.

Additional venues

6.148 A few respondents considered that a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses could create a need for additional venues so revenue for venues overall could possibly increase. For example, some respondents thought that circuses would continue to go to their usual venues without their wild animals, but the fact that they would be free of these animals would open up alternative venues to them as well. One respondent commented that smaller venues would be adequate as there would no longer be a need for beast wagons.
Venue fees

6.149 Some respondents were also of the opinion that landlords providing individual venues could potentially charge more rent because, without wild animals, the circuses would do better financially and everyone could gain from the increased profits. However, another respondent felt that as travelling circuses minus their wild animals would actually require less space at venues, presumably circuses would be charged less by landlords.

Visits to Scotland

6.150 Some respondents thought there would be a decrease in revenue for circus venues because less people would want to go to the circus in the aftermath of a ban and sooner or later fewer circuses, or perhaps even no circuses, would want to visit Scotland. The inevitable result would be a reduced demand for venues overall. However, a few respondents thought that, due to the small number of circuses that currently visit Scotland, the impact would not be dramatic. A few other respondents did point out that circuses brought work and money to the towns they visited, so the towns would also experience a financial loss if circuses no longer visited Scotland.

Visits to venues

6.151 Some respondents considered the possibility that if circuses stopped coming to venues there could be a loss of revenue from circus rents, but thought any loss would be negligible because travelling circuses tended to rent agricultural fields or park land at a low cost. If a ban was to create any significant loss from circus rents, respondents thought that landlords should simply rent out their land for alternative forms of entertainment such as food festivals, farmers’ markets, car exhibitions or rock concerts. In addition, there were plenty of existing human-only circuses that could potentially fill any gaps.

Respondents who selected ‘Increase’ to circus venue revenues

6.152 A total of 631 respondents selected ‘increase’ and 481 provided comments. Most respondents reiterated comments they had made previously (see questions 11 and 13).

Key points

6.153 Key points:

- Circuses that did not use wild animals would attract more people, particularly animal lovers, vegans and vegetarians who currently avoid them, with increased ticket sales as a result.
- A ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses would have no economic impact.
- The circus industry would have a better reputation if the use of wild animals in travelling circuses was banned – circuses would be perceived as ethical.
- Without wild animals to care for, insure and transport circuses would be cheaper to run and the money could be diverted to other areas.
• A ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses would increase popularity and takings so there would be more call for and more availability of venues.
• A ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses would increase popularity and takings so more could be charged for the renting out of venues.
• A ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses would open up opportunities and provide an incentive for talented human performers to join the circus.
• A ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses would result in increased competition - all circuses competing on equal terms on an even playing field.

General points

6.154 About two-fifths of those who commented said again that human-only circuses would attract more people, particularly animal lovers, vegans and vegetarians who currently avoided them. This would boost ticket sales and increase revenue.

6.155 Many people used the response from PETA UK which claimed that a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses would have no economic impact (see relevant quote below).

6.156 As can be seen from the points above, other respondents commented again that, in the event of a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses, the reputation of the circus industry would be improved because circuses would be regarded as ethical; circuses would be cheaper to run without wild animals; new circus job opportunities would be opened up for talented human performers; and there would be increased competition for other circuses because they would be competing on equal terms on an even playing field.

6.157 In the opinion of a handful of respondents, in addition to increasing the popularity and revenue of circuses, a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses would also create a need for additional venues and, according to respondents, this need could and would be catered for. It was considered that landlords providing venues could potentially charge more rent because, without wild animals, the circuses would do better financially and everyone could gain from the increased profits. One respondent commented that smaller venues would be adequate as there would no longer be a need for beast wagons.

“A 2006 study in Massachusetts by Harvard-educated economist Jennifer Fearing found that where travelling circuses are not an available entertainment option – which need not be the case here, as many circuses are successful without wild animals – there is, if anything, a positive impact on the economy because consumers spend the same amount on entertainment regardless of their options. And when the money is spent on local businesses, money stays in the local economy rather than going to a large non-local corporation. Fearing also found that jurisdictions that ban the use of exotic animals in circuses "may experience higher economic activity if family spending shifts from touring events like circuses featuring wild and exotic animals to resident events and activities" and that if "in the absence of the limited events, continued demand exists for circus-type amusement events, the market will respond and other substitute events will come to [the jurisdiction]". As of the publication of Fearing's study, 28 municipalities in Massachusetts had enacted bans on the use of exotic animals in circuses, and none of those
municipalities reported any economic losses as a result.” (Group Response – PETA UK)

“Increase over time as circuses become high value entertainment, with those staying away because of the taint of cruelty being lifted, and parents bringing their children along to witness non-wild animal acts. No amount of tarring up animal acts will substitute for well-thought new acts.” (Individual Respondent)

“The revenue of circus venues would increase because a circus would now be able to use a venue where previously only "animal-free" circuses were able to perform. Where I live, for example, the Council has decreed that only animal-free circuses may perform on Council-owned land, and, therefore, only issue licenses to cruelty-free circuses.” (Individual Respondent)

“A lot of councils already ban circus’s with animals from their land plus having to apply for special licence’s make a lot of venues inaccessible. Without animals they would have the same access as the other circus’s” (Individual Respondent)

“There are many people who stay away from circuses with wild animals for ethical reasons, and if the opportunity to develop more exciting human acts was taken up, the sky would be the limit” (Individual Respondent)

“More venues will allow them there, and as the circus’ will no doubt take more in revenue, so the percentage paid to the landowner/venue will go up.” (Individual Respondent)

“there would be a bigger audience in attendance so the venues would make more money out of merchandise and other sales” (Individual Respondent)

“Less risk without animals, less potential for mess, destruction and accidents so lower insurance costs.” (Individual Respondent)

**Respondents who selected ‘No Change’ to revenue of circus venues**

6.158 A total of 671 respondents selected ‘no change’ and 290 provided comments.

**Key points**

6.159 Key points:

- In the event of a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses, events other than circuses could be staged at the venues e.g. food festivals, farmers’ markets, car exhibitions, rock concerts etc.
- People would be pleased if the use of wild animals in travelling circuses was banned and more would go to these ethically correct circuses.
- Circuses without wild animals could still go to the same venues and possibly alternative venues as well.
- People will go to circuses whether wild animals are present or not.
- There are plenty of circuses that do not use wild animals and these would fill any venue voids created by a ban.
• Any loss of revenue for circus venues would be negligible because so few travelling circuses visit Scotland and they stay for such short periods.
• Revenue from circus venues would stay the same or possibly increase if a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses resulted in increased takings.
• Feeding and upkeep of wild animals would no longer apply in the event of a ban on the use of wild animals so travelling circuses would save on costs.
• In the event of a ban on the use of wild animals, affected travelling circuses would require less space at venues.

General points

6.160 Many respondents only briefly reiterated the comments they had made previously in questions 11 and 13 in relation to public attendance at circuses and reduction of costs following a ban on the use of wild animals in circuses.

6.161 Several respondents commented on circus venues; in particular, they were clear that, if a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses created any loss of revenue from circus venues, landlords should simply rent out their land for alternative forms of entertainment or to human-only circuses. However, some respondents were of the opinion that circuses would just continue to go to the same venues without their wild animals. If there was any loss of revenue this would be negligible because travelling circuses tended to rent agricultural fields or park land at low cost. In any event, very few travelling circuses visited Scotland and those that did stayed for only short periods of time.

Sample of respondents’ quotes

“Venues are very capable of finding alternative shows” (Individual Respondent)

“Circus venues will be multi-use places, not just empty till the circus comes round again.” (Group Response - Captive Animal Protection Society)

“We do not think that circus venues would suffer loss of revenue as a result of a ban on the use of wild animals. In a paper concerning the East Ayrshire Council Review of Council policy on letting of Council owned sites to circuses etc... in February 2012, the Executive Director of Finance and Corporate Support gave figures for letting the Scott Ellis Playing field in Kilmarnock to circuses, cattle shows and dog shows. The rent from the circus ranged from £1,800 for a week (in 2008) and £1,957 (in 2011). The rent from a cattle show, presumably of shorter duration, was £500. At the beginning of this period the Bobby Roberts Super Circus was visiting East Ayrshire with an elephant and camel, but by 2011 it had stopped using them. There was however no change in the amount of revenue to the Council. We think that the experience will be the same in other venues” (Group Response – OneKind)

“Loss of revenue to venue owners in Scotland who rent out their venue to travelling circuses with wild animals would be small. This is because of the rarity of such visits to Scotland.” (Individual Respondent)
Respondents who selected ‘Decrease’ in circus venue revenue

6.162 A total of 170 respondents selected ‘decrease’ and 66 provided comments.

Key points

6.163 Key points:

- Following a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses fewer circuses would visit Scotland due to reduced public demand.
- If the use of wild animals is banned in travelling circuses revenue for circus venues will decrease unless they can be utilised for other purposes.
- If the use of wild animals is banned in travelling circuses some will close so there will be less demand for circus venues.
- If the use of wild animals is banned in travelling circuses revenue for circus venues will decrease but the impact will not be dramatic.
- The towns that circuses visit will also experience reduced income in the event of a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses.

General points

6.164 The main reason respondents thought there would be a decrease in revenue for circus venues was because they felt that many people only visited circuses to see the wild animals; if wild animals were removed, therefore, less people would want to go to the circus and sooner or later less circuses, or perhaps even no circuses, would want to visit Scotland.

6.165 One or two respondents even considered it possible that circuses would close down without wild animals and, again, this would mean fewer circuses would be available to visit Scotland. The inevitable result of fewer or no circuses would be a reduced demand for venues unless, as pointed out by a few respondents, venues could be utilised for other purposes.

Sample of respondents’ quotes

“If by venue, you mean the sites circuses hire for their shows, then a slight decrease is likely, but given the small number of such circuses, the impact will not be dramatic.” (Individual Response)

“Decrease unless there venues can be utilised for other purposes.” (Individual Response)

“Temporary decrease in the transition phase, but venues may need to broaden their shows and research non-animal alternatives. Sometimes doing the right thing can be hard, and the hard way always ends up being better and more rewarding in the long term.” (Individual Response)

“A decrease is possible, not certain. Other business could fill the gap, circuses with animals are not a huge part of venue’s business in Scotland. But I think there is less public interest in such acts so a decrease may happen anyway, just more slowly.” (Individual Response)
“As the shows close down there will be an impact on ground owners and all the other industries that Circuses fund around the country.” (Individual Response)

“The circus venue as well as local hotels, restaurants, print shops and local workers (ushers, ticket booth, cleaning services, etc) in towns visited by the circus would have reduced income. Fees paid to and cost of services by local communities also would be reduced.” (Group Response - Federation Mondiale du Cirque)

“If circuses do not visit towns not only would the venue owners realise a financial loss the town would also realise a loss. The circus brings work and money to a town.” (Group Response - Classical Circus Association)

Respondents who selected ‘Don’t Know’ what impact will be on circus venues

6.166 A total of 529 respondents selected ‘don’t know’ and 131 provided comments. Many of the comments had no particular relevance to the question.

Key points

6.167 Key points:

- Venues are multi-purpose; it would be up to the land owners to maintain revenue from other sources in the event of a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses.
- In the event of a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses revenue for circus venues would be affected.
- In the event of a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses human-only circuses would fill any venue gaps.

General points

6.168 A few respondents considered that revenue for circus venues would be adversely affected in the event of a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses; others thought that any decrease in revenue would only occur in the initial stages of a ban. Some respondents thought it would be up to land owners to obtain alternative sources of revenue for their venues and a very small number of respondents commented that any shortfall in venue bookings would be covered by visiting human-only circuses. A few respondents pointed out that the towns as well as the venues where circuses visited would be adversely affected.

Sample of respondents’ quotes

“I wouldn’t have thought there were that many travelling circuses with animals to adversely affect the revenue of circus venues, given that travelling circuses would be likely to adapt and return to venues with a different type of performance.” (Individual Respondent)

“Again the popularity of animal circuses are continually decreasing so there will soon be no gain to allowing those circuses in their venue. An association with these increasingly
unpopular travelling circuses will eventually reflect on the venue and lose them custom on more respectable travelling circuses” (Individual Respondent)

“However, when the ban first comes in the initial fall in any custom from those circuses may have a slight decrease in their revenue.” (Individual Respondent)

“I’m not aware of circus venues, but assume they would then cater for non-animal companies.” (Individual Respondent)

“I think that would vary town to town. In venues in areas or countries unconcerned with animal welfare revenue would probably decrease. Where the populace is more forward thinking on these issues attendance and revenue would increase.” (Individual Respondent)

“If less come they potentially will make less but there are not many wild animal circuses left so I doubt many venues rely heavily on them for revenue” (Individual Respondent)

“It could decrease the revenue as these circuses may no longer book the venues however there would still be an appetite among the public for some form of family activities and im sure some other family entertainment organisation would grasp the opportunity and also the venue.” (Individual Respondent)

“If this question is about the local venues, of course they would lose revenue, because no other event would replace the performances by travelling circuses with animals. The same would be true for affiliated businesses and suppliers. To ban circus with animals means to cancel a part of history of performing arts.” (Group Response - European Circus Association)
CONSULTATION QUESTION 15: Do you consider that a ban on wild animals in travelling circuses could have an impact on other industries? If so, which industries, what would be the effect and why?

Table 6.10: Overview of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Film</th>
<th>TV - Drama</th>
<th>TV - Doc</th>
<th>TV - Kids</th>
<th>Ad - TV</th>
<th>Ad - Other</th>
<th>Other industries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>2043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Positive Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Negative Impact</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Blank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Drama</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Documentary</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV Children</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising TV</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising Other</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>2043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General summary

6.169 There were mixed views regarding the impact of a ban on the wider film and television industry partly because some respondents were confused about whether the question was asking about the ethical or economic impact that a ban would have. Respondents did not generally specify the roles that wild animals would usually play in these industries; many simply stated that they were used for ‘entertainment’ purposes. The majority of respondents felt that a ban on the use of wild animals in
circuses would have a positive effect across all industries, at least in ethical terms, and could ultimately lead to stricter controls for animal welfare monitoring, or even to fewer animals being used in these industries. The use of real animals for commercial or entertainment purposes was generally condemned, with respondents viewing substitutes such as CGI with more favour. However, a few respondents felt there would be irreparable damage to the UK film and TV industries by the removal of a ready supply of trained wild animals.

Points to note

Selection of industries

6.170 Respondents did not always provide responses for all of the pre-selected industries. In addition, although there were 3 ‘other’ descriptor boxes to allow the suggestion of up to 3 additional industries, there were only a small number of respondents who used the descriptor boxes correctly by actually naming an additional industry. In many cases, respondents simply ticked an impact option in the first descriptor box and left the remaining 2 boxes blank. The majority of respondents left all of the ‘Other’ descriptors completely blank rather than ticking an option or naming a specific additional industry. Despite this, on several occasions, and usually in line with their answer selections for pre-selected industry categories, respondents answered ‘positive impact’, ‘negative impact’, ‘no impact’ or ‘don’t know’ for blank ‘other’ descriptors without identifying any additional industries to those already mentioned, or specifying why they did this in their comments. In some cases respondents did this for all three blank ‘other’ descriptors. For these reasons, the table above shows the results from only the first ‘other’ descriptor box; any specific industries mentioned in the comments have been analysed in the corresponding sections below. As always, respondents were invited to make open comments on their choices.

Interpretation of ‘impact’

6.171 Not all respondents seemed to interpret the term ‘impact’ in the same way. For example, those respondents that focused more on the economic impact (revenue streams and finances) on these industries in the event of a ban were more likely to select ‘no impact’ as they felt that these industries operated as wholly separate entities from travelling circuses, at least financially, or ‘negative impact’ due to a potentially more limited supply of animals that these industries might have access to.

6.172 However, the majority of respondents appeared to interpret ‘impact’ in terms of the effect a ban might have on these industries with regard to animals, their welfare and the overall attitude towards these. In such cases, almost all respondents selected ‘positive impact’ because a ban was seen to be likely to promote the message of good animal welfare throughout these industries and to the people of Scotland generally. In addition, it was considered that the effect would be good for the animals. Several of these respondents felt that a ban would result in fewer animals being used in these industries which, from a purely financial standpoint, might be seen as a negative impact of the ban; from a welfare, ethical and moral standpoint, however, this effect was viewed by many more respondents as positive.
6.173 A few respondents highlighted their confusion at the question as they were unsure whether they were expected to answer from an economical or ethical viewpoint. Therefore, despite several respondents ultimately making the same point in their comments, their selection of ‘positive’ or ‘negative’ impact varied depending on whether they were arguing from an animal welfare orientated perspective and the animal’s role in the industry, or from the viewpoint of the industry itself. Additionally, when respondents referred to ‘the media’ and its influence on the public, it was sometimes unclear when they were referring to the products of these industries or to the industries themselves.

Impact on specific industries

Table 6.12: Film industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

Reasons given for positive impact on film industry

6.174 A large minority of respondents felt that there would be a positive impact on the film industry.

- **Alternatives to animal use** - Several respondents made the point that a ban would encourage filmmakers to use more CGI and would reduce the number of animals used in film as there would no longer be a ready supply of trained circus
animals to use. From an ethical perspective, respondents felt that this was a positive impact of the ban as fewer animals used in film would ultimately result in fewer animals being abused. Respondents also felt that, if real animals were not used in film, then more members of the public would see the film for that reason, thus generating more revenue for the film industry.

- **Improved welfare** - Some respondents thought that, even if animals were still used in the industry, the level of treatment and care towards these creatures would be increased and more rigidly monitored. This was viewed as a definite improvement as, in the opinion of some respondents, the film industry has often been criticised for its treatment of wild animals.

- **Message medium** - Additionally, some respondents felt that, in the wake of a ban, film could be used to promote messages about animal welfare which again was classed as a potential positive outcome in an ethical sense.

**Reasons given for no impact on film industry**

6.175 The majority of respondents felt that a ban would not impact on the film industry.

- **Alternatives to animal use** - The main reason given was that respondents felt that animals used in film could easily be replaced via the use of CGI, stock footage and other technical effects. One example that was used frequently by respondents to illustrate this point was the film 'Noah', which was due to be released around the time of the consultation. According to respondents, the filmmakers had famously stated they would not use a single real animal to make the film. Since this was a movie based around animals and animals played a large role on screen, respondents felt this clearly showed that there was no need to use real wild animals in any form of media.

- **Acceptable welfare** - A few respondents also felt, since animals were already well cared for in films, and since appearing in films for a short time put far less strain on the animal than living in a travelling circus 24/7, that the industry was ethically sound enough to be unaffected by the moral repercussions of a ban of wild animals in travelling circuses.

- **Circus animals not shown** - Five respondents claimed that a ban would have no impact on the film industry because circus animals were no longer shown in this medium due to being classed as 'old fashioned'.

**Reasons given for negative impact on film industry**

6.176 Some respondents, including the circus groups, felt that a ban would have a strongly negative impact on the film industry.

