

**Religion and Conservation Research Collaborative (RCRC)
Draft Position on the
Religious Practice of Releasing Captive Wildlife for Merit
for Consideration By the
Religion and Conservation Biology
Working Group (RCBWG) Board
Society for Conservation Biology (SCB)**

At the root of all religions are the same basic principles.

Live simply. Act with compassion. Be kind to one another. Nowhere does any religion say that we should destroy the very thing that gives us life. So, I feel quite confident saying that from a religious point of view, we must conserve all life and protect Earth.

H.H. 17th GYALWANG KARMAPA, OGYEN TRINLEY DORJE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The United Nations (UN) Decade for Biodiversity (2011-2020) is a global impetus geared at re-orienting society towards recognizing the value of biodiversity and conserving it. Religious institutions have already begun to show notable interest in and to take action toward reversing the environmental crisis in general and halting the loss of biodiversity in particular. Amidst these endeavors by religious institutions however, there is need for a holistic reappraisal of practices within their fold to address any that might impede global progress to save biodiversity. For example, a practice by Buddhists, Taoists, and Daoists that raises concern is *fang sheng*--the Chinese term for the act of releasing captive wildlife as an act of compassion. The manner in which 'animal release' is practiced raises concern for biodiversity that conflicts with the ritual's aim of compassion. 'Animal release' causes several adverse effects on biodiversity including the spread of invasive species, genetic swamping, extreme animal suffering, competition, vulnerability to predation, disease, and human health concerns. Aware of these adverse effects, the Religion and Conservation Research Collaborative (RCRC) of the Religion and Conservation Biology Working Group (RCBWG), Society for Conservation Biology (SCB) concludes that the religious practice of 'animal release' poses risk to the future of biodiversity in Asia and other parts of the world where currently practiced. The RCRC recommends a targeted awareness campaign that emphasizes the problems associated with 'animal release' and the most pragmatic alternative practices that maintain both spiritual and ecological integrity.

Context and the Importance of the Problem

The threats to biodiversity^a are real and its ongoing global loss has eluded the 2010 target set by governments to reduce biodiversity loss. This prompted the 193 signatory countries to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) to create a strategic plan for the next decade during the 10th Conference of the Parties (COP 10) to the CBD in Nagoya, Japan in 2010. Known as the *Aichi Targets*, this plan set measurable goals to address the failed attempt to mitigate biodiversity loss. Among these goals are: (a) Initiating action to address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss; (b) taking action now to decrease the direct pressures on biodiversity; and, (c) continuing direct action to safeguard and, where necessary, restore biodiversity and ecosystem services.² The CBD recommended these goals to the United Nations (UN) General Assembly which subsequently declared 2011–2020 the UN Decade for Biodiversity.

In 2012, 31 international scientists³ issued a call for human societies to change course and steer away from critical tipping points in the Earth system that might lead to irreversible change. These scientists urged a “fundamental reorientation and restructuring of national and international institutions toward more effective Earth system governance and planetary stewardship.”³ Religious institutions have begun to respond to this call by demonstrating a noteworthy motivation and commitment to reverse the environmental crisis generally and the ongoing loss of biodiversity in particular.^{4,5} The high ethical standards expected of religious communities and institutions require a holistic response to the crisis so that any discrepancies between word and deed (e.g., arising through traditional ritual) are minimized or eliminated altogether.

The Religion and Conservation Research Collaborative (RCRC) of the Religion and Conservation Biology Working Group (RCBWG), Society for Conservation Biology (SCB) concludes that practices of animal release (*fang sheng* in Chinese, *ho-jo-e* in Japanese, and *tshe thar* in Tibetan)⁷ by Buddhists, Taoists, Daoists, and other religions are detrimental to biodiversity and are causing increasing concern.^{6,7,8} For example, some Buddhists practice *fang sheng* by releasing captive wildlife as a demonstration of compassion and kindness. This practice occurs throughout Asia (e.g., in Taiwan, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Japan, Korea, Singapore, Cambodia, China, Vietnam, Hong Kong, Tibetan Autonomous Region, and Malaysia) and, in recent decades, in western countries (e.g., Canada, Australia, and the USA).^{7,8} The motivation behind the practice is of several dimensions.⁷ Notable among these motivations is cultivating compassion for all forms of life, while expressing good wishes for the well-being and longevity of the practitioners and their familial relations, both living and deceased.⁷ One

^a Biodiversity has been most generally defined as the “full variety of life on Earth”¹.

Buddhist Pure Land Temple in Vancouver, British Columbia, has practiced 'animal release' for 13 years and claims to have released a total of 25,000 pounds of sea creatures into the Pacific Ocean.⁷ The Buddhist China Preserve Life Association asserts that it released more than 20 million animals in 2008 during 300 ceremonies, the vast majority of which were small aquatic creatures.⁹ Religious groups in Taiwan spend more than US \$6.19 million annually to engage in 'animal release' rituals which, according to the Environment and Animal Society of Taiwan (EAST), is practiced 750 times on average each year.¹⁰ EAST further estimates that more than 200 million animals are included annually in 'animal release' rituals in Taiwan.¹⁰

Knowing that many religious adherents are unaware of the adverse effects of 'animal release' on biodiversity, the RCRC takes the opportunity to identify the associated problems, declare our position as a body of concerned professionals and suggest appropriate alternative practices based on consultations with religious adherents, conservation scientists, and literature reviews, that will support both spiritual and ecological integrity. This position paper is ultimately aimed at engaging the religious community, government and society in dialogue for a consensual resolution of the problem.

