



10 December 2019

AN OPEN LETTER

- 1. To: The Right Honourable Mr Cyril Ramaphosa
President. The Republic of South Africa.**
- 2. To: The Hon. Mrs Barbara Creecy,
Minister of Environmental Affairs, Forestry & Fisheries.**

Parliamentary Committees, DEFF and Animal Rights; The Captive Breeding of Lions (CBL); & A Call to Action

Dear Mr Ramaphosa and Mrs Creecy,

NB: This dissertation is written by the CEO of the TRUE Green Alliance (TGA), who is an independent observer submitting an objective report on, inter alia, the activities of the parliamentary committee that has been dealing with the Captive Breeding of Lions Industry in South Africa.

NB: The TGA's vision is:-

To create a southern African (ultimately global) society that is properly informed about the principles and practices of science-based wildlife management; that understands the wisdom of, and necessity for, the practice of sustainable utilisation of living resources (both wild and domestic) for the benefit of mankind; that supports animal welfare; and that rejects animal rights - the doctrine of which seeks to abolish all animal uses by man.

Our mission includes a firm commitment to support government (particularly the Minister of Environmental Affairs) with regard to achieving the objectives of South Africa's National Conservation Strategy (NCS); and to promote and to support the provision in South Africa's constitution that encourages and enables the sustainable utilisation of our environment - or rather of the living resources within our environment - for the benefit of all South Africans.

The South African Predator Association (SAPA) and the Parliamentary Committees dealing with the Captive Breeding of Lions Industry (CBL)

Mr Deon Swart (CEO of the Predator Association of South Africa (SAPA), has requested that I prepare a report that reflects my impressions of the parliamentary colloquium of 2018 on the CBL and the lead up to, and the proceedings of, the November 2019 parliamentary (oversight) meeting on this same subject. SAPA is the public governing body of the CBL Industry.

NB: The TGA has no affiliation with the South African Predator Association (SAPA).

I attended the 2018 colloquium but not the November 2019 one. What I know about this latter meeting comes from my gleaning of information from an audio recording of the proceedings; and from telephonic conversations with Mr Swart and Mr. Andre Mentz (the SAPA president). I have elected, however, to focus this report on something that, in my opinion, is far more important than the CBL Industry itself.

My focus in this report is on: **“The influence of the animal rightist NGOs on the parliamentarians who comprised the CBL colloquium; and the subsequent related meetings.”**

My biggest concern about this whole CBL debacle – and it IS a ‘debacle’ - is the manner in which the parliamentary committee ‘teamed up’ with local and international animal rightist NGOs. And it is about *this* fact that I call government to action.

I think - I hope - you will find my observations to be interesting, relevant and important.

My personal credentials that qualify me to enter this debate

I am an ex-game warden and national parks board director. I have some 30 years of hands-on government service in Africa's national parks and wildlife management organisations. I have served, inter alia, as the Provincial Game Warden-in-charge of Zimbabwe's Hwange National Park - one of Africa's bigger and more prestigious game reserves. I am a university-trained ecologist. For 20 years I was a member of the British

Institute of Biology (London). During that same period I was registered as a Chartered Biologist for the European Union. My involvement in national parks management, and with the management of the big game animal populations that live in and around Africa's national parks, is vast. I have considerable experience in hunting stock-killing lions; and I have killed six man-eating lions. These first-hand experiences with wild lions make my considerations of the CBL Industry particularly relevant. For the last 30 years I have been an investigative wildlife management journalist. I have published 15 books on big game hunting and 'conservation'. Five of my books are university-level text books. I have had, therefore, a total of 60 years of continuous and relative (to this subject) involvement in Africa's wildlife management affairs. I believe, therefore, that my observations should be worthy of appropriate consideration.