- **No animals available** - The main reason for this was that, as has previously been discussed, the supply of trained animals from the circus that films can use would cease once a ban was imposed. According to respondents, this could have dire consequences for the UK film industry, as filmmakers would be put off filming
in Britain due to the restrictions. These filmmakers would then take their projects to other countries and continue to use animals in these places. If filmmakers managed to procure animals from other sources, respondents pointed out that these animals would most likely not be trained or acclimatised to the level of stimulation or travel involved in filmmaking, thus resulting in a far more stressful experience for these creatures than would have occurred if circus animals were used.

- **Alternatives to animals** - The circus groups also pointed out that the use of CGI to replace animals was not always available or affordable, and often needed real life animal models in order to appear lifelike.

- **Ethics before revenue** - Generally though, although respondents regarded the loss of animals that could be provided to the film industry as a negative in terms of this industry’s economy, some still regarded this as a necessary evil and maintained that banning wild animals in circuses would have an overall morally positive impact.

**Sample of respondents’ quotes**

```
“Getting the message across to other industries who use animals for financial gain, i.e. movie/tv animals, that animals are not ours to treat as toys means these other industries would treat the animals better and even find other ways to do animal-led shots (i.e. CGI or compositing existing footage onto new shots). Movie/tv animals are better treated than their circus counterparts but the moral obligation to an animal’s freedom remains the same.” (Individual Respondent)

“These industries might adopt the same rules and start using CGI animals ....if you look at old western films you can see the abuse of the horses quite clearly. A CGI horse doesn't break a leg” (Individual Respondent)

“I think a ban on circus animals would lead the way to animals being used less, and so mistreated less, in tv and film.” (Individual Respondent)

“Film, TV, and advertising could increase their profits by focusing in the true habitats of the WILD animals, what we should do to protect endangered species, species that have become totally extinct partially due to capture by profit-making ventures like circuses, etc.” (Individual Respondent)
```
Table 6.14: TV - Drama

Table 6.15: TV – Drama: Breakdown of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

Reasons given for impact on TV-drama

6.177 With regard to TV drama, the majority of respondents felt that there would be no impact as a result of a ban. Respondents rarely made comments specifically relating to this category but the few who did felt that TV dramas had little to no budget for animals and certainly did not feature circuses often.

6.178 Several respondents felt that there would be a positive impact on this industry but did not expand on this at all in their comments.
Table 6.16: TV – Documentary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Groups No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Individuals No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

Table 6.17: TV – Documentary: Breakdown of Responses

Reasons given for positive impact on TV documentaries

Most respondents felt that a ban would impact positively on TV documentaries.

- **Acceptable and educational** – TV documentaries were generally seen as ‘the one acceptable format’ in which wild animals could be viewed. Several respondents felt that the popularity of documentaries would increase with a ban, with all the media attention surrounding the ban generating renewed interest in wild animals. Respondents saw this as a non-invasive way of educating future generations and promoting respect for animals without causing the animals any suffering or interfering with nature.

- **Promotional medium** - Some respondents felt that a ban and any travelling circuses affected could be promoted and discussed via a documentary, much like the recent feature on Seaworld, which could generate more public interest in the cause as well as providing an in-depth look at a ‘before and after’ of the circus industry. According to respondents, this could generate income for the makers of the documentary and also morally enrich the people who viewed it.

154
Reasons given for no impact on TV documentaries

6.180 Many respondents selected ‘no impact’ with regard to this industry mainly because they did not appear to regard the documentaries as exploitative of animals but merely an observation of them; therefore, in the opinion of respondents, documentaries should not be affected by calls for fewer wild animals used in media or stricter controls regarding animal welfare.

Reasons given for negative impact on TV documentaries

6.181 Very few respondents felt there would be a negative impact on this industry but 2 respondents did comment that, with fewer circuses to expose, documentaries would have less material to feature.

Table 6.18: Children’s TV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% comments</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>829</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

Reasons given for impact on children’s TV

6.182 Few respondents specifically made comments pertaining to children’s TV but many of those who did felt that a ban would have a positive impact on this medium due to the educative messages that could be conveyed to children about animal welfare and the reinforcement of respect for animals.
Table 6.20: TV Advertising

Table 6.21: TV Advertising: Breakdown of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>comments</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

Reasons given for positive impact on TV advertising

6.183 The majority of respondents who commented felt that a ban would have a positive impact on TV advertising.

- **Fewer animals used** - several respondents felt strongly that it was cruel to use wild animals in this medium, and that a ban may see fewer animals used in future. Some respondents felt this could benefit the TV advertising agencies financially. For example, several respondents stated that, when wild animals were used to advertise a certain product, they made sure to boycott that product. Therefore, in the opinion of respondents, if a ban resulted in advertising agencies realising that the public generally did not want to see wild animals being used in this way and the agencies ceased to use them to promote products, their promotion and subsequent sales of that product would consequently be a lot more successful.

- **Alternatives to animal use** - Some respondents suggested the use of CGI or stock footage to replace the use of real animals which could mean that the impact on these industries as a result of a ban might be reduced.
Reasons given for negative impact on TV advertising

6.184 A few respondents felt that a ban might have a negative impact on TV advertising: again they might lose a supply of trained animals. However, these same respondents also felt that, morally, it was not right to feature wild animals in advertising anyway so the impact was only negative from a purely financial viewpoint.

Table 6.22: Other Advertising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>comments</th>
<th>Individuals No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>comments</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

6.185 No respondents specifically referred to mediums of advertising other than TV in their comments.
Table 6.24: Other Industries

Table 6.25: Other Industries: Breakdown of Responses (first ‘Other’ descriptor only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Impact</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Impact</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

Table of Other Industries

6.186 As previously mentioned, the vast majority of respondents left all the ‘other’ descriptors blank despite having selected answers against them. However, a small number of respondents who filled in the first column did specifically refer to other industries in their comments.

Table 6.26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry or business</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife and Safari Parks</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoos</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Zoos</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Rescue Centres</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquariums</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGI Companies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling Circuses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static Circuses</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotourism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet Trade</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals used in Sport</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Impersonators</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badger Baiting and Dog Fighting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Trailer Manufactures</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Food Suppliers (for wild animals)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons given for positive impacts on other industries

6.187 Reasons given:

- **Wildlife and safari parks** - A total of 7 respondents thought safari or wildlife parks would see an increase in visitors as a result of a ban because they were no longer in competition with circuses. Due to the publicity surrounding a ban, respondents also thought the public might show a renewed interest in wildlife parks.

- **Zoos** - 3 respondents thought that zoos might see some benefit as re-housing the animals for the circus could provide new attractions to draw customers.

- **Other industries** - A handful of other respondents mentioned a variety of industries that might be positively affected as a result of a ban but did not always elaborate as to why they thought this could be.

6.188 One respondent felt that CGI companies may gain more work as a result of a ban. Another felt that circuses, reformed as ethically sound industries in the wake of a ban, might gain more business in the form of schools, parties and catering. Yet another respondent felt that a ban would have a positive impact on the exotic pet trade as fewer people would wish for and potentially abandon exotic pets. One respondent also felt there could be a decrease in activities such as badger baiting and dog fighting in the wake of a ban because it would promote a greater respect for animals in the general public.

Reasons given for negative impacts on other industries

6.189 Reasons given:

- **Manufacturers of animal trailers** - 2 respondents thought there would be a negative impact (although they suggested this would not have been a big business to begin with).

- **Suppliers of wild animal food and products** - 1 respondent thought that suppliers of animal food and products for wild animals could lose business as a result of a ban.
Reasons given for no impact on other industries

6.190 Reason given:

- Two respondents thought that a ban would most likely affect zoos and static circuses but were not sure how or to what extent.

Impact on industries in general

6.191 A large number of respondents selected the same answer for all pre-selected industries and made very general comments regarding the impact that a ban would have, not just on specific industries, but also on media generally, the public, future generations and Scotland’s global image as a whole. These ‘generalised’ comments are documented below.

Reasons for positive impact on industry in general

6.192 Reasons given:

- **Key points**
  - A ban would have a positive impact across all categories and in the public sphere generally as it would raise awareness about potential animal welfare issues and reinforce a ‘zero tolerance’ policy against animal cruelty.
  - A ban would result in fewer animals being used in these other industries – ultimately leading to fewer animals being abused.
  - From an ethical perspective, these industries would increase their credibility through not using animals.
  - By using fewer animals or tightening their policies regarding animals as a result of a ban, these industries would garner more public support and revenues would increase.
  - The animals used in these industries currently would benefit as their levels of care and welfare might increase as a result of a ban.

- **Animal welfare** - The vast majority of respondents who commented on this question spoke of the potential positive impact of a ban with regard to effects it could have on animal welfare across these industries. Over 400 respondents thought that a ban would raise awareness of animal welfare and the immoral practice of exploiting animals, both within the industries and among the population of Scotland generally. Respondents considered that a ban would show these industries that the people of Scotland would not tolerate animal cruelty, which might force them to review their own policies and practices regarding the animals they used; this would inevitably lead to increased monitoring and care of these animals which, respondents felt, at least from a moral perspective, could only be a positive thing.

Similarly, many respondents commented on the direct and immediate benefits of a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses for animals currently within
these industries, as they would surely be treated better or perhaps never used for entertainment purposes again. Additionally, respondents felt that, if fewer animals were used in these industries, which would be an inevitable response to a ban once these industrials saw it was what the public wanted, this would inevitably lead to fewer cases of animal abuse as there would be less opportunities for abuse to occur. Hence, at least from an animal’s perspective, the impact of a ban across all industries was seen as positive.

- **Industry image** - From an ethical perspective several respondents felt that, if these industries were to adopt better practices relating to animals or cease to use animals completely, they would gain moral credibility in the public eye and would be supported wholeheartedly in this decision by the Scottish public. According to respondents, decisions to stop using animals completely or to use animal substitutes (such as CGI) in these industries would not only gain the support of the general public but would encourage these medias to evolve and modernise and be in-keeping with what the public wanted to see. This could even lead to increased revenue for these industries as people would be attracted by the good publicity generated through the improvements made to animal welfare policies.

Furthermore, respondents felt a ban would be a good way of educating future generations, who were influenced by these mediums, about the importance of respect towards animals. This is with the exception of TV documentaries, which respondents viewed as being already ethically sound in their practices due to their lack of interference with or ‘use’ of the animal itself for entertainment. However, as previously mentioned, respondents felt that the popularity of these may increase as public interest for animals, their welfare and their wild natures potentially increased as a result of the media coverage of a ban, thus producing the same educative impact on future generations.

- **Scotland’s image** - Some respondents went so far as to say that, as a result of a ban, Scotland as a whole would increase its moral standing as a nation and the people of Scotland would be proud for their country to be a forerunner for this kind of ethical change.

**Sample of respondents’ quotes**

“I believe all these industries would begin to benefit from increased support from all people and organisations who might currently not support them because of the use of wild animals in anything promoted or produced by them.” *(Individual Respondent)*

“A very positive message would be sent about the exploitation of animals for human entertainment. This could only be a good thing” *(Individual Respondent)*

“Animals should not be exploited by any of these industries. The positive effect on them would be in a regaining of much-damaged public trust - and the knowledge that they were finally acting ethically; a position of positivity that money can’t buy.” *(Individual Respondent)*

“Hopefully by banning the use of wild animals in circuses, other forms of media such a television and advertisements would take the same ethical approach, therefor resulting in a positive effect.” *(Individual Respondent)*
“Whilst it is likely that there will be no direct impact on these other industries from this ban it maybe that it heightens some peoples awareness of animal welfare issues. This may lead to the other industries being more thoughtful about whether to put an animal in a tv advert or in a film. This would then be a positive impact.” (Individual Respondent)

“Raised awareness of the issues would mean that more companies and industries would want to be seen as ‘ethical’ and would consider very carefully their own animal-use policies.” (Individual Respondent)

“Industries that behave in a way that reflects public sentiment tend to do better.” (Individual Respondent)

“The ban of wild (preferably all) animals will set a positive example and a serious message to everybody and every other industry that handles animals.” (Individual Respondent)

“Banning the unacceptable use of wild animals in circuses can only be a good thing and should act as a catalyst for programme planners/film directors when considering ethical and responsible behaviour in other entertainment genres.” (Individual Respondent)

“I don't see how it could have any other…the more widespread a ban like this becomes, the clearer the message that the inappropriate use and treatment of animals, wild or otherwise, will not be tolerated. A warning to all organisations and businesses.” (Individual Respondent)

“I imagine a change in legislation would cause other professions to reconsider how they treat and exhibit animals. At the very least, it would send a message to those industries that cruelty and exploitation will not be tolerated in today's society.” (Individual Respondent)

“An ethos that Scotland is a nation that respects the other inhabitants of Earth can do nothing but enhance Scotland's reputation on the world stage.” (Individual Respondent)

“If animals were protected from being exploited in a circus, then others who exploit them and force them to behave unnaturally, would be more aware that it is wrong. Perhaps more frightened too. If the law banned circus animals on the grounds that they were not beneficial to the animals, then perhaps it would eventually extend to other areas” (Individual Respondent)

“If it can be shown that an industry doesn't need to rely on animal abuse to be successful then this is an example to all” (Individual Respondent)

Reasons for no impact on industry in general

6.193 Reasons given:

- **Key points**
  - Animals used in these industries are easily replaced by using creative techniques, such as CGI.
  - Animals used in these industries are monitored more strictly and are better cared for than in circuses.
  - The impact of a ban on the revenue streams of these industries would not be significant.
• There is no connection between the circus industry and the other industries mentioned here.
• These industries do not need to use animals to entertain so, even if they are deterred from doing so as a result of the ban, it will not affect revenue.
• Only industries which currently treat animals unethically would be affected and these deserve to lose revenue as a result.
• Travelling circuses are not the main supplier of animals to these industries.
• These industries are covered by animal legislation different to that of a travelling circus so thus would not be affected by a ban.

• **Alternatives to animal use** - The reasons that respondents selected ‘no impact’ across the industries were wide and varied but, for the most part, respondents seemed to take it for granted that these industries would use wild animals less frequently for entertainment as a result of a ban. However, many respondents followed this statement by commenting that it need not follow that the industry in question would be negatively affected by this. In fact, many respondents who selected ‘no impact’ did so either because they felt that the quality of the entertainment produced would not suffer for lack of real animals or because they felt that animal programming, films or adverts could still be achieved through the use of replacement techniques such as stock footage or CGI. This would allow these industries to easily continue on unaffected even if they no longer used animals. If the industry was unable to demonstrate the level of creativity needed to continue to entertain the public without the use of animals, to the point where business was being harmed as a result of a ban, then it was not, in the opinion of respondents, ethically sound and consequently not worthy of public concern.

• **Acceptable welfare** - Some respondents felt that the wild animals used in these industries were already treated quite differently to and had a higher quality of life than animals in the travelling circus environment and therefore would not be affected by the increase in animal welfare considerations that would follow a ban, as most of these industries already had these controls in place.

• **No circus influence** - Other respondents in the main felt that the circus industry had no real influence on these other industries and was not large enough or modern enough to affect anything. A couple of respondents mentioned that there were hardly any circuses in Scotland anyway at present. A small number of respondents commented that the majority of animals used in these industries were procured from sources other than travelling circuses so if wild animals were removed from the circus environment this would have little impact on the wider industry as a whole. Some respondents stated that they failed to see any connection between a travelling circus and any of the industries mentioned in the question.

• **Few programmes on circuses** - Some respondents answered ‘no impact’ with a more direct view on how circuses might affect these industries but felt that, since there were few programmes featuring circuses or their animals nowadays, there would be little impact to these wider media industries; the only impact would really be to the animals themselves.
Sample of respondents’ quotes

“I don’t think a ban on animal circuses will have much of an impact on any other profession to be honest, it will however have a huge impact on the lives and welfare of the animals.” (Individual Respondent)

“As long as the animals were well cared for and not caged or ill treated then I do not see any of the above being impacted. IF there was ill-treatment of the animals, then yes there would most definitely be a negative impact and rightly so!” (Individual Respondent)

“I do not think this would change, the difference here is that animals safety is monitored and how they are treated, it is not in circuses.” (Individual Respondent)

“The use of animals in tv and advertising is more controlled and they are well looked after (in comparison to how they are looked after in circuses)” (Individual Respondent)

“My opinion is that as long as the animals are cared for, treated humanely, not beaten or tortured or punished unfairly, or taken from their homes/mothers at young ages for just this purpose, then they can still be used in media. Those that consider that impossible shouldn’t use the animals.” (Individual Respondent)

“This is a very specific problem. I don’t think it will affect other bigger advertising or entertainment industries because they have to follow much stricter guidelines and industry rules. It has been proven time and again that circus people use cruel and barbaric methods to train the animals.” (Individual Respondent)

“Using wild animals for say advertising, or films, may involve some travelling, but it is not the same as year after year doing the same day in day out. Animal welfare can be more easily maintained than being on the road ‘doing the rounds’ but must be regulated.” (Individual Respondent)

“We do not believe that there would be any impact. Currently no travelling circuses with wild animals visit Scotland while other circuses using only domestic animals would be able to do so, as at present.” (Group Response - OneKind)

Reasons given for negative impact on industry in general

6.194 Reasons given:

• **Key points**
  
  • Industries would lose their supply of trained animals which would have a negative impact on the industry’s revenue stream.
  
  • Industries may see it as a negative impact if they feel pressured to stop using animals as a result of a ban.

6.195 On the whole, respondents who thought there would be a negative impact on other industries as a result of a ban gave their answer from an economic perspective.

• **Wild animals unavailable** - The most frequently mentioned point was that these industries would lose their supply of trained animals and the repercussions of this would extend beyond individual businesses to impact on Scotland’s media industries as a whole. However, respondents felt that the only negative outcome
of this would be in terms of the industry’s revenue stream and considered that, from a moral standpoint with regard to animal welfare, the implications of a ban were still positive. Some respondents went so far as to say that any industry that was completely reliant on the travelling circus for support, deserved to lose revenue as they were perceived to be unethical.

Sample of respondents’ quotes

“Please put the welfare of the animals first. This is far more important than whether profits decrease or increase. Our very first responsibility is to the animals, not to the income of circuses, television, advertising or anything else just concerned with profit.” (Individual Respondent)

“If there are negative consequences, we should deal with them rather than not impose a ban.” (Individual Respondent)

Reasons given for not knowing the likely impact on industry

6.196 Reasons given:

- Respondents who selected ‘don’t know’ generally did so for 2 main reasons; many felt that the question was irrelevant and that only the welfare of the animals should be considered; and some respondents were confused about whether the question was asking about the ethical or economic impact that a ban would have on these industries.

Sample of respondents’ quotes

“Don’t know whether you mean a Positive or Negative impact on the animals or the industries. Film makers, TV drama producers, TV childrens producers and Advertisers might have to think more carefully about how they used animals. I believe there are already restrictions on the use of animals. These might be tightened, which would be good.” (Individual Respondent)

“I had to answer “Don’t know” as I believe it would be a mixed bag of impacts - and it would be very much up to each industry how they handled the situation. Ethically, there is no contest.” (Individual Respondent)

“We selected 'Don't know' as it is so difficult to gauge. We would hope it would give some added impetus/traction to the general campaign to improve animal welfare and stop their exploitation throughout the world, but realistically the film, tv and advertising industries operate in a separate silo from circuses. We would respectfully request a similar consultation process for these 3 sectors (as well as mobile and static zoos) in the near future.” (Individual Respondent)

Respondents who did not select any option (blank)

6.197 On the whole, respondents who failed to select an option but commented, pondered over the relevance of the question as, in their opinion, the dealings of circuses were wholly unrelated to these industries.
7. SHOULD SCOTLAND BAN THE USE OF WILD ANIMALS IN TRAVELLING CIRCUSES?