Environmental, Ecological and Health Concerns

The manner in which 'animal release' is currently practiced raises concerns for biodiversity and ecological integrity that negate the ritual's actual aim of compassion. There are several consequences of 'animal release' that raise concern and they include: (1) The spread of invasive species^b; (2) genetic swamping^c; and, (3) the spread of disease coupled with human health concerns.

Invasive species: Xuan Liu, Monica E. McGarrity, and Yiming Li⁸ showed that the organized, Buddhist release of American bull frogs (native to eastern North America and listed among 100 of the World's Alien Invasive Species by the International Union for Conservation of Nature⁸) in water bodies in Yunnan Province, China, caused invasion of these waters resulting in significantly higher populations than water bodies where release events did not take place.⁸ Higher

^b A non-native invasive species is an organism that has been introduced either intentionally or unintentionally via human activity in territory outside of its natural home range, and has successfully established, often spreading with potential socioeconomic or ecological impacts. Conversely, a native species can be defined as one living in its place of origin, and therefore that has evolved within set environmental limitations. A native species may also turn to invasive species when environmental conditions change.¹¹

^c Genetic swamping is the process that occurs when two genetically isolated populations come into contact and the genes from a larger population dominate over the genes in the small population, reducing the genetic diversity in the small population.¹³

populations of American bullfrogs indicate they may have out-competed the native species in the water bodies surveyed in Yunnan Province. Bullfrogs are generalist predators and are vectors of the disease chytrid fungus which is mainly responsible for global amphibian decline.^{8,13}

Genetic swamping: Birdlife International reports that the increase in hybrids in the wild has been heightened by release of Chinese Bulbuls for religious purposes.¹⁴ As a result Taiwan Bulbuls are increasing in rarity in the wild, and there is danger of their disappearance through genetic swamping by Chinese Bulbuls.¹⁴

Human health concerns: Because of the contact between humans and animals in the 'animal release' ritual, there is a high risk of humans contracting diseases from these animals. Ramona A. Gutiérrez and Philippe Buchy for instance, investigated the potential role of the Eurasian Tree Sparrow in the spread of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI) H5N1 virus in Cambodia.¹⁵ The findings from their experiment, suggest that due to the presence of significant quantities of H5N1 virus on Eurasian Tree Sparrow feathers, the merit-release bird rituals represent a risk for human contamination in countries where the avian influenza virus is spreading.¹⁵

Ethical Concerns

Exploitation of animals due to commercialization of the 'animal release' practice raises ethical concerns. As is often the case, animals needed for this ritual need to be specially ordered thereby leading to the capture of animals in the wild. And if the supply is insufficient to meet demands for the periodical ritual, animals have to be obtained from other regions or countries. EAST published an article in 2004 that outlined the sequence for catching and releasing birds for ceremonial purposes in Taiwan: (1) Orders are made by the Buddhist organizations; hunters catch birds; wholesalers collect the captive birds; (2) birds are sold to the retailers; (3) retailers sell birds to Buddhist organizations; (4) birds are released in a ceremony; and, (5) hunters wait to catch the released birds.¹⁶ The case of hunters waiting to catch released birds is not restricted to Taiwan but is also reported to occur in Cambodia¹⁷ and Australia.¹⁸ This practice contradicts the aim of liberating animals based on the original intention of acting with compassion. Animals die during capture and, when held in captivity, may be denied adequate food and water. High mortality occurs when ordering, shipping and keeping animals until the day of ceremonial release. Furthermore, animals released into a non-native environment results in abnormally high death rate.⁷ Henry Shiu and Leah Stokes cited in their article published in 2008 in *Contemporary Buddhism* the Chinese newspaper *Sing Tao Daily* as having reported that 8000 birds were found dead in the Baiyun area in Guangzhou, where many

people go on weekend mornings to release birds and pray for merits.⁷ Also, the Institute of Supervising Animal Epidemic Control of Guangzhou declared that the death rate of released birds is 90% or higher.⁷

Hence, contrary to the compassionate intentions of releasers, merit release as currently practiced is a direct cause of extensive animal suffering.

Positions

Based on the associated problems and consequences of the religious practice of 'animal release' or *fang sheng* on biodiversity and ecological integrity, the urgent mandate of the CBD in the UN Decade for Biodiversity, the mission and strategic priorities of the Society for Conservation Biology (SCB), and our genuine respect and recognition of faith-based organizations in Asia and around the world and their efforts to conserve biodiversity, the Religion and Conservation Research Collaborative (RCRC) of the Religion and Conservation Biology Working Group (RCBWG) SCB takes the following position:

1. The religious practice of 'animal release' poses risk to the future of biodiversity and ecological integrity in Asia and other parts of the world where this ritual is currently practiced given, its constancy, the scale of the releases and the aforementioned associated problems.
2. Faith-based organizations are sincere in their intentions and have the capacity to adjust their approach to 'animal release' given the aforementioned problems that oppose their ritual's aim of compassion.
3. Conservation and faith-based organizations should work together to realize the best possible outcomes in solving the problem of 'animal release' where both spiritual and ecological integrity remain valued and are not violated.