A further qualifying credential:

The 2018 TGA survey of the CBL Industry

Together with a TGA colleague, Mrs Elma Britz, we together completed a full one month's survey of the CBL Industry - at the invitation of Mr Mentz. It lasted the entire month of June 2018. We toured and inspected (in depth) lion farms in the Free State; the North-West Province; and the Limpopo Province - visiting some 40 farms out of the estimated 200 in the country. We spoke to farmers, veterinarians, field staff - black and white - professional hunters, and overseas CBL lion hunters. We investigated everything to do with the slaughter of lions and the preparation of their skeletons for export. We examined all the farm infrastructures including the registered hunting camps. I spoke at length to several overseas hunters and obtained their impressions of captive-bred lion hunting in South Africa. And, finally, I examined a number of scientific publications concerned with the collection of DNA material and micro-chipping of the CBL lion population. My published report was entitled: **"SEARCHING FOR THE TRUTH"** – a copy of which was submitted the Minister (Environmental Affairs) in late 2018.

Before, during and after this inspection - but before we had written the report - I was given 'instructions' by many different people: to condemn the CBL Industry; and/or to condone it. We refused to take any such advice from anybody and we made up our minds to see for ourselves how the industry was operating 'on the ground'.

I set myself the task of making one of two truthful and simple decisions: either to condemn CBL (and say why); or to condone it. In the end, we condoned it whilst admitting that there was a great deal of 'room for improvement'. We did NOT, however, find any reasons to condemn it. None at all. Indeed, we believe that it had, and still has, great potential - if government and the public would allow the industry to be developed and administered in a proper and professional manner. Everybody seems to think they

know how best to deal with all CBL issues. But nobody seems to realise, or won't acknowledge, that the people who know BEST how to manage CBL's affairs, are the members of SAPA and the lion farmers themselves.

In our report we stated that the CBL Industry was worth saving and we recommended to the Minister (the late Mrs Edna Molewa) that she should nurture the industry and help it to rub off its still (then) many rough edges. This is STILL the TGA's opinion.

Background to the Captive Breeding of Lions Industry (CBL)

This is how I understand the background to be:

The Captive Breeding of Lions (CBL) Industry was approved by government several years ago - admittedly, not without controversy. And since that primary approval, 200+ farmers invested a great deal of money, time, effort and expertise, into developing the infrastructure of this new and intriguing business. The value of these facilities enters into millions of SA Rands.

To begin with, the industry focussed on producing and rearing lions for captive-bred-lion-hunting purposes. It has expanded, in recent years, into the production of skeletons (for sale into the Far Eastern Lion Bone market). These skeletons were originally derived from the bodies of 'hunted' lions - so they were a by-product of the captive-bred lion hunting industry. Today, however, the production of these skeletons has become a new and independent production line in its own right. The TGA believes there is nothing wrong with that; and we encourage the Minister to enable the lion bone trade to develop to its maximum potential (and that it disposes of all lion bone quotas.)

Opposition to the concept and to the practices of CBL - from hunting to the lion bone trade – has come from many quarters. It was, however, largely spawned by animal rights organisations (both local and international) whose purpose in life is to abolish ALL animal 'uses' by man. This should have been expected. (The animal rightists even oppose the keeping of chickens for the production of eggs for human breakfasts.)

Internationally, the anti-hunting, and anti-lion-hunting fanatics, gained a boost for their campaign from the publication of a fabricated story (based on a real hunt) about the hunting of "Cecil the Lion" in Zimbabwe (2015). The bulk of the animal rightists' propaganda associated with 'Cecil the Lion', however, was not true.

The 2018 Colloquium

I was absolutely NOT impressed with the composition of the gathering in the committee room half of which, it seemed, was made up of South African and overseas animal rights people and NGOs. In this regard, I have to point out that the committee had been

tasked to pronounce on an entirely South African issue - the CBL Industry; and matters which concerned South Africa's well established National Conservation Strategy (NCS). It is also true, however, that our national constitution approves the sustainable use of the living resources in our environment for the benefit of South Africa's people – which brings this important inclusion 'in-line' with CBL.

I had to remind myself that the purpose of each and every animal rightist in that parliamentary committee room was to **ABOLISH ALL ANIMAL USES BY MAN**. And I wondered just what kind of contribution these animal rightists were going to make to this important debate. I was soon to find out that they had already 'captured' the bulk (if not all) of the committee members' attention.