7.1 This section of the consultation document contained 5 questions and asked respondents, now that they had considered all of the information and issues raised in the consultation, to give overall views on whether a ban should be introduced in Scotland and in what form such a ban should take.

7.2 This section was comprised of 5 questions:

Consultation Question 16 Do you agree that the use of wild animals for performance in travelling circuses should be banned in Scotland? Why?

Consultation Question 17 Do you agree that the use of wild animals for exhibition in travelling circuses should be banned in Scotland? Why?

Consultation Question 18 Do you consider that any ban should be a blanket ban on all wild animals in travelling circuses?

Consultation Question 19 Do you consider that any specific species of animal not commonly domesticated in the British Islands should be permitted to be used in travelling circuses in Scotland? If so, which species and why?

Consultation Question 20 Do you consider that there are key species that should be covered by a ban in the event that a blanket ban could not be achieved? If so, which species and why?

7.3 These were multiple choice questions that gave respondents the option of selecting ‘yes’, ‘no’, or ‘don’t know’ in each case. The meaning of these choices within the context of these questions is self-evident. Opinions on banning performance (training for and performing in shows) and exhibition (being on display in their living quarters) were asked for separately. Similarly, opinions on a blanket ban, whether there should be any exemptions to a blanket ban, and whether there were any key species that should be banned as a minimum were also asked for separately.

7.4 Key points raised in these questions have not been listed in order of frequency; to do so would have been unfair on the many respondents whose comments referred to unspecified points they had made previously in the consultation questionnaire.
CONSULTATION QUESTION 16: Do you agree that the use of wild animals for performance in travelling circuses should be banned in Scotland? Why?

Table 7.1: Overview of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

7.5 A total of 2032 respondents (99.5%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, the overwhelming majority, 2003 respondents (98%) answered ‘yes’ indicating that they thought that the use of wild animals for performance in travelling circuses should be banned; 25 respondents (1.2%) answered ‘no’; and 42 respondents (0.2%) answered ‘don’t know’.

7.6 The remaining 11 respondents (0.5%) left this question blank; only 1 respondent commented and these comments clearly indicated that the respondent was in support of a ban.

7.7 In total, 1549 respondents (75.8%) offered comments at Question 16.

Respondents who answered ‘Yes’ wild animal performances should be banned

7.8 A total of 2003 respondents answered ‘yes’ and 1521 provided comments. Many respondents who commented referred to the points they had made in previous questions in support of a ban without reiterating them; a few referred to points they had specifically made in their answers to questions 1 and 4; many other respondents simply summed up the points they had made in support of a ban in previous answers; and the remaining respondents who commented provided detailed reasons as to why a ban should be implemented but no new points were raised.

7.9 In particular, many respondents felt strongly that Scotland, as a modern, civilised country, should be leading the field in the ethical treatment of animals and believed that if Scotland imposed a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses it would send out a clear message to other countries and encourage them to do the same.

Key points

7.10 Key points:
It is unethical, unnecessary and unjustifiable to use wild animals for frivolous human entertainment. The use of wild animals in travelling circuses should have been banned a long time ago. There is no longer a place for this outdated practice in modern day society. It is undignified for wild animals to be used in this way. Keeping wild animals in circuses is cruel and contradicts the essential values society should hold in today’s world. Wild animals are unable to express their natural behaviours in the circus environment. Respect for wild animals in travelling circuses is non-existent. It is cruel to take animals away from their family groups in the wild. A ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses is the only humane way forward. The use of animals in circuses perpetuates the belief that wild animals belong to humans and it is alright for humans to impose their will on them. Wild animals are not toys. There are sufficient good human acts to make wild animals superfluous in travelling circuses. Wild animals are held captive and forced to behave contrary to their natural state. It is distressing to see wild animals used and abused in the circus environment. Wild animals are being denied their basic rights in a circus environment. Wild animals do not belong in a circus environment because of the negative impact on their physical/psychological health and wellbeing. Travelling circuses present a false and unacceptable image to children and young people as to how wild animals should be treated. Wild animals should live in their own environment as nature intended.

Sample of respondents' quotes

“They are outdated and completely unnecessary. People's tastes have changed.” (Individual Respondent)

“There is no need to use wild animals in a performing way or to impose a life of confinement in sub standard living accommodation Children today are more interested in IT games rather than see an elephant perform” (Individual Respondent)

“Wild animals should stay wild whenever and wherever possible. Scotland should be joining many other countries around the world which are banning the use of animals in circuses and thereby setting an example.” (Individual Respondent)

“A circus can not offer the environment suitable for the enrichment of an animal” (Individual Respondent)

“Yes, and in England, America and everywhere else. It is inevitable that it will happen; it is just a case of when. Holding on to an outdated concept of using animals for financial gain, to be toys for human entertainment simply because tradition says it is acceptable, or worries over loss of income, may slow progress down but it should not halt it.” (Individual Respondent)
“Scotland is not some third world country that needs to make money from the persecution of animals.” (Individual Respondent)

“The use of wild animals in circuses is so over, so yesterday, so boring, old fashioned, cruel, weird and old hat, part of a different time, not eco-conscious, not in keeping with current young thinking, not in line with current shifts in attitude towards the planet and our relationship with all nature…” (Individual Respondent)

“There is a fine line between traditional and archaic. Where once circuses had the role of exposing people to animals they would otherwise never have seen or had knowledge of, 200 years on this role is now much better filled by TV documentaries. Although scientific research into the experiences of specific species under travelling circus conditions is lacking, most animals are recognized as sentient under European law and this gives us a moral duty to protect animals from negative experiences and promote those experiences which allow them to live full and rich lives. The behaviours performed as tricks are sometimes unnatural to the animal, and even if natural are seen out of context by the audience. This may be detrimental in perpetuating unrealistic or incorrect ideas about what the animal really “is” (ie compromises its integrity).” (Group Response - West Lothian Council)

“First: Their performances are not voluntary (even if one subscribes to the ludicrous notion that ‘positive reinforcement’ training regimes are generally used. If this was true, every animal trainer would enter the ring clutching only a big bag of treats as opposed to whips or poles). Second: The 'tricks' they are forced to do are often unnatural and/or painful (eg elephants rearing up on their hind legs), as well as frightening and/or dangerous (eg tigers jumping through hoops of fire). As the late Pat Derby, one time (in)famous animal trainer (for tv series such as 'Flipper', 'Lassie' and 'Gentle Ben') who later developed a conscience and renounced her former ways by co-founding PAWS (Performing Animals Welfare Society) in the United States and actively campaigning against the exploitation of animals in the entertainment world, commented: “After 25 years of observing and documenting circuses, I know there are no kind animal trainers.” (Individual Respondent)

Respondents who answered ‘No’ wild animal performances should not be banned

7.11 A total of 25 respondents, including those respondents affiliated with the circus industry answered ‘no’ to this question; 23 respondents offered comments and, out of these, the comments of 3 respondents appeared to support a ban on the use of wild animals in circuses rather than the opposite; 1 respondent simply referred to previous answers.

7.12 The comments of the remaining 19 respondents were varied; all thought that circuses that used wild animals should be allowed to continue and the following reasons were provided:

Key points

7.13 Key points:

- There is no scientific evidence to support a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses.
- There is no ethical reason to ban the use of wild animals in travelling circuses.
• There is no welfare reason to ban the use of wild animals in travelling circuses because their welfare is not compromised.
• There is no genuine reason to ban the use of wild animals in travelling circuses.
• The use of wild animals in travelling circuses could be effectively controlled by effective regulation and robust inspection schemes.
• The use of wild animals in travelling circuses should be allowed to continue because it is a tradition and a cultural heritage.
• The public should have the right to choose what they see and what they spend their money on.

**No evidence or reason**

7.14 Several respondents commented that there was no scientific evidence to support a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses or any ethical or welfare reason because the animals were not compromised in the travelling circus environment. In fact, respondents considered that there was a place for wild animal circuses in the wider entertainment industry.

**Cultural heritage and choice**

7.15 A few also thought that if the use of wild animals was banned, an important component of cultural heritage would be sacrificed. Respondents felt that the public should have the right to choose what entertainment they wanted to see and spend their money on; if people stopped paying to see wild animals, circuses would stop touring but then this would be the public’s choice and not because of any ‘minority opinion against circuses’. One respondent stated that the issue had been blown out of proportion for years and that the majority of the public would not see the use of wild animals in travelling circuses as a major issue.

**Will not change things**

7.16 One respondent stated that banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses in Scotland would achieve very little; in fact, it would only push any perceived animal welfare issues somewhere else rather than stop them.

**Regulatory approach**

7.17 Several respondents thought that imposing strict regulation and robust inspections on the use of wild animals would be a much better way of dealing with any perceived welfare issues.

**Sample of respondents’ quotes**

“I believe it can be done properly and that if we can be assured that it is ethically done we have no right to stop it. Good welfare and training can inspire the owners of domestic owners to improve their own practice.” (Individual Respondent)

“the public should have the right to choose what they see and what they spend their Money on. If they don’t pay to see an Animal show the circus would not continue to tour s, so no need to ban it let the public vote with there feet.” (Individual Respondent)
“Argyll and Bute Council do NOT support the ban as there is no scientific evidence to support this action, and there are sufficient legislative controls in place to address the animal health and welfare concerns. This decision was made by the PPSL Committee on the 19th March 2014.” (Group Response - Argyll and Bute Council)

“There are no welfare reasons to justify it. An important component of cultural heritage would be sacrificed and the right to live and work throughout the European Union by animal trainers and presenters sacrificed because of a minority opinion against circuses. To prohibit licensed exhibitors (including those licensed by England, France Germany or other countries) from conducting their performance with any animal, just because some portion of society - or anti-circus campaign groups - prefer something else is nothing less than censorship of those who do not subscribe to a certain philosophy. The public has the right to decide for itself whether it thinks classical circus, built on the three traditional pillars of acrobatics, animals and clowns, has value to them and whether they want to see human/animal interaction - particularly in places where such interaction may be hard to find. The decision as to whether to attend a circus should rest with the public, not be made for them by a government prohibition that has nothing to do with animal welfare.” (Group Response - Federation Mondiale du Cirque)

“As pointed out even in the consultation document itself there is no scientific evidence whatsoever to justify a ban. If some ways of presenting so called “wild” animals are regarded as outdated or questionable, these specific forms can be ruled out by strict regulations. Circuses that fulfil all regulations must still be allowed to present animals, including so called “wild” animals.” (Group Response - European Circus Association)

“There is no justification to ban wild animals in circuses, not on any grounds and certainly not on welfare or wellbeing grounds as there is no scientific evidence to justify a ban.” (Group Response - Classical Circus Association)

“There is no scientific and ethical evidence to ban animals in circus. To prohibit licensed exhibitors from conducting their performance with any animal, just because some portion of society - or ultra-minority anti-circus campaign groups - prefer something else is nothing less than censorship of those who do not subscribe to a certain philosophy. The public has the right to decide for itself whether it thinks classical circus, built on the three traditional pillars of acrobatics, animals and clowns, has value to them and whether they want to see human/animal interaction - particularly in places where such interaction may be hard to find. The decision as to whether to attend a circus should rest with the public, not be made for them by a government prohibition that has nothing to do with animal welfare.” (Group Response - Club Amici del Circo)

Respondents who answered ‘Don’t Know’ whether wild animal performances should be banned

7.18 A total of 4 respondents answered ‘don’t know’ to this question and all 4 commented; the comments of 2 respondents appeared to support a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses; the third respondent simply referred to previous comments and the fourth respondent expressed concern about where the animals for film and TV would come from if ‘proper legislation’ on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses was not implemented; the respondent wondered if animals would come from other countries with lower animal welfare standards.
CONSULTATION QUESTION 17: Do you agree that the use of wild animals for exhibition in travelling circuses should be banned in Scotland? Why?

Table 7.2: Overview of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%.

7.19 A total of 2002 respondents (98%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, the overwhelming majority, 1969 respondents (96.4%) answered ‘yes’ indicating that they thought the use of wild animals for exhibition in travelling circuses should be banned; 27 respondents (1.3%) answered ‘no’; and 6 respondents (0.3%) answered ‘don’t know’.

7.20 The remaining 41 respondents (2%) left this question blank although 22 commented; the comments of 17 respondents were in line with a ‘yes’ response; 3 respondents referred to previous comments; 1 respondent did not think that the current science supported a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses; and the comment of the final respondent was unclear.

7.21 In total, 1349 respondents (66%) offered comments at Question 17.

Respondents who answered ‘Yes’ exhibition of wild animals should be banned

7.22 A total of 2003 respondents answered ‘yes’ and 1521 provided comments. Approximately half the respondents who commented referred to the points they had made in support of a ban either specifically in question 16 or in previous questions, without reiterating them and a few referred to points they had made in their answers to questions 1 and 4.

Key points

7.23 Key points:

- Wild animals have the right to live a life of freedom in their natural habitat.
- The exhibition of wild animals in travelling circuses promotes objectification of living things and discourages respect, particularly in children.
- The needs of wild animals are not being met in a circus environment.
- Wild animals cannot carry out their natural behaviours in a circus environment.
- It is unethical, unnecessary and unjustifiable to use wild animals for human pleasure.
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• Wild animals should be treated with dignity.
• Today’s extensive media availability gives people the opportunity to see the natural behaviour of wild animals in their natural environments.
• Wild animals are not the property of humans.
• Wild animals in a circus environment give children an unacceptable image of how living mammals should be treated.
• Travelling circuses can function perfectly well without wild animals.
• Wild animals in circuses pose a real danger to members of the public as well as circus staff.
• There is no conservation merits in exhibiting wild animals.
• The travelling circus is an unsuitable environment for wild animals.
• Wild animals are exploited for gain in travelling circuses.
• Animals suffer from physical abuse and mental health issues in the circus environment.
• Allowing wild animals to be on show in travelling circuses debases Scotland and is a stain on its reputation.
• It is cruel to keep wild animals in a circus environment and the animals do not benefit.
• Wild animals are not toys.
• Wild animals in travelling circuses are an outdated form of entertainment.
• Seeing wild animals in circuses is not educational because they are not in their natural environment.

7.24 Some respondents did, however, raise a few points that related directly to the use of wild animals for exhibition, as opposed to performance, in travelling circuses, as follows:

• It is against the nature of wild animals to be exhibits.
• The only difference between ‘exhibition’ and ‘performance’ is that exhibition animals do not have to be trained but they are still forced to live an unnatural life in a circus environment.
• Non performing animals potentially suffer more than performing animals as they have longer confinement periods and less mental stimulation.

General comments

7.25 A number of respondents stated that wild animals were not exhibits and did not want to be ‘gawped at’ by the public. Other respondents queried whether there really was a huge difference between ‘exhibition’ and ‘performance’ and some stated that there was no logical reason to make a distinction between animals that travelled with the circus for exhibition and those that travelled to perform.

7.26 However, a couple of respondents were of the opinion that exhibition animals could potentially suffer even more than performing animals as they would face longer periods of confinement and even less stimulation. While performing and being trained to perform may be stressful for animals, respondents felt that confinement and boredom were equally stressful for different reasons.
7.27 Taking an opposing view, a few other respondents thought that ‘exhibition’ might not be as bad as ‘performing’ as it involved no training methods; however, these respondents were in no doubt that it was still a sorry life for wild animals which, they considered, should have been living in their natural habitats in the wild.

Sample of respondents’ quotes

“Animals are not exhibits” (Individual Respondent)

“There is nothing more heart-breaking than seeing a forlorn and broken-down animal sitting in a cage being looked at. Who benefits from this?” (Individual Respondent)

“...It is not in the nature of these animals to be exhibited. It is an abuse of their nature.” (Individual Respondent)

“Performance and exhibition amounts to the same thing- the animal will suffer and be kept in an unnatural, unhealthy and cramped environment, and be subjected to pain and cruelty. So neither are justifiable.” (Individual Respondent)

“Non performing animals would potentially suffer even more so than performing animals as they would face longer periods of confinement and even less mental stimulation. Whilst performing and being trained to perform may be stressful for animals, confinement and boredom are equally as stressful for different reasons.” (Group Response – West Lothian Council)

“As above, except that no training methods are involved.” (Individual Respondent)

“Exhibition entails transport and confinement as well as an unnatural environment and exposure to noise and distress, even if not enforced performance.” (Individual Respondent)

“Performance or exhibition doesn’t really matter. The living conditions are the same. Even if the animal is not forced to perform it is still being held capture for our amusement and have to spend life in a cage.” (Individual Respondent)

Respondents who answered ‘No’ exhibition of wild animals should not be banned

7.28 A total of 27 respondents, including 4 of the groups who were affiliated to the circus industry, answered ‘no’ and 20 provided comments; 9 respondents referred to previous comments they had made, particularly in support of questions 1 and 16; and the comments of 3 respondents were in line with a ‘yes’ response.

Key points

7.29 Key points:

- No circus keeps animals just for ‘exhibition’ purposes.
- No scientific reason / no scientific evidence to support a ban.
- The exhibiting of circus animals ensures transparency by allowing the public to observe the care and keeping of the animals.
- Allowing people to see animals in their quarters after a performance is a part of circus culture.
There are sufficient legislative controls in place to address animal health and welfare concerns.
Circus animals should be regulated and checked to ensure high welfare standards.

General comments

7.30 A small number of respondents pointed out that circuses do not keep wild animals just for exhibition purposes. Permitting the public to see animals behind the scenes after a performance was a part of circus culture and ensured transparency because people could see for themselves that the animals were cared for. One respondent stated that circus culture should not be interfered with by politicians on the say-so of minority groups of animal rights extremists because it would open up a can of worms and lead to the eventual campaigning for the banning of farming, pets, zoos, gymkhanas and everything else.

7.31 Once again, a few respondents pointed out that there was no scientific evidence to support a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses and one respondent considered that there were sufficient legislative controls in place to address any perceived animal health and welfare concerns. Another respondent thought that circus animals should be regulated and checked to ensure high welfare standards.

