

# A STAMPEDE OF HYPOCRISY

How Animal Rights Activists  
Poach Elephant Donations







## BACKGROUND

Animal rights groups have launched high-profile propaganda campaigns against the sustainable and highly regulated hunting of African elephants, using them to push a sweeping political agenda. Despite the incessant trumpeting from these activists that they're "speaking for" the interests of elephants, the record shows that they are nothing more than jumbo hypocrites. While hunting benefits animals and African communities, animal rights activists want to impose their ideology on Africa at a cost to communities, an arrogant attitude rivaling that of 19th-Century colonialists.

## THE HYPOCRITES





# A PROPAGANDA STAMPEDE

Have you gotten a calendar in the mail from HSUS? A t-shirt? Or even socks? Animal rights groups are constantly putting out pleas for money to solve the latest crisis. In fact, the donations raised by these weepy pleas often don't go to help any animals—they go right back into fundraising to “save animals” from the next contrived “crisis,” begetting a cycle of factory fundraising. Fortunately, charity watchdogs are on the case.

The Humane Society of the United States earns a “C-minus” grade from the American Institute of Philanthropy for spending as little as 55 percent of its budget on programs and up to 42 cents to raise every dollar. Meanwhile, the International Fund for Animal Welfare earns a “D” grade for its low spending on programs and high spending on fundraising, and Born Free USA earns a middling “C” grade.

Donors to these groups don't just need to be concerned about the amount of money being blown on talking the talk instead of walking the walk. In June 2014 the nonprofit evaluator Charity Navigator issued a “Donor Advisory” against HSUS and Born Free USA after these groups were part of a \$15.75 settlement of a racketeering lawsuit (see below).

	% on Programs	Cost to Raise \$100	Grade
<b>HSUS</b>	55-76%	\$20-42	C-
<b>Born Free USA</b>	61-76%	\$24-45	C
<b>IFAW</b>	62-74%	\$36-61	D
<b>PETA</b>	67-84%	\$17-37	C+

## THE IVORY TOWER

“We at IFAW... advocate real, meaningful conservation efforts and community solutions.”

While HSUS, IFAW, HSI, Born Free, and PETA may find it convenient to lament about the plight of the African elephant — perhaps with the next fundraising appeal in mind — these groups aren't doing a whole lot of work on the ground to help African communities or pachyderms.

HSUS, despite raising over \$110 million a year, doesn't run a single sanctuary in Africa for elephants. HSUS

spent a paltry \$40,000 on grants to sub-Saharan Africa in 2012, a mere 0.03% of its budget. Not a single grant appears to be for elephant conservation.

HSI, meanwhile, spent \$495,000, or just 5% its budget, in sub-Saharan Africa—and it's unclear how much of this even went to elephant conservation.

IFAW raised \$17.5 million in contributions in its most recent fiscal year and spent just 2% of its budget, or

\$462,000, on grants to support elephants. IFAW claims that it spent a total of \$3 million on elephants, or 15% of its budget; however, this included “direct mail initiatives.” Given that the American Institute of Philanthropy finds that IFAW spends up to 38% of its budget on overhead, the true program spending—once you take out fundraising costs dressed up as program spending—is likely much lower.

Born Free USA only made grants of \$62,000 to sub-Saharan Africa in 2012—almost all to affiliate offices, and according to its tax return, it doesn't appear any of this was earmarked specifically for elephants.

PETA, meanwhile, raised over \$33 million during its 2012 fiscal year. Yet according to PETA's tax return, the organization didn't make a single grant to sub-Saharan Africa. (PETA's efforts to “save animals” in the U.S. don't seem any more distinguished: in 2013, PETA killed about 1,800 dogs and cats at its headquarters in Virginia.)

In short, IFAW, HSUS, HSI, Born Free USA and PETA together raise nearly \$170 million and only about 1 penny of every dollar goes to sub-Saharan Africa, according to their most recent tax returns. Considering how much these groups spend on overhead, they have little credibility to complain.



# BRIBERY SETTLEMENT

For all of their noise about African elephants, animal activists' work on Asian elephants shows the lengths to which they will stoop. In May 2014, HSUS, two HSUS employees, Born Free USA, and other animal rights activists settled a federal racketeering lawsuit for \$15.75 million. The suit, filed by Feld Entertainment, owner of the Ringling Bros. circus, alleged that various animal rights defendants engaged in illegal witness payments, bribery, racketeering, fraud, obstruction of justice, and litigation abuse against the circus. Feld sued after it uncovered a scheme by which animal activists had been making covert payments to a witness who was testifying against Feld in other litigation brought by animal rights groups and who lied to the court.

This settlement, which totals \$25 million when including a separate 2012 settlement from ASPCA, likely exceeds what they have collectively given to Africa over a decade. Ironically—and shamelessly—HSUS announced on the day of the settlement that Feld, which had been harassed in the courts



and press by animal activists, should spend the settlement money on elephant conservation. Yet Feld already runs an elephant conservation center in Florida that breeds endangered Asian elephants. What Feld spends to run this center is undoubtedly far more than anything HSUS spends on African or Asian elephants.