And I was utterly dismayed when I was told that the animal rights NGOs - during the actual proceedings of the colloquium - were sending text messages (by WhatsApp) to the committee members - prompting them - and/or advising them - how to answer particular questions or circumstances. I found THAT state of affairs to be utterly scandalous.

I have been led to believe that this same committee (in an over-sight capacity) had called a meeting early in 2019 – to clarify its position within itself – and that it had invited ONLY animal rightists (and animal rights NGOs) to contribute to its deliberations. No member of SAPA was invited; and no member of any other South African organisation that supported the sustainable use of living resources, was invited either. This indicates to me, just how enamoured the committee members are with the animal rights fraternity. And this observation was borne out by the committee members' utterances during the sessions that were conducted during the proceedings.

I further believe that the November 2019 oversight committee meeting – with the same committee members – was convened under exactly the same circumstances.

***NB:** I understand, however, that SAPA contrived to make its voice heard at this latest meeting (under very difficult circumstances) – which is a matter that I am not going to discuss here because it deviates from the main and new theme of (this) my report. Nevertheless, I fully concur with the presentation facts articulated by Mr. Richard York on behalf of SAPA, during this session. And I am also not sure just HOW these oversight committees function.*

Suffice it to say - in conclusion - that the parliamentary committee has clearly hitched its wagon to the animal rightists' tractor – and it has deflected all attention away from any discussion on the benefits to South Africa that would accrue to this country, and to its people, if it would just embrace the concept of sustainable-use-of-living-resources. And I

am quite positive that the committee's negative attitude - towards 'sustainable-use-of-wildlife' - has come from the committee's close association with the animal rightists.

Finally, I would like the Minister to investigate, and to determine, who wrote the parliamentary colloquium committee's 2018 report that condemned CBL. The report was very articulate and it used animal rightist terminology, jargon and language throughout. I have been led to believe that one of the animal rightists who attended the colloquium offered to write the report - and that he was taken up on his offer.

The World Conservation Strategy (WCS) (1980) & South Africa's National Conservation Strategy

This is a very important collective subject but it is not possible to discuss the WCS without first making sure that everybody is on the same page. A great deal of today's wildlife management philosophy dates back to the WCS (1980) the principles of which are still valid.

Over the years, South Africa's National Conservation Strategy (NCS) evolved with the times but we should not forget that our first-version National Conservation Strategy (NCS) was based upon the WCS 1980. In those days the WCS was the mission statement of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN); and it had three objectives for what it calls '*living resource conservation*'. They were (in brief):

- **To maintain essential ecological processes and life support systems;**
- **To preserve genetic diversity (e.g. to stop species extinctions); and**
- **To ensure the sustainable utilisation of species and ecosystems** (notably fish and other wildlife, forests and grazing lands) which support millions of rural communities as well as major industries.

NOTE: *The WCS supports the sustainable use of wildlife resources for both subsistence and commercial purposes!*

Even though the original South African NCS was an almost exact carbon copy of the WCS, and although different (changed and/or expanded) environmental laws now apply in South Africa, the principles of these three objectives have not changed within our legal system. And it is the TGA's intention to keep these three objectives alive and relevant. The fact that the third of these objectives is now written into the New South African constitution makes this objective easier to explain and to reinforce.

In 1980, everyone was enamoured with the WCS. It was called 'the blue print' that would take man-and-nature into posterity in symbiotic harmony. And all those sovereign states that were members of the IUCN, obligated themselves to world society to model their NATIONAL Conservation Strategies on the WCS template. South Africa was one of them.

NB: It is very important to note that the animal rightists reject the WCS!

Animal Rights vis-à-vis Animal Welfare

It is impossible to debate the issue of animal rights without first making sure everybody understands animal welfare and environmentalism, too; and just where all three of these 'units' fit into the bigger 'conservation picture'. All three of them comprise what is euphemistically called "The Green Movement".