Sample of respondents’ quotes

“People have always been allowed to see animals after the performance in their quarters. It is a part of circus culture and culture has no place being interfered with by politicians on the whim of a minority of violent lying animal rights extremists. It is the thin end of a wedge and would open a can of worms that will lead to the eventual campaigning for the banning of farming, pets, zoos, gymkhanas and everything else. These people WANT circus to go because it is the catalyst to get the rest of their extreme manifestp. If you ban circus, do you think you have heard the last of these fanatic cultists?” (Individual Respondent)

“Argyll and Bute Council do NOT support the ban as there is no scientific evidence to support this action, and there are sufficient legislative controls in place to address the animal health and welfare concerns. This decision was made by the PPSL Committee on the 19th March 2014.” (Group Response – Argyll and Bute Council)

“We don't understand the difference between questions 16 and 17. No modern circus keeps animals just for "exhibition" purposes. Circus trainers live and work with their animals to be able to present them to an audience. Of course, the public is welcome to visit the animals at any given time behind the scenes, but that is part of the full transparency of the circuses and no commercial "exhibition" as such. To train animals is a general-complex concept.” (Group Response – European Circus Association)

“Working animals as well as young and retired animals should be able to be exhibited as part of circus activities. This ensures transparency and allows the public to observe for itself the care and keeping of the animals.” (Group Response – Federation Mondiale du Cirque)

“Apart from animals partially retired or animals in training no circuses keep animals just for exhibition. Semi retired animals still travel with circus as it is not in their best interest to banish them to the winter quarters away from all they know.” (Group Response – Classical Circus Association)
Respondents who answered ‘Don’t Know’ whether exhibition should be banned

7.32 A total of 6 respondents answered ‘don’t know’ and 4 provided comments. All were concerned about the animals’ welfare but thought there were other concerns as well. One felt that animal/human interaction needed to be a minimal impact activity but thought that, like zoos, the exhibition of animals did good for the protection of endangered animals and education; another respondent thought that the main focus of the exhibition should be education and perceived that it would not be completely cruel if the animals were given adequate living environments and received periodic rest from travelling; a third respondent was concerned about how an outright ban would affect the people in the circus industry; and the fourth respondent thought the exhibition of animals had to be considered if the revenue it produced helped to support the cost of caring for these animals.
CONSULTATION QUESTION 18: Do you consider that any ban should be a blanket ban on all wild animals in travelling circuses? Why?

Table 7.3: Overview of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups No.</th>
<th>Groups %</th>
<th>Groups comments</th>
<th>Individuals No.</th>
<th>Individuals %</th>
<th>Individuals comments</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%.

7.33 A total of 2022 respondents (99%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, the overwhelming majority, 1955 respondents (95.7%) answered ‘yes’ indicating that they thought that any ban should be a blanket on the use of all wild animals in travelling circuses; 35 respondents (1.7%) answered ‘no’ indicating that they did not consider that a blanket ban should be imposed on all wild animals; and 32 respondents (1.6%) answered ‘don’t know’.

7.34 The remaining 21 respondents (1%) left this question blank even though 7 provided comments; 2 respondents thought there should be a blanket ban; the remaining comments had no particular relevance to the question.

7.35 In total, 1281 respondents (62.7%) offered comments at Question 18.

Respondents who answered ‘Yes’ there should be a blanket ban

7.36 A total of 1955 respondents answered ‘yes’ and 1234 provided comments; a large number of respondents referred to previous comments or reiterated comments they had provided previously as to why they thought a blanket ban should be put in place.

Key points

7.37 Key points:

- A blanket ban is required because no wild animals regardless of species are naturally designed to live in a captive state in a circus environment – all are negatively impacted so all should be protected and treated equally with the same degree of respect.
- Animal welfare and animal rights equally applies to all animals, not just some.
- A blanket ban would prevent loopholes and grey areas in the law.
- There’s no point unless it’s a blanket ban – a part ban is no ban at all.
- No-one knows if one species of wild animal would suffer less than another so it would be wrong, cruel and unfair to differentiate.
• Banning only 1 or 2 animals makes no sense and would send mixed messages of ambiguity – there can be no half-measures.
• A partial ban would not work because it is not realistically enforceable.
• Who would decide which animals would be banned and which would not.
• There is no feasible justification to allow only some circuses to use wild animals.
• If legislation only covered the banning of some species of wild animals and others were introduced later the list of banned animals would have to be reviewed.

No loopholes

7.38 Many respondents thought it would be pointless to only ban the use of certain wild animals in travelling circuses because they thought there would always be people who would try to bend the rules and get round the law. Respondents perceived that wild animal owners and ‘disreputable circuses’ would look for, find and creatively exploit ‘loopholes’ or ‘grey areas’ in the legislation that only banned the use of some species of wild animals and that this would lead to exemptions, inconsistencies, contradictions and other problems. They also thought that such legislation would be complex, difficult to monitor and realistically unenforceable.

“Unless it is a blanket ban, people will exploit loopholes or ‘grey areas’ and the animals will lose out.” (Individual Respondent)

“There should be no loop-holes in legislation for disreputable circuses to continue to exhibit animals of any shape and form - from flea circuses to elephants standing on impossible small stools - hard to believe this kind of thing still goes on. I would be embarrassed by my government if a ban wasn’t implemented.” (Individual Respondent)

“Wild animals should not be taken from the wild or bred for circus purpose. The Earth is facing a mass extinction of iconic animals due to poaching, habitat loss, trophy hunting, the weird pet trade and for circuses. No exceptions as any loophole would be exploited and put there by circus connections with politicians.” (Individual Respondent)

“Any half-way measures will be open to exploitation and manipulation. A blanket ban ensures that everyone knows where he or she stands; and that anyone with any wild animal on the move on the road, whether as an exhibit or as a performer, breaches the law.” (Individual Respondent)

“A species based ban will be complex. The case for a ban on all wild animal acts is persuasive and compelling” (Individual Respondent)

“For all the reasons above and because a blanket ban would be easier and cheaper to administer.” (Individual Respondent)

7.39 Other respondents considered that the partial ban itself would be the ‘loophole’ as it would leave the door wide open for unscrupulous people to bring into the circus different types of wild animal species that were not covered by the ban; once in the circus environment respondents feared that these animals, in turn, would be trapped either until the list of banned wild animals was reviewed or a blanket ban on the use of all wild animals was finally introduced. Consequently, respondents were clear that they considered half-measures would be weak and would not do; they wanted a simple blanket ban introduced by uncomplicated legislation, without
exemptions or loopholes, that would send a clear, unambiguous message to all concerned. There should be no room for avoiding or circumventing the law.

“No species, large or small, roaming or sedentary, should be kept in these conditions or made to do tricks. A blanket ban is the only way to stop circus owners from trying to get around legislation by getting hold of other species not currently used in circuses. As evidenced in other countries, a ban is also the only way to make circus owners adapt their businesses to provide the kind of entertainment people actually want.” (Individual Respondent)

“So there is no future proliferation or exploitation of a particular unfortunate ‘loophole’ species.” (Individual Respondent)

“I don’t think that one species is more "wild" than another. Besides, if you legislate to cover only certain species, then if others, which are not currently used are introduced at a later date, you then have to review the decision in relation to the new species.” (Individual Respondent)

“Because otherwise there will be loopholes and a ban could mean nothing if people find their way round to letting animals back in circuses.” (Individual Respondent)

“One rule for all, ends confusion, and no "loopholes" within the law” (Individual Respondent)

“There should be no room for avoiding or interpreting the law.” (Individual Respondent)

Fairer

7.40 A few respondents also pointed out that if a partial ban was introduced and the use of only some species of wild animals was allowed to perform in circuses this could result in some circuses being allowed to keep their wild animals while others were not allowed. This would be completely unjustifiable and such a situation could have the potential to create rivalry and competition between circuses that would not be in the best interests of the animals.

“There is no feasible justification for some circuses to be allowed to use wild animals and others not” (Individual Respondent)

Consistent message

7.41 Some respondents also thought that picking and choosing wild animal species to ban would send out mixed messages to young people - it is alright to confine and use this animal in the circus but not that one! This would be confusing and, since all the animals would be wild, difficult to justify.

“Anything short of this would not demonstrate the necessary respect for animal welfare, and would leave some unethical practices to continue to the detriment of animals. Leaving loopholes open would encourage exploitation.” (Individual Respondent)

“To pick and choose species for a ban would be unjust to other species and send mixed messages to young people - its ok to confine this animal but not this one, is confusing.” (Individual Respondent)

“To stamp out animals in circuses for all, there will be no competition then” (Individual Respondent)
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Equality

7.42 The main reason that many respondents wanted a blanket ban as opposed to a partial ban on certain species was because they considered that all wild animals were equal in value, all entitled to the same rights, the same freedoms and all deserving of protection and respect. Respondents simply could not understand how the use of some wild animals could be banned from the circus but other wild animals would continue to be used. Respondents stated that there could be no possible justification for this because, even if some animals suffered more than others - and no one could actually know for sure if some animals suffered more than others - animal welfare and animal rights applied equally to them all, not just some, so it would be cruel and unfair to differentiate between them. Respondents were also extremely concerned about who would decide which wild animals should be banned and which should not.

"It seems to be an absurd question whether some animals suffer more than others in captivity; or whether the suffering of one sort of animal is more acceptable than the other. Suffering is suffering and a strong society should ban it altogether." (Individual Respondent)

"The same reasons of animal welfare apply to all wild animals." (Group Response – Mossburn Community Farm)

"Why discriminate, otherwise it would seem a rather tokenistic gesture if the ban wasn't all inclusive" (Individual Respondent)

"One type of animal should have no more worth than another type of animal." (Individual Respondent)

"We shouldn't differentiate - and where do you draw the line?" (Individual Respondent)

"Because keeping any wild animal in such an unnatural environment is appalling, regardless of which animal it happens to be. A wild animal is a wild animal. One is not more wild than another. Why distinguish between some wild species and not others in that respect? If the animals could talk, I hardly think there would be one species that would say, 'Well actually, I'd prefer to stay cooped up in a cage, in a lorry or performing meaningless tricks for dumb humans than be in my natural environment. Please don't make me go and live in the wild.'" (Individual Respondent)

"The suffering does not stop depending on the animal, location, or standard of care. The environment is utterly unnatural and use nothing to do with gain for the animal." (Individual Respondent)

"Ridiculous to think some deserve saving and respect and not others - all animals are equal." (Individual Respondent)

"All animals are the same and should be respected the same. Should a black man be treated less than a white man, NO. Should a woman be treated less than a man, NO. So you cannot pick and choose, all animals have the same rights." (Individual Respondent)

A blanket ban, as the issues outlined in previous answers above, apply to all wild animals. Placing certain animals above others simply down to anthropomorphic delusions, smacks only of, "all animals are equal, but some are more equal than others!" All wild animals should have their welfare equally protected." (Group Response – Glo-Wild Limited)
Respondents who answered ‘No’ there should not be a blanket ban

7.43 A total of 35 respondents, including 4 of the groups affiliated with the circus industry, answered ‘no’ and 25 provided comments. Five respondents referred to previous answers.

Key points

7.44 Key points:

- 4 respondents thought there was not a shred of credible, genuine or scientific evidence that would support the notion of a ban, 1 of these respondents claiming that there were sufficient legislative controls in place to address any animal health and welfare concerns.
- 2 respondents thought there should be an outright ban.
- 2 respondents considered that a blanket ban would not work claiming that some exotic animals such as camels, zebras and captive bred Indian elephants within the circus environment, could be as ‘domesticated’ as any horse but that some would argue they were wild.
- 2 respondents thought there was no need for a ban, 1 claiming that there had been no welfare breaches relating to circuses in Scotland.
- 2 respondents totally opposed any ban based only on ethical grounds.
- 1 respondent thought that any sort of ban was better than no ban.
- 1 respondent considered that any type of ban was a witch hunt against perfectly expert and ethical circus people.
- 1 respondent thought that perhaps smaller animals like snakes would be able to live happily in a travelling circus.
- 1 respondent thought that existing circus animals would be used to that environment but did not elaborate.
- 1 respondent opposed a blanket ban on any animal in modern classical circuses stating that to blanket ban anything would be illegal and discriminatory.
- The comments of the 3 remaining respondents were unclear.

Sample of respondents’ quotes

"Blanket bans don’t work. A captive bred Indian Elephants can be a domesticated as any horse or camel but some would argue that they were "wild"." (Individual Respondent)

"I have not seen a single shred of credible evidence that would support the notion of a ban. All claims to the contrary should be thoroughly investigated to separate the truth from the lies, hype and the unsubstantiated. There is only one party to this process that has the truth on its side, and that is the circus. Do not for a single minute believe the lies and untrue claims made by Animal Rights Activists. I suggest you investigate such claims and see where the truth is. As I said its not the circus telling lies." (Individual Respondent)

“No I consider any type of ban as a witch hunt against perfectly expert and ethical circus people and an encouragement for again, fanatical radical extremists to chip away at society and get TOTAL animal apartheid, That i what their beliefs are bout. Yo nly have to look on the ridiculous but frightening pages of PETA to see how fanatical their dream ideology is. They truly believe that every species is EQUAL to a human, b it an elephant"
a rat or a fly. These people are mad plain and simple. Do NOT encourage them.”

(Individual Respondent)

“camels and zebras etc with a circus are domesticated” (Individual Respondent)

I don’t feel there is a need for a ban. There has been no welfare breaches in Scotland to my knowledge, there has been no circuses taken to court in Scotland, so there is no need for a ban on any species.” (Individual Respondent)

“Argyll and Bute Council do NOT support the ban as there is no scientific evidence to support this action, and there are sufficient legislative controls in place to address the animal health and welfare concerns. This decision was made by the PPSL Committee on the 19th March 2014. There should be an ability to assess their suitability as there is no evidence to support the ban.” (Group Response – Argyll and Bute Council)

“We fundamentally oppose any ban that is based only on ethical grounds. As long as animal welfare is guaranteed, the public must have the right to decide for itself what kind of circus they want to attend. There are no examples for such bans in other areas that would forbid unharmed behaviour just because it is regarded as "outdated". We also think that an animal living in a travelling circus, being admired and loved by mass audiences and cared for by its trainers and keepers is much more to be considered to be living a full and active life characteristic of its kind than its counterparts living in what is left of their natural habitats. There is no reason to ban animals in circus, because animals are trained in several situations and circus could not be discriminated.” (Group Response – European Circus Association)

“The United Kingdom Classical Circus Association opposes a blanket ban on any animal in modern classical circuses. Each circus should be viewed on its merits and comply with robust regulations in order to gain a license to travel with wild animals. To blanket ban anything would be illegal and discriminatory.” (Group Response – European Circus Association)

“We totally oppose any ban that is based only on ethical grounds. We look for a better welfare standard for animals. In this condition the audience has the right to decide for itself what kind of circus they want to attend. There not a real good reason to ban animals in circus cause animals are trained in several situations and circus could not be dicriminated. And its not even possible to think to ban every kind of training cause will mean to keep animals far from men's life.” (Group Response - Club Amici del Circo)

Respondents who answered ‘Don’t Know’ whether there should be a blanket ban

7.45 A total of 32 respondents answered ‘don’t know’ and 15 provided comments.

Key points

7.46 Key points:

- 11 respondents stated that they were unsure what a blanket ban was but 3 of these respondents thought that, regardless, there should be a complete ban.
- 2 other respondents also said that there should be a complete ban.
- 1 respondent said that it could depend on the animal because small animals could possibly be accommodated but ultimately thought that a blanket ban might be best to avoid any potential loopholes in the law.
1 respondent commented that attention should be paid to what is considered wild and what domesticated because some animals were obviously more adaptable than others.
CONSULTATION QUESTION 19: Do you consider that any specific species of animal not commonly domesticated in the British Islands should be permitted to be used in travelling circuses in Scotland? If so, which species and why?

Table 7.4: Overview of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | No.    | %           | No.   | %  |
|                | comments | comments | No.   | %  |
| No             | 27      |            | 791   |     |
| Yes            | 4       |            | 53    |     |
| Don’t Know     | 1       |            | 10    |     |
| Blank          | -       |            | 9     |     |
| Total          | 32      |            | 863   |     |

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

7.47 A total of 2023 respondents (99%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, the overwhelming majority, 1916 respondents (93.8%) answered ‘no’ indicating that they thought that no specific species of animal not commonly domesticated in the British Islands should be permitted to be used in travelling circuses in Scotland; 84 respondents (4.1%) answered ‘yes’; and 23 respondents (1.1%) answered ‘don’t know’.

7.48 The remaining 20 respondents (1%) left this question blank even though 9 provided comments; 6 respondents commented in line with a ‘no’ response; 1 respondent thought that any species of animal should be permitted to be used in travelling circuses; 1 respondent thought it would have been better to specify which species were classed as commonly domesticated; and the remaining respondent thought that perhaps some animals domesticated in other countries could be permitted to be used in travelling circuses, as long as they were not tropical animals or animals from cold climates, and their specific needs could be met; however, no specific species were mentioned.

7.49 In total, 895 respondents (43.8%) offered comments at Question 19.

Respondents who answered ‘No’ there should be no exemptions

7.50 A total of 1916 respondents, including 3 of the groups affiliated with the circus industry, answered ‘no’ and 818 offered comments. Many respondents who commented referred to previous answers or simply confirmed that they thought a blanket ban should be imposed on the use of all animals in a travelling circus.

Key points

7.51 Key points:

- Some ‘wild’ animals such as camelids are domesticated in other countries so may be suitable for use in circuses.
• Some reptiles, small birds and small animals may be suitable for display purposes.
• Only domesticated animals native to the UK and fully adapted to a human-controlled environment, such as horses and dogs, would be suitable substitutes for performing wild animals.
• Exotic animals should not be imported because the risk of disease was too high.
• The Scottish definition of ‘wild’ animals is outdated.

General comments

7.52 Respondents mostly said no because they considered that the circus was a cruel, unnatural environment for wild animals and could not meet their needs; all wild animals had the right to be free in their natural habitat; wild animals should not be exploited for gain and coerced to perform for human entertainment; or a combination of these reasons.

7.53 A considerable number of respondents stated that no animals should be subjected to life in a circus regardless of species and whether or not they were from the British Isles and several respondents stated categorically that no animals whatsoever, wild or domesticated, should be exhibited or made to perform in a circus and that a ban should be placed on the use of all animals.

“Any ban should be consistent and not allow for any loopholes or grey areas. The ban should also be based on what is not commonly domesticated in the British Isles.” (Group Response - British Veterinary Association)

Possible exemptions

7.54 Possible exemptions:

• Small and easy - A very small number of respondents thought that some reptiles, small birds, small cats, small monkeys and rodents might be suitable for display purposes because they could be well cared for and kept reasonably easily.

• Domesticated animals - Other respondents thought that possibly camels, llamas, alpacas and other camelids and even some elephants were fairly domesticated in other countries and could possibly be less sensitive to captive conditions in a circus environment; however, some respondents were not entirely convinced of this, one respondent stating that such animals could probably adapt to a travelling circus life but preferred that there were no animals in circuses; and another believing that, although it would be easier to give such animals large exercise areas where they could graze and associate freely, the arrangement was unlikely to be feasible or practical.

A few other respondents said that, in theory, only domesticated animals native to the UK and fully adapted to a human-controlled environment, such as horses and dogs, would be suitable substitutes for performing wild animals; again, however, respondents were not convinced that any animals whatsoever should be living in a circus environment but, if any were, they should have limited exposure to stress
and the chance to have a high quality of life; in addition, their welfare should ideally be protected by regulation and monitoring.