Recommendations

Religious adherents have the potential to evolve a new and sustainable approach to 'animal release'. For example, a new form of animal release practice is gaining root in Singapore¹⁹ where religious adherents (1) release marine animals that would have become seafood and (2) use captive-bred animals from aquaculture. These practitioners claim that sea animals will not cause ecological damage because they belong to the marine environment and that these releases do not contribute to wild catches. While these justifications are over-simplistic, they do show that the Buddhist community is progressive and will adapt their practices in the light of factual information from science.

The RCRC therefore recommends the following:

1. Wide publicity and education of society by faith-based organizations in collaboration with conservation organizations on the detriments of 'animal release' and sustainable alternative practices.
2. Since religionists and conservationists share similar values, both parties can build on this by organizing religious release activities that promote the goals of conservation. For example, government or conservation NGOs could sponsor breeding programs for native species at risk and work with local temples to hold ceremonial release or reintroduction events in appropriate habitats.⁸

In order to achieve the above, collaboration and partnerships are needed globally and regionally among interested parties in the religion and conservation circles. The global urgency before us calls for a new awakening of responsibility and purposeful stewardship of life on Earth for the future of biodiversity, our children and our planet.

REFERENCES

1. Takacs, D. (1996). *The Idea of Biodiversity: Philosophies of Paradise*. The Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, MD. 393 pp.
2. Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). (2010). *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and Aichi Targets*. Available from <http://www.cbd.int/doc/strategic-plan/2011-2020/Aichi-Targets-EN.pdf> (accessed April 2012).
3. Biermann, F., Abbott, K., Andresen, S., Bäckstrand, K., *et al.* (2012). Navigating the Anthropocene: Improving Earth System Governance. *Science* 335: 1306-1307.
4. Gosler, A.G., Bagwhat, S., Harrop, S., Bonta, M & Tidemann, S. (2012). Leadership and Listening: Inspiration for Conservation Mission and Advocacy. In MacDonald, D. & Willis, K. *Key Topics in Conservation Education*. Chapter 6.
5. Awoyemi, S.M., Gambrill, A., Ormsby, A. & Vyas, D. (2012). Global Efforts to Bridge Religion and Conservation Are They Really Working? In: *Topics in Conservation Biology*, Povilitis, T. (Ed.), In Tech, Croatia, ISBN 978-953-51-0540-4.
6. Severinghaus, L.L. & Chi, L. (1991). Prayer Animal Release in Taiwan. *Biological Conservation* 89: 301-304.

7. Shiu, H., & Stokes, L. (2008). Buddhist Animal Release Practices: Historic, Environmental, Public Health and Economic Concerns. *Contemporary Buddhism* 9: 181-196.
8. Liu, X., McGarrity, M.E. & Li, Y. (2012). The Influence of Traditional Buddhist Wildlife Release on Biological Invasions. *Conservation Letters* 5: 107-114.
9. Available from <http://wildsingaporenews.blogspot.com/2009/10/release-of-life-religious-practice.html>
10. Available from <http://tinyurl.com/cm8e6ee>
11. Simberloff, D., Souza, L., Nunez, M.A., Barrios-Garcia, N., & Bunn, W. (2012). The natives are restless, but not often and mostly when disturbed. *Ecology* 93: 598-607.
12. Available from <http://vceenviroscience.edublogs.org/2009/04/23/genetic-swamping-and-genetic-drift/>
13. Wake, D.B. & Vredenburg, V.T. (2008). Are We in the Midst of the Sixth Mass Extinction? A View from the World of Amphibians. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 105: 11466-11473.
14. BirdLife International (2001). *Threatened Birds of Asia: the BirdLife International Red Data Book*. Cambridge, UK: BirdLife International.
15. Gutiérrez and Buchy *BMC Proceedings* 2011, 5(Suppl 1):P64
<http://www.biomedcentral.com/1753-6561/5/S1/P64>
16. Available from <http://www.east.org.tw/01/link3-32.htm>
17. Sipress, A. (2006). Bird Flu Puts an Element of Peril into Buddhist Rite. *Washington Post* March 16: A15.
18. De Bien, N. Prod. (2005). *Animal Liberation Buddhist Style*. The Religion Report. Sydney: Australian Broadcasting Corporation.
19. Available from <http://wildsingaporenews.blogspot.com/2011/05/animal-release-science-compassion-and.html>

Stephen Mufutau Awoyemi (RCRC Team Leader)
Tropical Conservancy
Nigeria
E-mail: awoyemi@tc-biodiversity.org

Jame Schaefer
Marquette University
USA

Andrew Gosler
University of Oxford
UK

Tom Baugh
Hidden Springs
USA

Kwek Yan Chong
National University of Singapore
Singapore

Eric Landen
Landen Consulting
USA