1. **TRUE Environmentalists** are people (and/or NGOs) whose purpose in life is to make sure that the earth's environment remains a safe and healthy habitat for man, and ALL other living organisms (plants and animals), to live in. Every responsible member of society, therefore, should be an environmentalist because to be otherwise is to be suicidal. True environmentalists support all three of the WCS objectives.
2. **TRUE Animal Welfarists** also support all three of the WCS objectives. They insist, however, that when man uses a live animal for his own benefit (such as when he rides a horse or uses a horse to pull a cart; or an ox to plough a field) his treatment of that animal should be humane. And that when he has to kill an animal to gain benefits, (such as when he kills a cow or a kudu to get meat to eat) the killing act should not be cruel. Animal welfarists, therefore, oversee man's civilised treatment of animals. Every responsible member of society, therefore, should support animal welfarism.
3. **Animal Rightists** can be identified as people who reject, particularly, the third of the three WCS objectives. They believe that man has NO right to use or to *kill* an animal - any animal - for his own benefit. They believe – or purport to believe – that when man 'uses' or 'kills' an animal for the benefit of mankind, that he is abusing the rights of the animal(s) concerned. It is the animal rightist's purpose to STOP man's use of animals – ALL animals – for whatever reason. The animal rightist is not concerned about whether or not the treatment that man metes out to animals when he 'uses' them, or 'kills' them, is humane or cruel. His requirement is that man should NOT 'use' or 'kill' animals AT ALL. And he certainly should not eat meat. They believe that man should exist by way of a vegetable diet and no other.

NB: Killing, in itself, is not cruel. For any act-of-man to be cruel it must be carried out with the intention of inflicting pain and suffering. When a hunter kills his quarry or a butcher kills a domestic animal, therefore, such killing cannot be construed as being 'cruel' because the 'killer' had no intention of inflicting pain and suffering. Likewise when a lion kills a buffalo that action is not cruel – even though the victim

might take half-an-hour to die. Why so? Because the lion's reason for killing a buffalo is to obtain meat to eat. Its purpose is NOT 'to cause pain and suffering'.

South Africa's legal systems allow for wild animals to be owned by man and to be hunted; and for domestic animals to be slaughtered in an abattoir to obtain meat for man to eat. Supermarkets and butcheries sell venison, beef, mutton, ostrich, pork, poultry, eggs and fish to their customers. And all this is carried out under the umbrella of legal incentives for the supermarkets, butcheries, farmers and game ranchers, commercial fisheries and anglers, to 'make a living'.

Within the wildlife industry – because it is 'commercial' - game animals can be bought and sold, and harvested in a variety of ways. And the venison so obtained can be sold legally by the landowners almost anywhere. Furthermore, it is obligatory that game ranchers secure their wild animals behind 'adequately fenced enclosures' (high game fences). Even the still highly controversial CBL lion farming is legal; the hunting of captive-bred lions is legal; and the sale of lion skeletons is legal. And none of these CBL activities are detrimental to South Africa's WILD lion populations – NOT IN ANY WAY AT ALL! It is also legal for game ranchers to breed a wide variety of animals on their properties, and to release captive-bred animals onto their game ranches for the express purpose of having someone come and hunt them. This is the nature of South Africa's very successful and commercial wildlife culture.

And EVERY SINGLE ONE of the facets I have here recorded - as being an integral and essential part of South Africa's commercial wildlife industry - is vehemently opposed by every single one of the animal rightists who were invited to the official South African parliamentary CBL colloquium in 2018; AND the two related CBL parliamentary meetings in 2019. Nevertheless, it must be clearly pointed out that the animal rightists have already 'let it out' that South Africans are immoral people "because they make money out of wildlife".