“OneKind does not consider that any animal should be used in travelling circuses. The confined, constantly travelling lifestyle is unsuitable for a sentient animal and unlike human performers the animals do not have any choice as to whether they participate in it. There is no pressing necessity for humans to watch animals performing tricks in the circus ring; therefore that can be no justification on grounds of need.”  (Group Response – OneKind)

Two of the groups affiliated with the circus industry also considered that many species of animals had already been domesticated in countries outside the UK and that these species should be excluded from a ban along with domesticated animals in Britain; they pointed out that, in their opinion, the Scottish definition of ‘wild’ animals was outdated. It was their strong belief, however, that no animal species should be banned from the circus. They stated they were content for strict regulations to be introduced and considered that if circuses managed to comply with the rules of such legislation, there was no reason why they should not be allowed to continue to present their animals to audiences (see quote below).

“If anything is outdated, it is the Scottish definition of so called “wild” animals as “a kind that is not commonly domesticated in Great Britain”. There are many species that have been domesticated for centuries elsewhere in the world. In times of globalization at least such species must be excluded from a ban along with those domesticated in Britain. But it is our strong belief that no species should be banned at all. Ideally all species could live, work and be raised correctly with man, especially at circus. There should be strict regulations that might make it difficult, sometimes almost impossible for travelling circuses to keep them. But if such regulations are met by a circus, there is no reason to stop it from presenting those animals to their audiences.” (Group Response – European Circus Association)

- Non-native animals - A couple of respondents felt that animals not indigenous to Britain or Scotland should not be imported into the country under any circumstances because the risk of bringing in disease was too high. One respondent thought that the borders should be very strictly policed to prohibit the entry of animals.

Respondents who answered ‘yes’ there should be exemptions

7.55 A total of 84 respondents, including 1 group affiliated with the circus industry, answered ‘yes’ and 57 provided comments; more than half commented in line with a ‘no’ response, indicating or implying that no animals should be used in circuses, or referred to previous comments; a few other comments were not particularly relevant to the question and a couple of other respondents appeared to believe incorrectly that circus animals were subject to licensing conditions in Scotland.

Needs met

7.56 Several of the remaining respondents indicated in their comments that all animals should be permitted to be used in travelling circuses so long as circuses had the ability to provide for the animals’ welfare. One respondent pointed out that it
would be unfortunate if animals such as racoons and various reptiles could not appear in circuses but could appear in other leisure venues such as pet shows and fairs (see quote below); scorpions and tarantulas were also suggested as possibly being suitable for use in circuses.

**Domesticated animals**

7.57 A few respondents thought that domesticated animals could be used in the circus, dogs in particular, but that strict regulation would be required to protect their welfare. A few respondents commented that, in particular, animals considered domesticated in other countries such as camels, llamas and zebra, although not indigenous to the UK, should be permitted for circus use; 1 respondent stated that elephants and arguably big cats were also domesticated in other countries (see quote below). Another suggested that only those wild animals born in captivity with no realistic hope of rehabilitation or release should be used.

> “Because they do not have to be domesticated in Scotland to be domesticated. That is a ridiculous excuse to ban. Elephants have been domesticated for centuries in Asia, and even African ones were domesticated by Hannibal. Camels are domesticated in arabia, big cats are several generations down from the wild in circus so are arguably domesticated as being unable to hunt for themselves. Would you suggest these animals were sent back to the wild to starve to death?” *(Individual Respondent)*

> “There are a number of none native animal species that can be freely kept within the UK without any form of restriction or licensing, (e.g. raccoons, various reptiles) it therefore seem unfortunate that these animals can not appear in a circus but can appear in other leisure venues such as pet shows and fairs.” *(Individual Respondent)*

> “As long as the circus has the resources, knowledge, an ability to provide for the animals welfare, wellbeing, housing, veterinary needs and have an honourable commitment to the animals in its care then no animal should be banned.” *(Group Response - Classical Circus Association)*

**Respondents who answered ‘don’t know’ whether there should be exemptions**

7.58 A total of 23 respondents answered ‘don’t know’ and 11 provided comments; 1 respondent stated that any animal should be permitted to be used in circuses and 2 respondents answered in line with a ‘no’ response by stating that no animals should be used.

**Possible exemptions**

7.59 A small number of respondents considered that small animals such as ferrets, rats, guinea pigs and some parrots, if they could be trained and kept well and if they were relaxed around humans, could be permitted to be used in circuses; also horses, dogs, livestock such as cows, sheep and pigs and animals domesticated outside the UK. However, one respondent advised caution, pointing out that to take advantage of the behaviour that came naturally to dogs, even though they liked doing tricks and were crowd pleasers, was cruelty in itself.
Another respondent suggested that care should be taken when defining animals that were wild and animals that were domesticated because not all domesticated animals should remain in circuses either since some were better equipped to deal with performances than others.

One respondent suggested that animals that would otherwise be destroyed and animals that had been in laboratories and could not be set free might be better off in circus conditions if the alternative was to be put down.

Another respondent suggested that possibly monkeys could be permitted to be used in circuses as they interacted well with man and could have a social life in captivity; it was observed, however, that this could open doors to the already rampant illegal wildlife trade.
CONSULTATION QUESTION 20: Do you consider that there are key species that should be covered by a ban in the event that a blanket ban could not be achieved? If so, which species and why?

Table 7.5: Overview of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% comments</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%.

7.63 A total of 1950 respondents (95.5%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, the majority, 960 respondents (47%) answered ‘no’ indicating that they thought there were no key species that should be covered in the event that a blanket ban on the use of all wild animals in travelling circuses could not be achieved; 781 respondents (38.2%) answered ‘yes’ indicating that there were key species that could be covered; and 209 respondents (10.2%) answered ‘don’t know’.

7.64 The remaining 93 respondents left this question blank even though 41 of them commented. Most stated that there had to be or that they would prefer to have a blanket ban on the use of all wild animals in travelling circuses rather than a partial ban; however, a few said that if a blanket ban could not be achieved as many species as possible should be banned and, in particular:

- All endangered species;
- Larger animals that should naturally live in acres of space and have social interaction with their own species;
- Animals that cannot be released into a paddock to graze without shackles;
- Species that would migrate in the wild;
- Elephants;
- Big cats, in particular lions and tigers;
- Primates, in particular monkeys, chimps and baboons;
- Camels;
- Zebras;
- Bears;
- Reptiles;
- Penguins;
- Birds.

7.65 In total, 1443 respondents (70.6%) offered comments at Question 20.
Respondents who answered ‘No’ there are no key species to ban

7.66 A total of 960 respondents, including 4 of the groups affiliated with the circus industry, answered ‘no’ and 653 provided comments.

Key points

7.67 Key points:

- A blanket ban is required because all wild animals need to be protected, respected and treated equally.
- A partial ban on only some species of wild animals is a compromise and is unacceptable.
- Who has the right to decide which species are ‘key’ and which are not.
- If a blanket ban is impossible then the use of endangered species and the larger roaming species should, in particular, be banned.
- The use of wild animals in travelling circuses should be regulated in Scotland and any circuses meeting the conditions should be able to keep and present all species.

Blanket ban

7.68 All but 6 respondents were strongly in favour of a blanket ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses. A few respondents referred to previous questions but the vast majority pointed out that only a complete blanket ban could prevent exploitation and suffering and that all wild animals had the right to be treated with dignity and respect; all wild animals had to be protected; and all wild animals should be treated equally because they were all equally important. A number of respondents stated that they could not understand why a blanket ban could not be achieved and several others insisted that there was no practical reason why a blanket ban could not be achieved.

"All species should be covered by a ban. There can be no compromises. This question is the equivalent of someone stating that children under 12 deserve to be protected from domestic abuse, but those between 12-18 don’t because they can somehow tolerate the abuse, or make sense of it!” (Individual Respondent)

"Only a blanket ban would prevent the exploitation and abuse of animals. A ban which applied only to certain species would be inadequate and extremely disappointing as it would mean the Scottish Government had failed in their commitment to animal welfare.” (Individual Respondent)

"We do not believe that there is any justification to allow the continued use of certain wild animals whilst prohibiting the use of others. The ethical arguments in opposition of the use of wild animals in circuses apply regardless of the species under consideration....” (Group Response – OneKind)

Defining key species

7.69 Many respondents queried that, in the event of a partial ban, how wild animals could be separated out and choices made as to which were the ‘key’ species and which were not and who had the right to make the decision. This was
discrimination. Even if some species suffered more than others, respondents considered strongly that it was unfair to choose one species over another because those animals left behind in circuses would be subjected to cruelty and imprisonment for the remainder of their lives and none of them deserved this. Respondents were therefore adamant that, for the benefit of all wild animals, without exception, no compromise would do; only a blanket ban would be ethical.

“A blanket ban can be achieved if there is a will to do so. If there is a sense of feebleness, then one would need to talk of key species. However, as with slavery, how would one differentiate between them. Which species is more deserving than another and how do we earn the right to judge?” (Individual Respondent)

“Once again, no compromise, otherwise you would create speciesism which to many of us is as bad as racism, ageism etc. who are we to decide which creature is more important than the other? That would make us very arrogant don’t you think?” (Group Response - Teacher and AS pupils in RS Ysgol Gyfun Gwyr)

“Although it would be some comfort to know that at least some species may be spared thanks to the ban, I hope that the Scottish government make the right decision and support a blanket ban. Who could truly make the decision on which species should be protected by the ban and which species should not? All wild animals deserve to be free of a life of ridicule and cruelty and I truly hope that the Scottish government decide to support this by calling for a blanket ban.” (Individual Respondent)

“I was tempted to say elephant but in truth all animals that are used by circuses are sentient and intelligent and would suffer. We should not start discriminating on the basis of ‘favourite’ species and I see no reason why there cannot be a full ban which would protect all wild animals.” (Individual Respondent)

Suggested key species

7.70 A few respondents did, however, attempt to address the question by suggesting which species they thought it would be most important to ban in the event that a blanket ban could not be achieved. All stated categorically that a blanket ban would be preferable but, failing that, a ban on endangered species, such as elephants, lions, tigers and bears should be imposed.

7.71 Other respondents said that, in particular, the larger roaming species which would not be comfortable in tiny dark circus wagons, such as elephants, big cats (lions, tigers, leopards etc.), giraffes and rhinos, should be banned.

7.72 Other suggested creatures for banning were monkeys, camels, sea lions and snakes although one respondent thought that possibly snakes could be excluded from a ban. It was also suggested that mammals should definitely be banned because it was perceived that they had a higher capacity for suffering. Some respondents thought that the use of domestic animals should also be banned.

“Pragmatically of course endangered animals should be banned, like tigers, leopards. Also elephants in the light of what is happening to these animals through unrestricted poaching. To allow some animals to escape the ban might just expose too many loopholes for the unscrupulous to exploit” (Individual Respondent)
No Ban

7.73 Only 6 respondents, including the groups affiliated with the circus industry, considered that no wild animals in travelling circuses should be banned. One respondent stated that the current regulations in England worked well so these should be implemented in Scotland. Three of the circus groups referred to previous questions but one was of the opinion that if a circus can meet the conditions of good regulations it should be able to keep and present all species.

"NO, there are NO animals that should be banned. They have all appeared for centuries with only two British RSPCA prosecutions in all t at time, yet thousands of RSPCA prosecutions a year for pet owners. hat is a fantastic record for circus people so why ban ANY?"  (Individual Respondent)

"The current regulations in England work well, so these should be implemented in Scotland too. Not a ban."  (Individual Respondent)

"If a circus can meet the conditions of good regulations, it should be able to keep and present all species."  (Group Response - Federation Mondiale du Cirque)

Respondents who answered ‘Yes’ there are key species to ban

7.74 A total of 781 respondents answered ‘yes’ and 682 provided comments.

Defining key species

7.75 Nearly half of the respondents who commented stated that it was difficult to near impossible to select which species should be banned because all deserved equal treatment and all deserved to be free to follow their instincts and live their lives in the wild. Respondents said that they would find it disheartening if a blanket ban was not achieved because it would be unfair on those animals that ended up unprotected. One respondent stated that only animal experts should decide which animal species were key if a blanket ban could not be achieved.

Loophole

7.76 In addition, respondents pointed out that the problem with banning key species was that circuses would simply look for species not covered by the ban so they perceived that anything short of a blanket ban was likely to be as good as useless. In their opinion, the only ethical choice was to ban the use of all wild animals (some respondents also wanted domestic animals to be banned) in travelling circuses and this should be aimed for; a partial ban would only be a step in the right direction. However, if a partial ban was all that could be achieved in the first instance, then as many species as possible should be covered by the ban.
Suggested key species

7.77 Respondents who provided key species for banning either did so using group or specific species selections; explanations were provided by respondents for some of the selections but by no means for all of them, respondents merely pointing out that their animal selections were unsuitable for the circus environment or that they were at risk.

List of group selections

7.78 List of group selections:

- Larger wild animals (64 respondents).
- Endangered species of wild animals (58 respondents).
- Any non-native species/exotic animals (46 respondents).
- Species that need huge amounts of space and the freedom to roam or travel over large distances (30 respondents).
- Wild mammals, particularly large ones (25 respondents).
- Highly social animals that live in packs or need the company of their own kind for their emotional wellbeing (16 respondents).
- Large wild predators/carnivores because they need to hunt (10 respondents).
- Wild animals that are dangerous to work with and which would normally kill a human in the wild if they felt threatened (7 respondents).
- Animals most exposed to suffering because of captivity and which show distressed patterns of behaviour (6 respondents).
- All species that would not readily interact with humans or perform for humans in their natural habitat (5 respondents).
- Species with a scientifically proven higher level of intelligence (5 respondents).
- Species that are wild–caught or bred from wild-caught (3 respondents).
- Species for which a ‘natural environment’ within the circus could not be sustained (3 respondents).
- Nocturnal Animals (2 respondents).
- All animals that have to be shipped from other countries (2 respondents).
- Herd animals with strong flight instincts (2 respondents).
- Large hoof animals (1 respondent).
- Those species most commonly used in circuses (1 respondent).
- Any animal that is denied a natural life (1 respondent).
- Any animals that are too large for cages (1 respondent).
- Animals that are permanently caged and cannot roam free (1 respondent).
- Animals that are very territorial and don’t take well to travelling (1 respondent).
- Animals that show distress (1 respondent).
- Species that are particularly timid (1 respondent).
- Animals with low survival rates and high mortality rates among offspring (1 respondent).
- Animals that care for their young (1 respondent).
• Animals that only use land as a temporary place to rest or to give birth (1 respondent).

Larger wild animals (elephants, big cats, apes and bears)

7.79 Respondents’ perception was that the greater the size of the animal, the more relatively constrained its life was in the world of the circus. Typically, larger animals inhabited larger territories and roamed long distances in the wild so their size made their confinement more significant because there was no opportunity for them to exhibit this natural behaviour; instead, they were caged or confined in the travelling circus environment and respondents considered this to be completely unethical. In addition, respondents considered that these animals were denied all their natural social needs and since these animals were perceived to be very intelligent, their physical and psychological welfare was at stake.

Endangered species of wild animals (elephants, tigers, species where populations in the wild are on the decline)

7.80 Respondents considered that the more endangered a species was the less it should be used for entertainment; endangered species should be left in the wild or in wildlife sanctuaries in their own countries because they were valuable to ecology and the environment; respondents perceived that removing any from the breeding pool could make the difference between survival and extinction. Respondents pointed out that these animals were already under threat from poaching.

Any non-native species/exotic animals

7.81 Respondents considered that animals not commonly domesticated in the British Isles such as African, Asian, American, Eurasian and Australasian animal types were unable to exhibit natural behaviours such as walking extensive distances, finding food, climbing trees and breeding. Respondents pointed out that these animals had to be protected and their natural behaviours, habitats and good welfare were far too unachievable in a circus environment.

Wild mammals, particularly large ones (elephants, big cats, primates)

7.82 Respondents did not offer much by way of explanation as to why they thought it important to ban the use of wild mammals in travelling circuses, simply stating that large mammals were unsuitable given the complexity of their physical and social lives. In addition, respondents considered prey mammals to be especially ill-equipped to be in circus environments; also any large social and/or highly strung hoofed mammals (giraffes, hippos, antelope, zebra); and large or fast mammals. Respondents stated that the ability of mammals to suffer in unnatural environments was well documented and that it was impossible to give them a natural habitat in a circus environment.
Specific species selections

7.83 As already stated, many respondents simply listed species they considered key for banning in their comment boxes. The tables below indicate the specific species selected and the number of respondents who selected them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Species</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Specific Species</th>
<th>No. of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elephants</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>Antelope</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigers</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Jaguars</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Cats</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Kangaroos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bears</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>Ostriches</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkeys</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Panthers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Polar Bears</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Pumas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebras</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Sea Mammals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giraffes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Wild Dogs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primates</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Wild Horses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seals</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Alligators</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camels</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Amphibians</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Lions</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Baboons</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippos</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bonobos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimpanzees</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cougars</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolphins</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Deer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Animals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Emus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopards</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Exotic Birds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snakes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Falcons</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolves</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fruit Bats</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gazelle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheetahs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Large species of fish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llamas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lemurs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhinos</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lynx</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lizards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Orangutans</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Type</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Animal Type</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorillas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Orcas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodiles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Poisonous snakes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donkeys</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ponies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyenas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Raptures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrots</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sharks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyotes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sloths</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Small Wild Cats</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Birds/Birds of Prey</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spiders</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reptiles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tapirs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Birds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Walrus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Elephants** - Respondents thought the circus environment was particularly unsuitable for elephants, which were perceived as being highly intelligent, sensitive creatures, because they considered that the animals’ special needs could never be met in such an unsuitable environment. Respondents were of the opinion that elephants would be particularly affected by the unnatural living conditions and, as they were highly social creatures, any kept singly in circuses would suffer a long lonely existence; these animals needed to live in family groups and have whole herd interactions. In the opinion of respondents there was no way a circus could duplicate the kind of life these animals should have no matter how well meaning they might be. According to respondents, elephants required huge amounts of space to travel across to keep their feet and joints healthy and circuses could never provide enough space for them. Elephants needed to live in the wild with their own kind because their liberty was so totally denied in the circus environment.

- **Big cats** - Respondents considered that big cats in particular could not express natural behaviours in the circus environment and did not adapt to captivity. According to respondents lions and tigers would naturally be given to aggression and would therefore be distressed in an artificial environment; big cats belonged in the wild where they could roam freely and kill prey; there was no way a circus could duplicate what should be their natural life in the wild.

- **Primates** - Some respondents considered that primates would particularly suffer in a circus environment because they were one of the most susceptible species; they were intelligent, highly social animals with very specific needs that could never be fully met in the transient environment of the circus. One respondent did not agree with this, however, considering that primates could be happy in a circus environment if they were well treated and allowed to live in a social group of their own.
Respondents who answered ‘don’t know’ whether there are key species to ban

7.84 A total of 209 respondents answered ‘don’t know’ and 41 provided comments;

Key points

7.85 Key points:

- Prefer to have a blanket ban.
- Endangered species in particular should be banned.
- Animals should all be treated the same.
- How can key species be selected - no animal is more important than any other.
- A partial ban would only be acceptable if that’s the best that can be done and, if it is, as many animals as possible should be banned.
- Science-based decisions are the only decisions that bear examination in this sort of determination.
- If a blanket ban cannot be achieved education about the animals’ plight in their natural habitats should be increased in order to raise awareness.
- The larger species such as elephants, lions and tigers in particular should be banned.
- Wild animals that should be in their own habitats should be banned.

