

The Mirror and the Mask: How Nada Farhoud's Crusade Betrays the Wild.

Author - Eugene Lapointe *et al.* (IWMC World Conservation Trust)

Earlier this year, Nada Farhoud cast veteran conservationist and professional hunter Robin Hurt as a villain who had “normalised killing animals for fun,” while disregarding his decades of support for community-based conservation and his statement that regulated hunting remains one of the best ways to fund the conservation of wildlife.

By all appearances, Nada Farhoud is a champion of wildlife. As the environment editor of the *Daily Mirror*, she has carved out a reputation with a stream of anti-hunting exposés designed to provoke outrage. Lions, elephants and leopards, each of these headlines paints a picture of brutality. But beneath this theatre lies a different story. One where the truth is obscured, science is ignored and real conservation efforts are undermined.

Farhoud's work is not just biased. It represents a classic case of neocolonial eco-moralism. She writes about African wildlife as if Africa were a passive landscape needing salvation from the West. Her reporting rarely includes the voices of the very people who live with wildlife and manage its risks every day. These lived experiences are replaced by a simplified narrative: the hunter is always the villain, the animal always the victim.

This is not conservation journalism. It is a performance that is crafted for readers who will never encounter the complexity of managing lions outside Kruger or elephants near farmland in Namibia. It is clickbait conservation, designed to provoke, not to inform.

In 2023, Farhoud targeted Syed Rizwan, a hunter who actively funds conservation work. Her article published identifying information about his home and business. This led to a barrage of online abuse, including death threats to his family. Rizwan filed a formal complaint with the UK's press regulator IPSO, citing privacy violations and initiated a copyright claim. He also had to relocate his family for safety.

[Fieldsports Channel, 2023](#)

This was not responsible journalism but trial by media, a reckless exposé that endangered a conservationist by inviting harassment through personal targeting rather than offering a critique of his work.

Farhoud continued this pattern in 2025 when she went “undercover” at *The Stalking Show* in the UK. Her resulting article portrayed hunting providers as cruel profiteers. Yet it offered no serious engagement with the scientific or ethical complexities of sustainable use. The portrayal was one-dimensional and designed to shock rather than inform. [Shooting UK, 2025](#)

Even more troubling is the inconsistency of the platform Farhoud writes for. The *Daily Mirror* has historically profited from industries that subject animals to genuine suffering. The *Daily Mirror* sponsored the English Greyhound Derby from 1983 until 1990, during which time the event was branded the ‘Daily Mirror Greyhound Derby’ in certain years, including 1987. This fact is often omitted when the paper claims moral authority on animal welfare.

Farhoud’s indignation about animal suffering appears highly selective. The *Mirror* condemned hunting as barbaric while benefiting from gambling-fueled sports that killed hundreds of dogs annually.

And yet, the greatest irony lies not in the coverage but in the consequences. Trophy hunting underpins conservation financing across millions of hectares in Africa. Hunting supports anti-poaching patrols, community infrastructure, scientific research and habitat protection. Without that income, wildlife does not flourish and neither do the communities. It vanishes. Forests are cleared for farming. Elephants are shot by desperate farmers. Lions are speared in retaliation. Critics like Farhoud rarely offer alternatives to this reality.

Conservation is not a morality play. It is a daily negotiation between humans and wildlife, often in regions where livelihoods depend on pragmatic choices rather than distant ideals. That negotiation belongs to those who live with the consequences, not those who write about them for clicks.

Let this be clear: the greatest threat to wildlife today is not the person carrying the rifle. It is the person holding the pen and misinforming the masses.