NB: BRAND SOUTH AFRICA. *The animal rightists present at the 2018 colloquium insisted that CBL had had a very bad effect on BRAND SOUTH AFRICA all over the world. This was refuted by Dr Swart (BRAND SOUTH AFRICA – Research) who said, whilst addressing the colloquium, that whatever ruffles the CBL controversy might have created on the world stage, they were far too insignificant to have had any effect on BRAND SOUTH AFRICA.*

The animal rightists also all oppose everything that is contained in South Africa's National Conservation Strategy and its attendant legislation. They oppose the 1991 Game Theft Act that created the conditions that have allowed South Africa's wildlife industry to be successful

Who on earth, therefore, was responsible for inviting these nefarious pariahs – all of them ‘anti’ every facet of our wildlife industry - to these official government meetings? And WHAT are they expecting from the animal rightists’ participation in the CBL debate?

Anarchy most certainly looms in the wildlife arena as a consequence. One might say that anarchy is already ruling.

A massive contribution of animal rightist philosophy within South Africa’s tourism industry suggests that the animal rightists are well on their way towards ‘capturing’ tourism in this country. When public tourism meetings occur in South Africa they are normally over-supplied with local animal rights delegates – and often with a representative or two from international animal rights NGOs, too. And from what I have been led to believe, these outsiders function as ‘advisers’. Two particular people come to mind – one from Holland another from America.

The editor of the tourism newsletter, “Tourism Update”, for example, often applauds his “regular article subscribers” - who are all local animal rightists. And whenever I have tried to place a ‘comment’ my approaches have been ignored.

One particularly worrying development – two or three years ago now – was that petitions were handed out (by certain South African Tour Guides) to incoming international tourists. The petition stated that they (the tourists) did not approve of hunting, especially trophy hunting, and (particularly) they hated the idea of animals being culled (for any reason). The petition was designed and constructed by a South African; and, once it was signed, it conveyed a demand to South African Tourism NOT to take these visitors to any game lodge that practised hunting or culling.

This upset many game lodge owners who then instructed their own estate tour guides NOT to discuss any kind of management, hunting or culling practices with the tourists who visited their lodges – on pain of immediate dismissal.

I have gleaned all this information from many tour guides who are equally worried, and who have become my friends or (book-buying) clients.

The question remains: How is South Africa going to deal with this problem – and it is a BIG problem!

An analogy that explains my reasoning admirably

If our Minister was asked to arrange and to host a conference on the subject of “Abuse Against Women and Children” – with the idea that the delegates would discuss and discover better and more effective ways to stop such crimes against these victims - who do you think the Minister would NOT (or should NOT) invite to ‘the party’?

If I were the Minister, I would not invite known paedophiles and convicted rapists to such a conference - for obvious reasons – and I am quite sure that every South African in the country would approve of my decisions. Even if the paedophiles pleaded that it was their democratic right, as a citizen of the country, to attend such a conference, I would not relent.....because paedophiles and rapists, in my opinion, have squandered their ‘democratic rights’ to participate in all such events.

I believe the animal rightists have squandered their rights to participate in wildlife management debates of any kind, too, for exactly the same reasons. In my book, the animal rightists are ‘the paedophiles of the wildlife industry’.

The TGA is slowly compiling a list of people and NGOs that, we believe, should never be allowed to attend official wildlife management debates (because of their animal rightist orientation). All and every animal rightist that lives in South Africa, or who is likely to visit South Africa, will appear on that list. And they will be listed as CODE-RED for ease of identity. This is going to take a little while to organise and to construct but the names of every single one of the animal rightists who attended these CBL colloquium meetings WILL be included on that list, too.

INTERNATIONAL ANIMAL RIGHTSISM – CITES and IWC (This is all fully related to the CBL issue)

CITES: The Conventional on International Trade in Endangered Species.

***NB:** This is a misnomer because, biologically, there is no such thing as ‘an endangered species’.*

CITES came into being in 1975 when its stated purpose was to REGULATE the wildlife trade. Since then, following the influence of a massive increase in animal rightist NGO accreditations, CITES has become an organisation that now aims to PROHIBIT the wildlife trade.

Two thirds of all accredited NGOs at CITES are now animal rightist in orientation. They disapprove of the wildlife trade. Their reason for accrediting themselves to the convention, therefore, is NOT to further the vision and/or the mission of the convention, but to totally destroy its honest purpose.