General comments

7.86 Most respondents stated that they would prefer to see a blanket ban put in place because no animal was more important than any other so there was no justifiable reason to treat different species differently. However, a small number of respondents indicated that, if a blanket ban could not be achieved and a partial ban was the best that could be done, as many animals as possible should be protected; in particular, the endangered species and the larger species such as elephants, lions and tigers.

7.87 One respondent commented that if a blanket ban could not be achieved there needed to be a rise in education and awareness of how close some of these animals were to extinction so that people did not merely accept what they saw but understood where the animals came from and the very real difficulties they faced with the destruction of their natural habitats. Another respondent pointed out that only science-based decisions could determine which key species of animals to ban in the event that a blanket ban could not be achieved.

7.88 Three respondents stated that they did not know what a blanket ban was.
8. **ANY OTHER COMMENTS**

8.1 The final section of the consultation document contained 4 questions and offered respondents the opportunity to raise any issues they did not consider had been covered, and to provide feedback on the consultation itself. This section contained 4 questions:

**Consultation Question 21.** Do you have any other comments on whether/how the use of wild animals in travelling circuses should be banned in Scotland?

**Consultation Question 22.** Do you consider that the consultation paper explained the key issues sufficiently for you to properly consider your responses?

**Consultation Question 23.** Do you consider that you had sufficient time to respond to the consultation?

**Consultation Question 24.** Do you have any other comments on the way this consultation has been conducted?

8.2 Questions 22 and 23 were multiple choice questions that gave respondents the option of selecting ‘yes’, ‘no’, or ‘don’t know’ in each case. Questions 21 and 24 only gave respondents the choice of selecting ‘yes’ or ‘no’. The meaning of these choices within the context of these questions is self-evident.
CONSULTATION QUESTION 21: Do you have any other comments on whether/how the use of wild animals in travelling circuses should be banned in Scotland?

Table 8.1: Overview of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% comments</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

8.3 A total of 1929 respondents (94.4%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, the majority, 1191 respondents (58.3%) answered ‘no’ indicating that they did not have any other comments on whether/how the use of wild animals in travelling circuses should be banned in Scotland; and 738 respondents (36.1%) answered ‘yes’. In total, 868 respondents (42.5%) offered comments at Question 21.

8.4 A total of 114 respondents left the question blank even though 73 provided comments.

Summary of main points across all respondents

8.5 Most of the comments were reiterated from previous questions; in particular, respondents repeated requests for a ban stating that the use of wild animals in circuses was, ‘unethical’, ‘inhumane’, ‘unnecessary’, ‘unjustifiable’ and ‘outdated’. A few respondents were concerned about what would happen to the wild animals following a ban and asked that they be retired to a suitable sanctuary or wildlife park so that proper provision could be made for them.

8.6 A few respondents offered comments on enforcement in the event of a ban stating that inadequate enforcement would make a mockery of any ban so strict enforcement and unannounced monitoring must take place with penalties for any offences; placing reliance on the public to report any issues and on the police to respond to these reports would not be good enough. Two respondents also wanted to see a ban on the transportation of wild animals for commercial use in circuses or simply a law to stop the movement of wild animals in Scotland and another respondent wanted a ban placed on the importation of any wild animals to the UK.

8.7 One or two other respondents were concerned with the transition period following a ban and suggested that the use of the wild animals could be phased out (although, for the sake of the animals, not over too long a period) to allow circuses time to adjust; in addition, advice and support could be offered to any circus owners who felt they needed help.

8.8 Only one respondent who left the question blank asked that a ban on the use wild animals in travelling circuses not be imposed.
Respondents who answered ‘No’, no further comments

8.9 A total of 1191 respondents, including 1 of the groups affiliated with the circus industry, answered ‘no’ and 71 provided comments. In line with their ‘no’ responses, the comments of most respondents simply hoped that they had explained their views thoroughly or made their feelings on the issue clear. Several respondents called once again for a complete ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses to be imposed as soon as possible but raised no new points. One respondent stated that a ban would be illegal but did not elaborate; another respondent commented that the public should have a chance to see wild or domestic animals in circuses if they wanted to and that these animals were just like ‘pets’ to their owners.

Respondents who answered ‘yes’ they had further comments

8.10 A total of 738 respondents, including 3 of the groups affiliated with the circus industry, answered ‘yes’ indicating that they had other comments to make on whether/how the use of wild animals in travelling circuses should be banned in Scotland; only 14 respondents did not actually provide any comments.

Respondents who answered ‘yes’ and supported a ban

- Key points

8.11 Key points:

- A complete ban on wild animals in circuses is the only way to prevent abuse.
- Animals should be retired or rehomed to live out their lives at wildlife sanctuaries or nature reserves; they should not be destroyed.
- The use of domestic animals should also be banned in circuses.
- There should be a complete UK wide ban.
- A ban in Scotland may encourage other countries to follow suit.
- Animals should be carefully monitored following a ban to ensure their welfare.
- Circuses could receive financial support or other incentives for giving up the use of their animals.
- A blanket ban with a short lead in period should be introduced in such a way that would prevent exploitation and loopholes.
- Banning would make circuses easier to police.
- There should be a ban on the transportation of wild animals for commercial use or a law to stop the movement of wild animals in Scotland.
- The breeding of animals for and by circuses should cease.
- If wild animal circuses want to enter Scotland following a ban the animals should be kept in animal welfare accommodation.
- Wild animals should not be allowed to enter Scotland even if other housing arrangements are made for the animals.

Reasons for a ban

8.12 The vast majority of comments by respondents who supported a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses either reiterated or summarised the points
they had made in previous questions; several specifically referred to their responses to question 20 stating that a complete ban on wild animals in circuses was the only way to prevent abuse.

8.13 A few respondents also argued that a blanket ban would negate the need for a licensing system, which would have involved costly inspections and law enforcement, and would also solve any possible dilemmas over which species of wild animals to ban.

8.14 The arguments in support of a ban were many and varied and all reiterated from previous questions. The main reasons respondents thought that a complete ban was the only ethical and moral option were that it was ‘cruel’, ‘unacceptable’, ‘unnecessary’, ‘medieval’ and ‘demeaning’ to force wild animals to live an unnatural life in a circus environment just for the sake of profit and entertainment; animals should be free to live in their own environments in the wild. Respondents also thought that the animals were unable to carry out their natural behaviours, that their welfare needs were not being met in the circus environment and that a ban on their use would positively educate children.

8.15 Several respondents also thought that the use of domestic animals should be banned in circuses as well.

**Timing and scope of a ban**

8.16 Many respondents wanted a ban to be imposed in Scotland as soon as possible but would ideally have preferred a UK ban to ensure a consistent approach across England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Respondents were also hopeful that a ban in Scotland would encourage the rest of Europe and beyond to do the same until eventually a worldwide ban was achieved.

“We would support measures by the Scottish Government to work with DEFRA, the Welsh Assembly and, if possible, the Northern Ireland Assembly, in order to implement a Great Britain or United Kingdom-wide ban, which would allow for a joined-up and consistent approach across England, Scotland, Wales and, ideally, Northern Ireland.

Notwithstanding the above, we understand that a joint legislative approach might not be deemed the most appropriate or desirable by the Scottish Government. If this is the case we would fully support the implementation of primary legislation to bring about full prohibition on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses.” (Group Response - The Captive Animals’ Protection Society)

**Disposal of animals**

8.17 Several respondents were concerned about what would happen to the animals following a ban. It would appear that they perceived animals being retired from travelling circuses and it was considered possible such animals could be in danger of being abandoned or released into the wild by the circuses, or even euthanased. Consequently it was considered prudent, especially with regard to dangerous animals and animals unable to care for themselves, that they should be carefully monitored, possibly even registered and microchipped, to prevent any of this from occurring. Thereafter the animals should be retired or rehomed to live out
their lives at suitable wildlife sanctuaries or nature reserves. It was considered to be extremely important that no animals were allowed to be destroyed.

8.18 Major animal welfare organisations expressed their willingness to assist with the rehoming of wild animals in the event of a complete ban (see quote below). A small number of respondents wondered if circuses would receive any financial support or other incentives for giving up the use of their animals; assuming legislation was passed, 1 respondent wished the Scottish Government in conjunction with the UK and EU Parliaments to set aside adequate funding to create a formal European framework for relocating former circus wild animals to an appropriate sanctuary, where they could live out the remainder of their lives in relative freedom and in the care of people who have animal welfare as their priority.

"Members of Quaker Concern for Animals believe that any ban should be implemented within the framework of a thorough plan to re-home all circus animals in appropriate places of sanctuary." (Group Response - Quaker Concern for Animals)

"Once a ban has taken place the government need to assure that all the animals that are used in travelling circuses are not just killed or abandoned just because the circuses don't know what to do with them. Something needs to be put in place to make sure all the animals are safe and are living in the correct atmosphere." (Individual Respondent)

"Some animals that have spent a life in a circus environment would need to be given careful consideration as to how their continuing needs would be met. What support would be made available to ensure any rehabilitation required? Any legislation might want to consider a scaled ban to ensure that no new animals are introduced into any travelling circus with immediate effect, a set period of time for animals to be rehabilitated, renowned or life care outside of the circus. Care also needs to be given of how the ban would be policed as to the retirement if current wild animals from circus life to ensure that abuse and/ or premature termination of life is not precipitated by the ban." (Individual Respondent)

"The Born Free Foundation, alongside the other major animal welfare organisations involved in this issue, have stated their willingness to assist in offering more suitable homes for any wild animals currently in circuses in the event of a complete ban. We strongly advocate the adoption of official rehoming plans to ensure humane and effective dispersal and retirement of wild animals from travelling circuses in the event of a ban." (Group Response - Born Free Foundation)

Format of ban

8.19 A number of respondents commented on how the use of wild animals in travelling circuses should be banned in Scotland. It was considered that a blanket ban with a short lead in period should be introduced in such a way that would prevent exploitation and loopholes. Banning would make circuses easier to police. A few respondents also wanted to see a ban on the transportation of wild animals for commercial use in circuses or simply a law to stop the movement of wild animals in Scotland. One respondent thought that the breeding of animals for and by circuses should cease in the first instance.

8.20 Some respondents thought that if wild animal circuses wanted to enter Scotland the wild animals should be kept in animal welfare accommodation; other respondents stated that circuses with wild animals should not be allowed to enter
into Scotland even if other housing arrangements were made for the animals while the circus was in Scotland; in other words, these circuses should not be supported in any way.

“The use of wild animals in travelling circuses should be banned as soon as possible, especially as no circuses are currently touring in Scotland. Additionally it is encouraging to see that, judging by the wording in the consultation, pg.22, which states the “need to make alternative accommodation arrangements for the wild animals if they are not permitted to bring them into Scotland”, that travel will be banned in addition to performance and exhibition. This is the only way to ensure that a ban, if hopefully introduced, is not one in name only – if circuses are still permitted to travel with wild animals, these species will continue to suffer and be unable to fulfil their natural behaviours.” (Individual Respondent)

“As I mentioned before I believe it’s important to not only ban the performance of such organisations in Scotland but also their transportation.

Any transportation of wild animals for commercial use in circuses should be banned, as to prevent them from even traveling through Scotland and limiting them even more.”

(Individual Respondent)

“Make it a law to stop the movement of wild animals.”

(Individual Respondent)

“Only that it should come in as soon as possible and take immediate effect. Circuses with animals should not be allowed into Scotland even if other housing arrangements are made for the animals whilst the circus is in Scotland. These circuses should not be supported in any way. That is not living up to the purpose and intention behind the ban.”

(Individual Respondent)

“All circus that uses wild animals should be banned from Scotland even if they agree to leave their wild animals outside of Scotland they should still not be allowed in.”

(Individual Respondent)

Additional quotes

“Given the worldwide concerns and issues regarding the destruction of habitats and animal and plant species it’s difficult see how Scotland could choose to allow it to continue. By banning the practice Scotland would set a really positive example for other countries to follow and give a huge boost to animal welfare in general”

(Individual Respondent)

“From a wider perspective, the use of wild animals for performance gives concern re: sourcing the animals. The poaching of animals globally is a huge problem. It is possible that this industry contributes to criminal activities (even inadvertently) by creating a demand for wild animals”

(Individual Respondent)

“Give them up to a year to change their format, in Scotland, Inform all circuses that the use of wild animals in circuses will not be tolerated in Scotland. Any circuses coming in to Scotland must be made aware of the ban and informed their animals will be impounded if they break the law. You must have people to impose this.”

(Individual Respondent)

“Ban all of them to make it easier to police. It is a cruel way of life for any animal. Ensure that they are inspected before allowing them into Scotland to make sure they carry none of these animals. & do spot checks without giving them warning while they are in residence.”

(Individual Respondent)
It has been suggested that the Scottish Government could accept the offer made by the UK government to include Scotland in the scope of any Bill to ban the use of wild animal in travelling circuses in England. OneKind would support a joined-up and consistent approach across England, Scotland, Wales and, ideally, Northern Ireland.

This would both ensure that legislation was consistent and contemporaneous across Scotland and England (and possibly the other devolved administrations) and reduce the amount of Scottish Government and Scottish Parliament time that needs to be spent on this issue.

While OneKind supports, promotes and campaigns for a full ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses in Scotland, we acknowledge that there are currently no such circuses in Scotland and, as interest in circuses appears to be dwindling on mainland UK, we believe that there is little risk of an upsurge. We are clear that circuses must be banned but we would not wish to see a disproportionate amount of time spent on this issue when there are other pressing animal welfare issues that require attention.

The Scottish Government would of course have to be satisfied that the Westminster legislation was comprehensive and covered all wild animals, with a satisfactory definition of wild animals, i.e. all non-domesticated animals. Please see our response to Question 20, above.

A further concern, already highlighted by organisations south of the border, is that the definition of the term “use” of wild animals at section 1, subsection (2) of the English Bill could allow for animals to continue to travel with the circus as long as they are not used for performance or exhibition. To allow this would be to ignore all the evidence that the constant transportation, the cramped, temporary and unnatural nature of the living environments and the unnatural social groupings which are necessitated by the keeping of wild animals in circuses are of equal concern to those surrounding training, performance and exhibition. We hope the Bill will be amended in this regard.

If involved with the Westminster legislation, we would ask the Scottish Government to be vigilant in ensuring that it safeguards the interests of all wild animals potentially used in travelling circuses, in all the relevant administrations. (Group Response – OneKind)

“The breeding of animals for and by circuses should cease first. Animals who die of old age or natural causes should not be replaced. No animals should be purchased from the wild.” (Individual Respondent)

Respondents who answered ‘yes’ and did not support a ban

Key points

8.21 Key points:

- Strict regulation with a licensing system, fines and imprisonment for offences would protect animal welfare and satisfy any public concerns.
- Wild animals in the circus is part of British culture.
- People will not stop at banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses - they will move on to other performing animals.
- A ban would be unfair on responsible circuses that take their welfare obligations towards their animals seriously.
- The scientific evidence is insufficient to support a ban.
• There are sufficient legislative controls in place to address any animal health and welfare concerns.
• The consultation is flawed, biased and unfair; animal wellbeing is dependent on the animal’s carer.
• Scientific investigations have demonstrated that the correct use of circus animals shows compatibility with nature and the animal's quality of life.

Reasons for not banning

8.22 A small minority of respondents did not want the use of wild animals in travelling circuses to be banned. Some respondents considered that strict regulation with a licensing system, fines and imprisonment for offences would protect animal welfare and satisfy any concerns the public might have. One respondent claimed that wild animals in the circus was part of British culture and another commented that people would not be satisfied with banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses and wondered what performing animals would be next. Another respondent stated that a ban would be unfair on responsible circuses that take their welfare obligations towards their animals seriously and a few respondents considered that the scientific evidence was insufficient to support a ban; 1 respondent also stated that there were sufficient legislative controls in place to address any animal health and welfare concerns. All reasons against a ban were reiterated from previous questions and no new points were raised.

Consultation bias

8.23 Two of the groups affiliated to the circus industry provided comments; 1 group stated that the consultation was flawed, biased and unfair in its assumption that all circus tigers are confined in small wagons for hours at a time which would be uncomfortable for them and not fair or conducive to their wellbeing. This was untrue, according to the respondent, and therefore showed the bias of its writers in its wording, leading the reader down avenues of agreement or defence of the statement.

8.24 Animal wellbeing was considered to be dependent on its carer once an animal was in any captive situation, and that included companion animals. The whole of an animal’s life depended on how it was treated and cared for by its owner as it could not forge its own purpose in life. Circus animals, because of their close relationship with their owners and presenters were part of the circus family and part of that circus’s society (see quote below).

8.25 The other circus group thought that the topic of circus animals was a scientific and ethical challenge. Several scientific investigations had demonstrated that the correct use of animals in a circus showed that it was compatible with nature and quality of life of the animals (see quote below).

“I think that the scientific criteria alone are insufficient to lead to an informed decision being made.” (Individual Respondent)

“There is widespread public confusion of the treatment of animals in circus. Animal Rights activists have invested donations heavily at promoting lies and untruths. I challenge the scottish government to put these allegations under scrutiny and
investigation to establish which side of the argument is telling the truth... There are no justifiable nor evidential reasons for banning animals in circus ... all concerns can be dealt with by way of licencing - a system that is working just fine in England” (Individual Respondent)

“They should NOT be banned .period. They are a huge part of British culture, and Britian includes Scotland. They are a pat of societys memory bank and people will want their own children to have the experience of circuses as thy did when they were children. If you ban circus you are destroying a part of your own culture, and it will be the thin end of the wdege with the animal rights fanatics. There is a huge difference between animal welfare(zoos, most vets and circuses) and animal rights(fanatics, cultist money gatherers and urban terrorists” (Individual Respondent)

“Proposed ban of wild animals in circuses

I have been involved in the care of animals for over 40 years in zoos and wildlife parks both in the United Kingdom and The Netherlands...

I am further familiar with a number of trainers and owners of animals in various circuses in the UK and Europe.

It has always been my contention that circuses with animals should have regulation of their care and handling of animals as is the case in many European countries which now includes the United Kingdom.

Welfare of Wild Animals in Travelling Circuses (England) Regulations 2012

However, I have never supported a ban of animals in circuses as from the scientific evidence (and from personal observation) this seems both unnecessary and unfair to responsible circuses that do take there welfare obligations towards their animals seriously.

There has been two reports commission on the welfare of animals in UK circuses.

The first was undertaken by my colleague Dr Marthe Kiley-Worthington and published in 1990 with the financial support of the RSPCA and The University Federation of Animal Welfare (UFAW).

Dr Kiley-Worthington spent some 18 months studying all aspects of animals in circuses, including making detailed quantitative recordings of their behaviour for over 3000 animal hours Her conclusions were that circuses were by their nature not cruel and that any deficits in the husbandry of the animals within these environments could be addressed without the need of banning such enterprises.