## ACTIVISTS: ELEPHANTS BETTER OFF DEAD

Despite claiming to speak for the elephants' best interests, animal rights activists have argued in court that the animals are better off dead than fed. The attorney representing Animal Protection Institute (which has since merged with Born Free USA), PETA, and the Animal Welfare Institute stated in federal court in 2003 that they'd rather see an African elephant killed than be cared for in a zoo.





# HUNTERS BENEFIT AFRICAN COMMUNITIES

Itai Hilary Tendaupenyu, a principal ecologist with Zimbabwe's Parks and Wildlife Management Authority, which manages sustainable utilization of natural resources, testified to the US Fish and Wildlife Service regarding regulated elephant hunting. Tendaupenyu noted that revenue from hunting is paid directly to the Authority's elephant conservation budget, and that hunting often occurs in rural areas, which promotes infrastructure development. Elephant hunting contributes \$14 million per year to Zimbabwe's economy.

Charles Jonga, director of the Zimbabwe program called CAMPFIRE, or Community Areas Management Program for Indigenous Resources, also notes the benefits of hunting for elephant conservation. CAMPFIRE runs wildlife management and anti-poaching programs for rural communities, covering 12.7% of the entire country, and 70% of CAMPFIRE's revenue comes from elephant hunting. In short, legal and regulated hunting contributes greatly to the fight against poaching.

Hunting's benefits aren't limited to elephants. Tanzania's highest-ranking wildlife official, wrote in *The New York Times* that "odd as it may sound, American trophy hunters play a critical role in protecting wildlife in Tanzania." Legal hunters' licensing fees alone provide \$1.9 million per year to support African governments' wildlife management efforts.

Hunters spend tens of millions in African communities, which helps fund not only conservation efforts and wildlife

management programs, but schools, roads, hospitals, and other infrastructure. Moreover, hunters spend money in and travel to remote areas not frequented by wildlife-watching tourists.

Trophy hunting generated \$75 million for Tanzania's economy alone between 2008 and 2011. That's far more than the pittance that HSUS, HSI, IFAW, Born Free USA, and PETA combined spend in all of sub-Saharan Africa.



## ON THE WRONG SIDE OF HISTORY

Both HSUS and Born Free USA are anti-hunting zealots whose ideology seeks to stifle even proven and pragmatic conservation strategies. In 2012, 60 Minutes revealed that private U.S. hunting ranches, many based in Texas, have successfully rehabilitated populations of African antelope that are endangered or extinct in the wild. Ranches work by allowing hunters to harvest a limited number of their animals every year, using the proceeds to help manage and grow the overall population. Hunting ranch conservationists are even in the process of shipping animals back to Africa. Yet animal rights extremists have pushed legislation and regulations that would cripple these ranches. They would burn down the barn to save the horses.

As to legal hunting in Africa, according to the CITES program for Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE), African areas suffering from higher levels of poverty experience higher levels of elephant poaching. This suggests that poaching is more likely to be adopted as an economic activity in areas where human livelihoods are insecure. Programs like CAMPFIRE, where well-regulated hunting contributes to the local economy, help decrease poverty by securing livelihoods, along with providing funds for anti-poaching programs. In other words, animal-rights efforts to end legal, limited hunting of elephants will not only defund anti-poaching efforts, but it will hurt local economies in Africa, driving up the likelihood of poaching as a means of economic sustainability.



## HSUS BACKER'S ILLEGAL IVORY

HSUS “ambassador” and pop star Ke\$ha was caught illegally importing ivory in 2012 by the Department of Homeland Security. An HSUS spokeswoman defended the singer.

## SUSTAINABLE HUNTING

In a recent op-ed at CNN.com, HSUS CEO Wayne Pacelle made hay out of the fact that in 2012 about 500 import permits were granted for elephants legally hunted in Zimbabwe, Tanzania, and Botswana. What he didn't mention was that these permits totaled less than half of the quota set by the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. Moreover, these permits total just 0.15% of the total elephant population in these three countries, which exceeds 325,000 animals. By contrast, poachers kill tens of thousands of elephants every year and are a far greater threat to the populations. That's why the money provided by legal hunts, much of which funds anti-poaching programs, is vital.

Even HSUS appears to recognize that elephant populations are healthy and even in need of thinning. HSUS and HSI advocate for the use of elephant birth control to control the population in South Africa. And Reuters reports that the elephant population in Botswana is so high that “vast forest have been lost” to satiate the elephant population's appetite. But HSUS's advocacy comes at a cost to taxpayers—the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service has subsidized the research into elephant immunocontraception—while legal hunting provides revenue for government programs.

## SAFARI CLUB'S AFRICAN EFFORTS

Along with the economic benefits that sustainable hunting provides to Africa, since 2007 SCI Foundation, SCI's sister foundation, has spent \$1.8 million in Africa on programs such as population surveys, researching genetics, and mitigating human-wildlife conflict. Many of these projects provide jobs for local residents and produce valuable research information for wildlife officials and biologists. Since 2010 SCI Foundation has spent \$170,000 directly on anti-poaching projects, and since 2003, SCI Foundation has spent \$750,000 on capacity building in Africa through the African Wildlife Consultative Forum.