ONLY the 183 sovereign states members (The ‘Parties’ to the Convention) have the right to vote at CITES - one vote per ‘party’ for every item on the agenda. Indeed, it can be said that serving the trade interests of these 183 sovereign states is (or should be) the sole purpose of CITES.

How does CITES work? Let me explain: If South Africa lodged a request with CITES for permission to sell its stockpiles of white rhino horn, for example, that request would be added as an 'item for debate' on the conference's agenda; and it would be debated at the appropriate time. The 'Parties' and ALL accredited NGOs (including the animal rightists NGOs) would be able to FULLY participate in the debate. It must be pointed out, however, that because two-thirds of the accredited NGOs at CITES are animal rightist in orientation – that fact seriously 'weights' the nature and the conduct of the debates.

Once the subject has been fully debated, the 'parties' - and ONLY 'the Parties' – are required to vote, "yea or nay". Nobody else at CITES is entitled to vote. Consensus - that is, the majority of the yea or nay votes cast - determines the outcome. And THAT represents the CITES decision on THAT subject.

It is also necessary to point out that only some 10 countries in the whole world are "white-rhino-range-states". That means there are only 10 countries that possess and manage white rhino populations. And these 10 countries are the only ones that have any kind of 'emotional' interest in the well-being and/or proper management of the white rhino.

Conversely, therefore there are 173 (183 minus 10) 'Parties' that are NOT white-rhino-range-states - and none of these 183 countries enjoy any kind of 'emotional ownership' over white rhinos. That, in turn, means they are not REALLY concerned about what happens with regards to the management of this species.

***NB:** By the same token the people of Mongolia are not REALLY concerned about what happens to the Jackass Penguin on the southern African coastline. And that is understandable. Why should they be concerned about the penguin? They are far more interested in what happens to their own wild flora and fauna. This is something that everyone needs to understand and to acknowledge - because it reflects the truth about 'human nature'.*

Many 'Parties', therefore - because they have no rhinos, and because they actually don't care what happens to Africa's rhinos - 'make it known' that they are open to selling their 'rhino-related votes' to the highest bidder. This procedure, of course, has been orchestrated, encouraged and finely tuned, over many years, by the accredited animal rights NGOs at CITES.

And this is just ONE way that these NGOs have constructed plans to secure clandestine voting rights at the convention. In this (above) case they 'buy' these votes - straight out - from those 'Party' delegates' that are susceptible to such bribery. In other cases the animal rightists mask their intentions by paying 'sponsorships' to delegations ostensibly

to 'cover their costs' when attending CITES meetings in foreign lands. The options and the alternatives are, in fact, almost limitless. The end results, however, are the same: the NGO's are rewarded by gaining clandestine access to votes to which they are not entitled.

***NB:** This corrupt practice has been going on at CITES for - to my personal knowledge - the last three-and-a-half decades. In the early 1990s, I reported three cases of vote selling to the US Government Accountability Office (GAO) - but it came to nothing because the crimes, I was told, were committed on foreign soil and with the connivance of foreign nationals. They were outside the jurisdiction of the USA. So the culprits got away with it.*

The GAO provides fact-based non-partisan information to congress; including facts about crimes committed by American nationals outside the USA. The US GAO is often called the "congressional watchdog".

This corrupt practice – the buying of votes – makes a HUGE mockery of the convention because genuine range states – who are looking towards CITES dealing with their requests on trade matters in a fair and equitable manner - cannot rely on “fair and honest treatment”. And more and more people are beginning to wonder why any government would want to be associated with such a corrupt organisation.

This year (2019) (at CoP 18), six SADC countries registered CITES reservations. This meant they refused to accept decisions reached at CITES (by way of the consensus vote) which enforced trade prohibitions; when there was really no reason for denying trade. And the consensus voting – which went against the better judgement of the six countries involved – was all “fixed” by the reason of clandestine manipulations of purchased (or coerced) votes by the accredited animal rightist organisations.