To quote her:

“...there is no reason why circus training, any more than any other animal training, of its nature causes suffering and distress to the animals, or should be considered ethically unacceptable” (Kiley-Worthington, 1990, p. 142).”

Dr Kiley-Worthington also presented an over-view of her research at the UFAW symposium: “Animal Training: A review and commentary on current practice” in September 1989.

Further, as you stated, a circus animal welfare report was commissioned by the UK's Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) in 2007 and stated:
"A ban on using wild animals in travelling circuses because of welfare concerns is not supported by the scientific evidence"

They concluded that there was "little evidence" that the welfare of animals kept in travelling circuses was any better or worse than that of animals kept in other captive environments.

It certainly is right that people should be concerned about the welfare of animals in the care of humans but as stated these concerns do need to be supported by proper objective research.

Unfortunately the debate about animals in circuses, despite the above cited research, has become incredibly polarised and emotive and much of this is due to the ideology of animal-rights not the science of animal welfare." (Individual Respondent)

"I don't believe in banning things just because some people ask for it to be done. I am well aware that some people do not like performing animals be it at a circus or anywhere else. But its always a minority that shout the loudest in the hope they can over rule the majority. A ban on circuses with wild animals is not needed, strict regulation yes, a ban no." (Individual Respondent)

"ECA thinks the topic of animals in circus is a scientific and ethical challenge. It is known that several scientific investigations have demonstrated that the correct use of animals in circus shows that it is compatible with nature and quality of life of the animals themselves. Since the last century, the acquired ethological knowledge and the need of new expressive codes in the presentation of animals in the circus ring and on the stage in general have lead to the progressive change of aesthetics and the general training approach. The circus ring had become the place where interaction between man and trained animals is emphasized: the animal becomes the leading actor while the trainer's duty is to make the natural behaviours of each animal stand out. Paradoxically, the battle of the most radical animal-rights activism has become extreme in the moment when the type, the quality, the implementation methods and the aesthetics have taken the direction of animal welfare. Animal's work with trainers represents a constant stimulus in their life and, from an ethological point of view, it replaces the stimuli found in nature." (Group Response – European Circus Association)

"Potential Ethical Grounds for a Ban. This document is flawed, biased and unfair in its assumption that all circus tigers are confined in small wagons for hours at a time. Of course this would be uncomfortable for the tigers and not fair or conducive to their wellbeing. However it is not true and therefore in its wording shows the bias of the writers. It leads the reader down avenues of agreement or in defence of the statement. Animal telos, wellbeing and end purpose is dependent on its carer, once an animal is in any captive situation and that includes companion animals, the whole of its life depends on how it is treated and cared for by its owner it cannot forge its own purpose in life. Circus animals, because of their close relationship with their owners and presenters, are part of the circus family or if you like part of that circuses society. A successful family is one where economic activity delivers exceptionally high levels of sustainable wellbeing for everyone within the family group. For this to be successful all areas of the animal's activity and being must be taken into account. The first place to start is with the five needs as laid out in the Animal Welfare Act 2006. Once all those needs are catered for we must move on to wellbeing and must take into account inter-relationships with other animals in their group and also the humans in their group. The animals must feel secure and safe and trust their caregivers, who must never let them down. Once this is in place the animal will be feeling good and then be able to function well as their mental state is calm. One of the well known and common ways to measure wellbeing is longevity and in circus wild animals it is known that they live longer than in..."
zoos and considerably longer than in the wild. At the moment one of the licensed circuses has a zebra which is nearly 30 years old and one of the tigers on the other circus is also nearing 30 years. Anne the elephant of which much fuss was made about her treatment by her groom had been in the circus for over 50 years and is probably the oldest elephant in the UK. There is much more to say regarding animal telos and no doubt will be forthcoming in the months to come. As the government liaison officer and along with other members of the Classical Circus Association we persuaded members of defra team to visit the circuses before they put together the 2012 regulations, which they did an could see for themselves how things really are and I would suggest that this would be an eye opener for the Scottish animal welfare team to do likewise.” (Group Response – Classical Circus Association)

Respondents who answered ‘yes’ and did not support or oppose a ban

8.26 One group who responded ‘yes’ but did not openly show support for or against a ban, requested that birds of prey in travelling demonstrations be exempted from any legislation the government might introduce with regard to the use of wild animals in travelling circuses, in the wake of this consultation.
CONSULTATION QUESTION 22: Do you consider that the consultation paper explained the key issues sufficiently for you to properly consider your responses?

Table 8.2: Overview of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% comments</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes / No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

8.27 A total of 2003 respondents (98%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, the large majority, 1636 respondents (80.1%) answered ‘yes’ indicating that they thought the consultation paper did explain the key issues sufficiently for them to properly consider their responses; 125 respondents (6.1%) answered ‘no’ indicating that they did not consider that the consultation paper explained the key issues sufficiently; 1 respondent (0.1%) answered ‘yes’ and ‘no’; and 241 respondents (11.8%) answered ‘don’t know’.

8.28 A total of 40 respondents (2%) left the question blank even though 12 provided comments; most of the 12 respondents who commented thought that the questionnaire was repetitive, confusing and long-winded, 1 respondent pointing out that there was a lot of repetition using subtle variations of questions which forced respondents to repeat their comments; 1 respondent stated that the general public was not made aware of these consultations.

8.29 In total, 311 respondents (15.2%) offered comments at Question 22.

Respondents who answered ‘Yes’ issues were sufficiently explained

8.30 A total of 1636 respondents answered ‘yes’ indicating that they were content with the consultation paper and 187 offered comments.

Key points

8.31 Key points:

- The consultation paper was very clear and comprehensive, well-constructed, thorough, thought-provoking and an important resource in understanding the key issues being considered.
- Some questions were too similar and repetitive and almost designed to put people off completing them.
The questionnaire was too lengthy.

Some questions were difficult to understand - should have been written in a simpler, clearer fashion in order to engage the most members of the public.

The consultation should have been written in a simpler, clearer fashion in order to engage the most members of the public.

Some people may actually have been put-off answering the questionnaire because it was unnecessarily formal and confusing.

The consultation paper was easy to answer and allowed ample opportunity to express in-depth views and concerns.

Some questions had to be read carefully to prevent selection of a wrong answer.

The paper contained bias in the set questions in favour of the circus owners who did not want a ban.

The paper contained preconceived bias regarding compromised welfare of circus animals unsupported by available research.

General comments

8.32 Just under a quarter of the respondents who commented backed up their responses by stating that the consultation paper was very clear and comprehensive, well-constructed, thorough, thought-provoking and an important resource in understanding the key issues being considered; in addition, respondents commented that the paper was easy to answer and allowed ample opportunity to express in-depth views and concerns.

Potential improvements

8.33 Despite responding 'yes', respondents thought that the issues were sufficiently explained and many offered suggestions on how the consultation might have been improved.

- Around one tenth of these respondents thought that the paper was too formal and too pretentious and should have been written in a simpler, clearer fashion in order to engage the most members of the public.
- Another one tenth of respondents thought that some people may actually have been put-off answering the questionnaire because it was, in particular, unnecessarily lengthy but also because some questions were a little difficult to understand.
- One respondent thought the paper needed to be issued in a simpler format for schools; another 2 respondents thought the paper was stilted, very legal in its terminology and too dull.
- About a quarter of respondents thought that some of the questions in the paper were too similar and repetitive. A few of these respondents acknowledged that the questions were slightly different but thought that fewer questions would have been less confusing.
- Other respondents stated that some questions seemed to be asked twice thus promoting the same answer.
- One pointed out that a few questions had to be read quite carefully to prevent selection of an answer opposite to the one the respondent actually wished to express.
• A small number of respondents considered that more emphasis should have been made in the paper on the welfare of animals in circuses and the psychological impact this has on them.
• Mention should also have been made about criminal proceedings against any circuses that ignored the law in the event of a ban.
• Some suggested that greater reference should have been made to specific practices that might have assisted those who had not grasped why a ban was necessary.
• One respondent thought that the paper appeared to have a preconceived bias regarding compromised welfare of circus animals that is not supported by the available research.
• 2 respondents detected a bias in the set questions in favour of the circus owners who did not want a ban.

**Respondent who answered ‘No’, issues were not sufficiently explained**

8.34 A total of 125 respondents, including 3 of the groups affiliated with the circus industry, answered ‘no’ indicating that they were not content with the consultation paper and 75 respondents provided comments.

**Key points**

8.35 Key points:

• Some of the questions were too repetitive.
• The questionnaire was unnecessarily complicated - almost designed as though it was trying not to engage the public with the issue.
• Some of the questions were confusing and long-winded.
• The consultation paper did not discuss or explain key issues.
• The consultation was overly concerned with the revenue and profits of circuses.
• The consultation was biased in favour of allowing the use of wild animals to continue in travelling circuses.
• The consultation was biased in favour of a ban on the use of wild animals in circuses and that could sway the results.
• The consultation was based on prejudice against circuses with animals.
• The consultation was filled with bias against circuses.
• The consultation paper incorrectly represented the conclusions of the Radford Report.
• The Radford Report recognised that the scope of the review was not wide enough to rule out welfare as a reason to ban the use of wild animals in travelling circuses.

**Potential improvements**

• The main issue was that some of the questions were too repetitive, unnecessarily complicated, rather vague and confusing.
• A few respondents thought that some of the wording in the questions did not make sense and needed to be in plain English.
• A small number of respondents indicated that they did not entirely understand the meaning of some of the questions and pointed out that other questions asked for a response that had already been given.

• Other respondents thought the consultation was far too long, stating that it was almost as though the Scottish Government was trying not to engage the public with the issue. They hoped the questionnaire would be simpler in the next consultation.

Consultation Bias

8.36 Some respondents stated that the consultation emphasised and was overly concerned about the revenue and profits of circuses and was biased in favour of allowing the use of wild animals in circuses to continue at the expense of the animals' wellbeing, rather than permitting circus owners to possibly lose revenue if a ban was imposed.

8.37 A few other respondents took the opposing view saying that the consultation was biased in favour of a ban and that could sway the results. Two of the groups affiliated with the circus industry stated that the whole document was based on prejudice against circuses with animals; rather than trying to get input from all sides in order to come up with the best solution, the consultation seemed to look only for arguments to justify the proposed ban, without giving any other option a chance.

8.38 A third group affiliated with the circus industry also stated that the consultation document was filled with bias against circuses, raising the following points:

• The paper fails to inform the public how other countries successfully regulate animals in the circus.
• The paper proposes an indefensibly discriminatory approach that would allow the same animals to perform in any static setting but not in the travelling circus despite scientific evidence that travel does not adversely impact these animals for which travel is routine and, therefore, not stressful.

8.39 The respondent then went on to say that it should also be noted that the consultation document incorrectly represented the conclusions of the Radford Report by turning them on their head. The Report made it clear that the present situation in England (status quo) could not continue. It referred to a situation where there was no circus specific legislation, continuing talks of bans and restrictions by approximately 100 local communities. The situation created legal uncertainty for English circuses that was unfair but this was rectified in England by the establishment of the licensing system which is now fully functional.

8.40 The respondent went on to say that, in addition, the Report noted clearly that if a regulatory system was to be put in place, the legality of the local community bans would be called into question - because they would render illegal an activity that would be deemed legal at the national level.

8.41 The respondent also said it should be noted that in Germany, Italy, the United States and other countries, the vast majority of local bans that have been challenged by circuses in court have been invalidated by judges for exactly the same reasons.
8.42 Two other respondents also raised concerns about the Radford Report, one respondent stating that the consultation made not a single mention of the Radford Report in which industry experts issued findings which were contrary to the spirit and tone of questions in the questionnaire; the other respondent commented that the consultation placed too much emphasis on the Radford Report which recognised that the scope of the review was not wide enough to rule out welfare as a reason to ban the use of wild animals in travelling circuses.

Issues missed

8.43 Several respondents indicated that they were discontented with the consultation paper, stating that it lacked discussion on various important issues which have been listed below:

- Circuses have detrimental effects on animals’ living conditions, stimuli, exercise, social interaction, medical care or mental health none of which were mentioned in the questions.
- Key issues were not explained; someone who knew nothing about the industry would not be able to consider the true facts of this so called entertainment.
- There was nothing in the consultation paper about animal cruelty and the impacts of animals in circuses.
- More information about what breeds of animals are used in circuses and how they are inspected and cared for may have been appropriate.
- The welfare issues were not stated clearly enough.
- The consultation paper could have explained what the existing laws are and provided more statistics.
- More information on animal welfare and the effect of performing on the lifespan/health of the animals may have been appropriate.
- Not enough mention of the special requirements for most of these animals not being met and what suffering that causes.
- No key issues were included in the questions such as the rights of an animal, the long-term effects of caging and performing, the right to reproduce or the psychological impact of more or less permanent isolation from other members of the species, thereby excluding the forging of bonds and friendship.
- Very little information on the dignity and physical and psychological wellbeing of the animals; nothing on environmental requirements.
- There should have been more information on where the poor animals are obtained for the circus and information of cases brought against circuses for abuse and neglect.
- The consultation paper was not very objective; there was no mention of why animals should be banned from circuses; the point about the welfare of animals is completely missing.
- The ban should be on all animals, not just wild ones – how do you define ‘wild’? Aren’t all animals wild?
- The definition of ‘wild’ seems loose and vague as does ‘travelling circus’; there seems to be loopholes.
- The paper did not include horses, dogs, birds, which are in equal danger of abuse and misery.
Respondents who answered ‘Yes/No’

8.44 One respondent answered ‘yes’ and ‘no’ to this question the reason being that, in his or her opinion, some questions were explained fairly but some were very loaded towards agreement to a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses.

Respondents who answered ‘Don’t Know’ if issues were sufficiently explained

8.45 A total of 241 respondents answered ‘don’t know’ and 36 provided comments.

General comments

8.46 Nine respondents said they had not read the consultation paper; and 4 other respondents did not know about the consultation paper or where it was to be found, 1 respondent suggesting that it could not have been made widely available. Another respondent did not have the opportunity to read the consultation paper but felt that there was no need.

8.47 One respondent thought the questionnaire was thorough enough but repetitious with very similar questions; other respondents commented that they kept repeating their answers to several questions or found the questions confusing and strangely worded and had to read many of them more than once to ensure they understood the meaning; 1 respondent stated that doubtless the consultation received many misleading answers from people who had not understood the questions, who were less conscientious, or who had less time to spend completing it, pointing out that a consultation only had worth if it was easily understood.

8.48 Only 3 respondents commented on the content of the consultation paper; 1 thought it was a little biased in favour of a ban on the use of wild animals in travelling circuses; 1 thought it should have showed evidence of how animals were treated behind the scenes in circuses; and 1 thought more of an explanation of the Radford Report or a link to the Report would have been useful.
CONSULTATION QUESTION 23: Do you consider that you had sufficient time to respond to the consultation?

Table 8.3: Overview of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% comments</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>1762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

8.49 A total of 2013 respondents (98.5%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, the vast majority, 1814 respondents (88.8%) answered ‘yes’ indicating that they did have sufficient time to respond to the consultation; 82 respondents (4%) answered ‘no’ indicating that they did not have sufficient time; and 117 respondents (5.7%) answered ‘don’t know’.

8.50 The remaining 30 respondents (1.5%) left this question blank although 3 provided comments; 1 respondent stated that to be given a decent length of time in which to read and absorb information concerning an important issue which many people felt strongly about, was most welcome; the other comments had no particular relevance.

8.51 In total, 146 respondents (7.2%) offered comments at Question 23.

Respondents who answered ‘Yes’, they had sufficient time

8.52 A total of 1814 respondents answered ‘yes’ and 103 provided comments.

General comments

8.53 Most respondents who commented simply confirmed that they had sufficient time in which to respond or that they had made the time; a few expanded by stating that to be given a decent length of time in which to read and absorb information concerning an important issue which many people feel strongly about, was most welcome; they also said that a reasonable period of time for responses meant that more people would be able to participate in the consultation process. Only 1 respondent commented that the timeline was quite short.

8.54 A couple of respondents thought that the consultation had not been sufficiently publicised; 1 respondent was unaware that there had been a deadline for completing the response form; 1 respondent pointed out that a back button would have been helpful when completing the questionnaire; and a few people reiterated that the questionnaire was too long or that it had taken them a lot longer to complete than they had anticipated.
Respondents who answered ‘No’, they did not have sufficient time

8.55 A total of 82 respondents answered ‘no’ and 26 provided comments.

General comments

8.56 Several of these respondents considered that the consultation had not been widely publicised enough, a few pointing out that they had barely managed to complete it in time because they only found out about it within the last 2 days. One respondent thought that the consultation should have been publicised on the Scottish Government Facebook page; another respondent commented that he or she had not known about the consultation until it was highlighted by the animal welfare organisation PETA UK on their Facebook page.

8.57 A small number of respondents stated that the consultation was too long and had taken much longer to complete than they had thought it would, even though they had been willing to give the time for such an important issue. One respondent said that the possibility to save and resume the questionnaire would have been appreciated; another respondent would have liked to have printed off the consultation paper for more time in which to consider his or her answers but was unable to do so and may possibly have missed making some important points as a result.

Respondents who answered ‘Don’t Know’ whether they had sufficient time

8.58 A total of 117 respondents answered ‘don’t know’ and 14 provided comments.

General comments

8.59 A few respondents stated that they were unaware when the consultation had come out or when it was due. One respondent had only had a few days to complete the questionnaire after finding out belatedly about the consultation and had no idea when it had started. Two respondents thought the questionnaire had taken longer than anticipated to complete; and 1 respondent thought that it was a difficult consultation to do quickly.
CONSULTATION QUESTION 24: Do you have any other comments on the way this consultation has been conducted?

Table 8.4: Overview of Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>% comments</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Percentages have been rounded to 1 decimal place so may not total to exactly 100%

8.60 A total of 1965 respondents (96.2%) answered this question. As can be seen from the table, the vast majority, 1691 respondents (82.8%) answered ‘no’ indicating that they had no other comments on the way the consultation had been conducted; 274 respondents (13.4%) answered ‘yes’ indicating that they did have other comments.

8.61 The remaining 78 respondents (3.8%) left this question blank even though 39 provided comments. No new points were raised; a couple of respondents were pleased to have been given the opportunity to provide their views and several respondents once again asked for the use of wild animals in travelling circuses to be banned; 1 respondent stated that domestic animals should have been included and was unhappy about the possibility that travelling circuses might decide to become static circuses in order to keep their animals in the event of a ban.

8.62 One respondent thought the consultation was clear and forceful but others reiterated that the questions could have been simpler and less confusing and that a number appeared to have been rephrased or repeated; one respondent considered that the questionnaire could have been reduced to only 5 questions. A few respondents thought the consultation should have been publicised more widely so that more people could have taken part.