Not one of the NGOs that purchase votes at CITES, 'own' elephants, rhinos (black or white), giraffe, cheetah, leopards or lions - which seem to be the main terrestrial subjects of the CITES debates these days. Whether any of the decisions these animal rightists manipulated at the convention, caused any of these animals to thrive or to become extinct - either way – does not affect any one of them one little bit. These wild animals therefore, are considered to be merely 'ideological subjects' by these NGOs – expendable tools of their trade. The manufactured emotions that the animal rightists create, using these animals, is all that matters to the NGOs – because emotion is the factor that loosens the purse strings of the First World public.

This is a good example of just how and why the accredited animal rightists at CITES have 'taken over' the convention. CITES was a good idea. If it had performed properly and honestly and grown honestly (since 1975), it would by now be providing a good and

valuable service to the sovereign states, and to the people and to the wildlife of the whole world. But the convention has been subtly 'taken over' by the animal rightist NGOs and it is now an abomination.

This exact same thing is happening in South Africa – in many different shapes and forms. The animal rightists' ostensible and emotional public disapproval of CBL is just one such fabrication. What they have wanted to do with CBL – and what they have succeeded in doing – is to turn every facet of the CBL into an emotional issue within the First World. Nothing more. And the manner in which the animal rightists have manipulated and inveigled their way into a position where they now dominate the opinions of our parliamentarians, is an excellent example of what is happening – and of how their ambitions are escalating. Another good example is how they are 'slowly taking over' policy considerations in South African tourism.

With regards to the CBL issue, the captive breeding of lions is merely the vehicle that will enable them to 'take over' – and to ultimately control and totally change - South Africa's wildlife industry in its entirety. And their supposed opposition to hunting – especially trophy hunting – is yet another of their developing machinations.

The International Whaling Commission (IWC): After many decades of active participation in the IWC, earlier this year (2019) Japan resigned from this commission because of continuous and irrational interference by the IWC's accredited animal rightist NGOs – which is exactly what is happening in CITES at this time. Japan is now whaling in the southern oceans in a sustainable and responsible manner without any kind of international approval. Good luck to them!

Here again, the animal rightists accredited to the IWC forced continuous PROHIBITION onto all the IWC members - against staunch scientific recommendations and advice - until Japan declared that it had 'had enough'.

Why don't we change the NGO accreditation rules for CITES? One way to control access by unwanted people and criminal delegations, to organisations like CITES and the IWC, would be to introduce application criteria that would control who can, and who cannot, be accredited as 'observers'. And ONLY those who are prepared to work towards achieving the stated objectives of CITES (i.e. REGULATION not PROHIBITION) should be permitted accreditation. This should not be difficult to do.

No sovereign state anywhere has yet tried to do this. Maybe South Africa should start the ball rolling?

Corrupting animal rights-ism is all embracing

The problem of corrupting animal rights-ism is not unique to South Africa. It occurs virulently in Europe; in the United Kingdom; in Canada; and in America.

“Thealdenham” (discussing animal rights-ism in the UK) posted the blog, below on December 4th, 2019 – under the title: **The Anti-Hunt Collective & Cyber Trolling**”:

Ideological Possession -“It’s the perfect recipe for total stupidity”

“The Anti-Hunt brigade (in the UK) is a collective with ideological possession. Those lucky enough to break free from its mind-numbing shackles, like Ex-Saboteur Miles Cooper, describe it as a cult. He was one of the lucky ones.”

Below, the behaviour that so typifies the animal rightist anti-hunt brigade, is laid bare as Professor Bruno de Sousa explains.

“Ideological Possession means that they (the anti-hunt brigade) have internalised a pre-programmed script of statements and responses to promote a specific narrative about how things are that, due to logical fallacy (usually tautology, but there are many others), is applicable to any situation. Once one accesses that “script”, and begins to execute it, a series of automatic behaviours emerges that involve no deliberation, judgement, inquiry or (God forbid) personal perspective or creativity. It’s just pattern recognition and remote memory (IF >>>>GO TO...).

“In such a state, people become unable to perform any form of higher-order thinking regarding the subject in question. This makes them impervious to any logic and evidence, to which they react, simply following the particular script they internalised, even when doing so is contradictory, tangential, off-topic, non sequitur, observably wrong, etc., for such shortcomings will simply be ignored, dismissed or altogether unperceived.

“It’s the perfect recipe for total stupidity, at least while the script is being run, and, in some cases, it never stops running.

“It is quite hard to win an argument against people who are ideologically possessed, for, as the saying goes:

“The difference between genius and stupidity is that genius has its limits”.

Alexandre Dumas.

NB: *The reason why an ideological script gets internalised in the first place has to do with its ability to reduce anxiety by simplifying one’s understanding of the world and their associated decision-making, as well as the emotional gratification coming from the collective approval of those who share the ideology. When said-ideology spreads to the point of providing some influence and power to the leaders of the movement, there can even be economic incentives to following the script.*

All in all, ideological possession is a dangerous and viral process that must be nipped in the bud when possible, for it is very hard to cure and often intellectually fatal.

NB: The animal rights movement, world-wide, falls into this dimension.

This *Thealdenham* post included some YouTube material showing how the anti-hunt brigade in Great Britain - with dozens of men and women dressed in black Ninja gear and balaclavas – some carrying Ninja weapons - invaded private farms, pastures and crop lands and harassed ladies on horseback, terrorising their young children who were riding on ponies nearby. Whilst the police cars drove by and did nothing. It is difficult to understand that all this was really happening on quiet roads in the beautiful British countryside. It becomes less difficult to understand, however, when one considers that - for political expediency - Lord Ashcroft and the British Prime Minister, Boris Johnson, often behave, on national television, like prime movers in the British Anti-Hunting league.

***NB:** One interpretation of the American Racketeering Influenced and Corrupt Organisations Act (The RICO Act) suggests that, if their actions were ever tested in a court of law, animal rightists would be classified as being common fraudsters, racketeers and components of organised crime. But that assertion has not yet been so tested.*

The animal rights brigade, however, is ‘ideologically possessed’ in every sense. And South Africa can well do without all the attendant troubles that flow therefrom. In terms of our wildlife management affairs - like CBL - responsible decisions need to be made ONLY on logical, common sense, biological and scientific evaluations of all related matters; including the intent, and the laws, pertaining to South Africa’s national conservation strategy.

We also need to take full cognizance of the facts that our wildlife culture is ‘commercial’ and that our constitution supports the sustainable ‘use’ of our environment - and of the living resources that live in our environment - for the benefit of all South Africa’s people.

There were reasons why this ‘right’ was specifically included in our constitution. One of those reasons was to avoid the chance that ‘ideologically possessed people’ - like the animal rightists – might be able to systematically remove that legal right from the South African landscape; or to corruptly ‘buy’ its removal if it was contained in a lesser protocol.

I wish to stress the fact that every single objective of the animal rights movement worldwide is contrary to everything that South Africa believes in. And I believe that the parliamentarians who were involved in the scandalous inclusion of these pernicious people into the parliamentary colloquium 2018, should be quietly and firmly, but also appropriately, informed of their error.

Finally, I believe the whole matter of animal rights-ism in South Africa - and the need to make sure these nefarious people be excluded from all future wildlife debates - needs to be addressed officially, urgently and openly. And I further believe that any conclusions that might have been reached on the CBL issue - by 'this' parliamentary committee **and** its animal rightist advisers - be declared null-and-void.

Finally, I call upon the South African government to address this WHOLE matter expeditiously. If this is NOT done - and done with a high degree of urgency and energy - I fear that our wildlife industry will fall apart.

Ron Thomson CEO - TRUE GREEN ALLIANCE

www.mahohboh.org

mahohboh@mahohboh.org

Facebook: thetruegreenalliance

Cell: 072 587 1111

Phone: 046 648 1243