8.63 In total, 353 respondents (17.3%) offered comments at Question 24.

Respondents who answered ‘No’, no further comments on how consultation was conducted

8.64 A total of 1691 respondents answered ‘no’ and 49 provided comments. No new points were raised; a few respondents were pleased that Scotland was considering this issue, pleased to have been given the opportunity to provide their views and most urged the Scottish Government to proceed with banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses. A small number of respondents reiterated that the questionnaire was quite longwinded and that the wording of some of the questions was a little confusing.
Respondents who answered ‘Yes’, have further comments on how consultation was conducted

8.65 A total of 274 respondents answered ‘yes’ and 265 provided comments.

Key points

8.66 Key points:

- The questions were too repetitive.
- The consultation was too long.
- The consultation had insufficient publicity.
- The consultation was biased because it was more concerned about revenue than with animal welfare.
- The questions were too complex.
- The consultation was fair, open, thorough and well-constructed.
- The length and complexity of the consultation would put people off completing it.
- Banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses would potentially conflict with European Law.

General comments

8.67 Several respondents said that they were pleased that such a wide-spread consultation had taken place because it indicated that the Scottish Government took animal welfare concerns seriously; they were also grateful for the opportunity to comment on the issue in such an extensive way and hopefully help effect positive change. A small number of respondents thought that it was a great idea to get people’s views on such important and worthy matters instead of asking for a straight vote.

8.68 A few respondents took the opportunity presented by question 24 to register their appreciation of the efforts and professionalism of those involved in the production of the consultation, which they considered had been conducted fairly and openly. They also stated that the briefing document and questionnaire were excellent, thorough - because the briefing document had examined the issue in-depth and from several angles - and well-constructed. One respondent pointed out that anyone can click a vote button on a polling site but as any decision reached following on from the consultation would undoubtedly affect jobs and livelihoods, it should not be taken lightly.

Potential improvements

- A number of these respondents pointed out that, in their opinion, the consultation had been too long and, as a consequence, had taken too long to complete.
- Some respondents felt that some members of the public would have got bored filling out the questionnaire and others would simply have been dissuaded from starting. In the end, respondents thought it possible that the people with strong beliefs about the issues may have been the only ones who would have taken the time and the trouble to complete it.
Several respondents considered that some of the questions had been repetitive enough to be considered redundant. They suggested that such surveys should be short, possibly around 4, 5 or 6 questions long, to the point and written in simple, plain English so as to be easily understood.

Several respondents thought that the technique of repeating the same basic questions in multiple forms and the constant demand for amplification of answers was a strong deterrent to completing the questionnaire.

Some respondents thought it indicated a desire by survey managers to ‘catch out’ those who did not respond consistently even if their views were sincerely and clearly expressed in earlier answers.

Other respondents considered that the language used was designed to put people off joining in the debate.

Several also considered that the questions were too complicated and worded in a way that was confusing; respondents stated that they had to read quite a few of the questions more than once to understand their meaning.

Several respondents were convinced that some of the general public would have found responding to the consultation a daunting task and may in some cases have inadvertently provided misleading answers to ambiguous questions.

A small number of respondents who completed the questionnaire using Questback commented that a back button would have been useful in case a page was missed, to reread text and to correct and alter answers as desired.

One respondent stated that he or she had difficulty completing the form using Open Office.

Other respondents pointed out that, prior to beginning the questionnaire, it should have highlighted that it was quite lengthy, particularly if comments for all 24 questions were entered.

One respondent suggested that it may have been better if the yes/no question about banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses had been asked at the beginning of the survey, then everything else could have followed on from that.

A few respondents were concerned about the views of people who did not have access to a computer in order to complete the online form.

Publicity

8.69 Some of the 265 respondents who commented expressed concern over the large number of people who, in their opinion, would have quite simply been unaware that the consultation had taken place. It was generally felt by these respondents that the consultation had been insufficiently publicised; they pointed out that it should have been widely advertised to give the maximum number of people the opportunity to respond.

8.70 Suggestions were that all forms of media should have been used including, but not limited to, the open press, particularly the Scottish newspapers, the media, particularly the news, social media such as Facebook pages, and a wide range of websites such as those of all animal welfare charities.

8.71 Quite a few respondents commented that they had only heard about the consultation from a friend or from the PETA UK Facebook page or because they
were on the Scottish Government mailing list for consultations, their point being that anyone who did not have a particular interest in animal welfare would probably not have known about it. Respondents were convinced that a low response rate to the consultation (no figure was provided that would indicate what, in their opinion, respondents considered a low response rate to be) did not equate to apathy or agreement with the use of wild animals in travelling circuses; rather it simply meant that most people did not know about what respondents perceived as the compromised welfare of wild animals in circuses so did not consider the matter and this is why it needed to be brought much more into the limelight.

Support for a ban

8.72 A large number of respondents used the comment box to once again urge the Scottish Government to ban the use of wild animals in circuses, reiterating many of the points they had made in earlier questions, and a few respondents also wanted a ban placed on the use of domestic animals.

Issues missed

8.73 Quite a few of the 265 respondents who commented were not particularly pleased with the content of the consultation stating that the key issues had not been addressed and both sides of the case should have been presented. Two of the groups affiliated with the circus industry wondered why Scottish taxpayers’ money was used to try to ban something that no longer existed in Scotland and at the same time would create serious conflicts with European law; e.g. the fundamental right of free movement and the general right to work.

Consultation bias

8.74 In particular, however, a number of the 265 respondents who commented were unhappy by what they perceived as the biased nature of the consultation.

8.75 Some thought that more emphasis should have been placed on the wellbeing of the animals and not on any possible loss of revenue to circuses. Respondents stated that they did not see the relevance of some of the questions because money should not be a deciding factor in the issue. In fact, some respondents were disappointed that financial effects on circuses and related industries were even being considered as a factor in the survey – they pointed out in strong terms that there was too much bias towards economics and, as a result, the consultation seemed more directed to a ban not being raised and allowing circuses to continue as they had for decades, rather than basic animal welfare.

Information on outcome

8.76 A few respondents wanted to be informed of the outcome of the consultation and how the consultation was going to be used; in particular, they wanted to know if it was simply an exercise to satisfy the need for consultation or would the results actually inform the decision making process.
Open letter from film producers, directors and professionals representing members of the audio-visual community in the UK and the USA.

To whom it may concern

ANIMAL WELFARE BILL - ANIMALS IN THE AUDIO VISUAL SECTOR

As Film Producers, Directors and Professionals we represent members of the audio-visual community in the UK and the USA. As storytellers our industry has a long history of featuring animals in commercials, film and TV productions. The popularity of films such as Gorillas in the Mist, Fierce Creatures, Anna and the King, Flyboys and Creation has shown how important these stories are to our cultural heritage.

We understand that there have been concerns raised about the use of animals in our industry and we would like to take this opportunity to set the record straight.

Persistent animal rights propaganda has distorted the facts about animals in entertainment whilst also failing to distinguish between different sectors.

In recent years the industry has made huge strides to ensure and uphold the proper and ethical treatment of animals when used on productions. PAWSI - the Performing Animals Welfare Standards International - was convened in 2000 to promote animal welfare standards and training for personnel and animals in the industry. PAWSI issues a code to ensure that a high duty of care is maintained when animals work within the industry and provides a monitoring system to uphold standards.

Most practitioners who work with animals in the audio visual industries belong to a trade association, IAWA - International Animal Welfare Association, this association is the association which monitors animal welfare standards and supports animal trainers in Los Angeles. ACTA - Animal Consultants and Trainers Association, this association is based in the UK and has a good selection of animal trainers who work in entertainment in the UK. ECA - European Circus Association, with the director based in the Netherlands this association covers the main circuses in mainland Europe. CCA - Classical Circus Association, this is a UK based association with members working in circus with animals. ACP - Association of Circus Proprietors, this is a UK based circus association with members' mainly running circuses with no animals. The members of these association work under strict codes of conduct and abide by very high ethical and welfare standards. These groups also have many veterinary surgeons as members and these vets are all familiar with animals in entertainment and their species specific knowledge means that they can handle any project concerning animals whether they are companion animals or wild and exotic animals.

Professional animal trainers have over recent times been active in promoting welfare standards for animals in entertainment and part of that progress has been the development of professional qualifications in the form of NVQs. AFTC - Animal Filming and Training Commission alongside PAWSI have worked with Skillset and City and Guilds in producing NVQs levels 2, 3 and 4 in Animal Care, Management
and Training in the Audio Visual Industry and these are out in the colleges now. The students for these qualifications have signed from all genres: circus; Zoo presenters; private animal trainers of all species; etc.

The areas covered range from Film, Television, Advertising, Theatre, Zoos, Animals at County Shows, Bird of Prey Displays, Nativity and Pantomime, tiger trainers, racing pig trainers right down to a donkey in a Christmas Nativity play.

These NVQs have now run their course and are now replaced by QCF - Qualification Credit Framework, where students can study for an Award, Certificate or Diploma in Animal Care and Management in Entertainment and Education. These qualifications are accredited by City and Guilds.

Furthermore there is no evidence to show that using animals in performances is detrimental to their welfare; in fact there is scientific evidence to show just the opposite. Dr Marthe Kiley-Worthington B.Sc D.Phil M.Phil, a professional ethologist, spent 18 months studying all aspects of animals in circuses. Her scientific report was presented at an animal welfare symposium at Cambridge in 1989 and published in a book (Kiley- Worthington M 1990 Animals in Circuses and Zoos).

Dr Kiley-Worthington' s report is mostly on animal training for animals in entertainment and in her conclusion, among other positive statements, she writes “By its nature the training and performing of animals does not cause suffering to the animals and is not therefore necessarily cruel. It does not appear to cause loss of the animal’s dignity, and does not have to involve or demonstrate human dominance”.

In 2007 Government convened a working group to examine evidence for and against the use of wild animals in circuses; this group was chaired by Mike Radford an expert on the legal aspects of animal welfare at Aberdeen University.

Mike Radford’s report on wild animal acts in travelling circuses was released on 20 November 2007. The Working Group concluded that a ban on wild animals in circuses could not be legally justified purely on scientific grounds.

Mike Radford said: “[Ministers] gave commitments in parliament that a ban would be based on scientific evidence and as yet there isn’t any.” He went on to comment in his report that - "animals such as tigers, elephants, sea lions, zebras and camels were still widely used in European circuses and a decision taken in Britain would be closely watched on the continent". As a result of this government declared that they could not ban wild animals in circuses based of bad welfare as there was no scientific evidence to support this.

The Scottish Government ruled out a ban on the use of wild animals in circuses in July 2009.

The Animal Health and Welfare Act passed by the previous Labour-Liberal Democrat Scottish Executive in 2006 was seen as paving the way for a ban. Now Environment Secretary Richard Lochhead has said he "cannot use the law to outlaw circus animals after an independent report in which Radford said there was no scientific evidence to show circuses caused any animal welfare problems".
Finally we wish to bring to your attention the fact that if restrictions are placed upon the availability of certain species of animals for filming in the UK, audio-visual productions will simply re-locate abroad where we are not able to ensure appropriate welfare standards. This means that UK film personnel will lose jobs as the money will be spent elsewhere.

Many film companies both in the UK and worldwide work with circus animals as they are: very well handled; used to lights and transportation; alert and eager to work; produce results without stress to themselves; and their wellbeing is constantly monitored by Veterinary Surgeons and the animals owners.

The animal industry personnel would like to see fit for purpose inspections, monitoring and animal welfare training, care and management qualifications as a necessity. The industry has also asked government for strict regulation to oversee all aspects of animals which work in our industry.

We are pleased that the UK Government now has in place a robust and fit for purpose regulation for circuses which travel with wild animals. These regulations are now in place for the second consecutive year and the UK circuses have complied with all conditions and received their license to work. Details of the inspections and conditions can be found on the defra website.

We would like to see the same style of regulation for all animals in the entertainment industry which promotes and maintains high standards of animal ethics and welfare so as to ensure animal magic in the movies for generations to come.

Yours sincerely,

Dean Devlin - Director Flyboys
Marc Roskin - Producer Flyboys
Andy Tennant - Director Anna and the King
John Cleese - Producer Fierce Creatures
Gela Jenssen - Director To Unwill a Heart
Guy Tannahill - 1st Assistant Director
Richard Widgery - Director Take4D & Kinetic Impulse
Paul Holmes - Producer Redrage Films
Gareth Williams - Producer Atlantis
Charles Dance Actor/Director
CONSULTATION LIST

Action of Churches Together in Scotland
Angus College
Animal Aid
Animal Concern Advice Line
Animal Defenders International
Argyll Adventure
Armac Veterinary Group
Ashgrove Veterinary Centre Ltd
Associate Parliamentary Group for Animal Welfare
Association of Circus Proprietors of Great Britain
Association of Government Veterinarians (Scotland)
Association of Government Veterinarians (Wales)
Association of Scottish Police Superintendents (The)
Barony College
Blair Drummond Safari Park and Adventure Park
Bodleian Libraries of the University of Oxford
Born Free Foundation
British and Irish Association of Zoos and Aquariums
British Horse Society Scotland (Crieff)
British Library's Legal Deposit Office
British Small Animal Veterinary Association
British Veterinary Association
British Veterinary Association (Scottish Branch)
Bute & Cowal Vets
Cambridge University Library
Catholic Parliamentary Office
Chartered Institute of Environmental Health
Church of Scotland (The)
Circus Friends Association of Great Britain
Circus Mondao
Collier & Brock
Convention of Scottish Local Authorities
Corby, J (Ms)
Covesea Greens Stud
Creature Feature Ltd
Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Department of Agriculture and Rural Development
Dukes Veterinary Practice Ltd
Dundas Veterinary Group
Elmwood College
Ethical Voice for Animals
European Circus Association
Federation of Companion Animal Societies
Fergusson, Alex, MSP
Flanders Veterinary Services
Foreside Farms
German Shepherd Dog Club of Scotland (The)
Great British Circus
Haflinger Trekking Centre
Heads of Ayr Farm Park
Health & Safety Executive
Highland Wildlife Park
Hudghton, Ian MEP
Humanist Society Scotland
Institute of Biodiversity, Animal Health and Comparative Medicine
Inverclyde Dog Training Club
Johnston & Farrell
Kennel Club (The)
Lamond Veterinary Clinic
Library of Trinity College, Dublin (The)
Lyon, George MEP
MacDonald, Margo MSP
Marine Conservation International
Martin, David MEP
Mossburn Community Farm
Mr Bug Ltd
Muslim Council of Scotland
Nardini Rudder Veterinary Centre
National Animal Welfare Trust
National Library of Scotland (The)
National Library of Wales (The)
National Secular Society
North of Scotland British Veterinary Association Welfare Representative
OneKind
Orkney Seal Rescue
Palacerigg Country Park
Peter Jolly's Circus
Police Scotland
Production Guild (The)
Road Haulage Association
Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies
Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons
Royal Environmental Health Institute of Scotland (The)
Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (The)
Royal Veterinary College (The)
Ryan & Calder
Scientialis Ltd
Scotland for Animals
Scottish Association for Country Sports
Scottish Centre For Animal Welfare Sciences
Scottish Churches Parliamentary Office
Scottish Conservatives & Unionist Party
Scottish Council of Jewish Communities
Scottish Enterprise
Scottish Equestrian Association
Scottish Federation of Meat Traders
## BREAKDOWN OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPS (56) – SECTORS</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Welfare Organisation</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circus Industry</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-Visual Industry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising/Entertainment Industry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinarian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the General Public</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not total to 56 as 1 group aligned itself to, and was counted under, 3 different sectors (circus industry, animal welfare organisation and audio-visual industry).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPS (OTHER)</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit organisation to promote and preserve circus arts and culture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Industry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Organisation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife/Animal Movement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Animal Welfare Group</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falconry and Bird of Prey Keepers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Specifics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUALS (1987) – SECTORS</td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Welfare Organisation</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circus Industry</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-Visual Industry</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising/Entertainment Industry</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinarian</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the General Public</td>
<td>1452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1992</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not total to 1987 as a few respondents aligned themselves with, and were counted under, more than 1 sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUALS (OTHER)</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic (studying Animal Welfare &amp; Human/Animal Interactions)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (1 studying Animal Biology &amp; Conservation)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoologist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Welfare Science</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Wildlife Consultant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Behaviourist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer writing about animal welfare</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founder of animal welfare organisation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpaca breeder</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo Manager &amp; worker with wild animals for 38 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal lover</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Circus Industry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Nurse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotherapist/Counsellor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Community/Profession</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Culture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the General Public</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Specifics</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ANNEX 4**

**TABLE OF QUANTITATIVE RESULTS OVERALL AND FOR SCOTLAND ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Scotland only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Do you believe that the exhibitions and performances required of wild animals in travelling circuses compromise respect for the animals concerned?</td>
<td>Yes 89.5%</td>
<td>No 9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Do you believe that the exhibitions and performances required of wild animals in travelling circus have an adverse impact on the development of respectful and responsible attitudes towards animals in children and young people?</td>
<td>Yes 94.7%</td>
<td>No 3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Do you consider that concerns relating to respect for animals could be resolved without banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses?</td>
<td>Yes 3.4%</td>
<td>No 94.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Do you believe that the ability of none, some, or all wild animals to undertake natural behaviours are compromised within the travelling circus environment?</td>
<td>All 90.8%</td>
<td>None 5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Do you consider that it is possible to facilitate the natural behaviour of none, some or all wild animals within the travelling circus environment?</td>
<td>All 4.3%</td>
<td>None 90.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Do you consider that the concerns raised surrounding the travelling environment could be resolved without banning the use of wild animals in</td>
<td>Yes 2.5%</td>
<td>No 95.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
travelling circuses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7: Do you consider that there are any benefits to be gained from having wild animals in travelling circuses?</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: Do you believe that there are sufficient benefits to justify the potential compromise to the wider well-being of wild animals kept in a travelling circus?</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Do you consider that the potential conflict between compromising the well-being of wild animals and obtaining any benefit could be resolved without banning the use of wild animals in travelling circuses?</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. – Cannot be represented here – see main analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11: What effect do you think a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals would have on the revenue of such circuses?</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12: If a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals was imposed, do you think that such circuses would still visit Scotland without the wild animals?</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13: What effect do you think a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals in travelling circuses would have on the revenue of other types of circus (e.g. static or those travelling without wild animals)?</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>decrease</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14: What effect do you think a ban on the use and exhibition of wild animals would have on the revenue of travelling circuses?</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibition of Wild Animals in Travelling Circuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>exhibition of wild animals in travelling circuses would have on the revenue of circus venues?</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Cannot be represented here – see main analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16: Do you agree that the use of wild animals for performance in travelling circuses should be banned in Scotland?</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17: Do you agree that the use of wild animals for exhibition in travelling circuses should be banned in Scotland?</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18: Do you consider that any ban should be a blanket ban on all wild animals in travelling circuses?</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19: Do you consider that any specific species of animal not commonly domesticated in the British Islands should be permitted to be used in travelling circuses in Scotland?</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20: Do you consider that there are key species that should be covered by a ban in the event that a blanket ban could not be achieved?</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21: Do you have any other comments on whether/how the use of wild animals in travelling circuses should be banned in Scotland?</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22: Do you consider that the consultation paper explained the key issues sufficiently for you to properly consider your responses?</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

232
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23: Do you consider that you had sufficient time to respond to the consultation?</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24: Do you have any other comments on the way this consultation has been conducted?</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>