The Struggle between Man and Nature

Editorial by Eugene Lapointe, IWMC President

The struggle between man and nature goes on. Over the past few months a number of international wildlife conservation meetings have taken place and each has been a cause for raised eyebrows.

In July, an attempt to hold a calm and non-controversial International Whaling Commission meeting in Jersey turned into chaos. Commissioners retreated into closed sessions as the quest for consensus broke down. The Latin American group attempted to take advantage of the absence of several African and Caribbean countries (who were unable to obtain British visas) to ask for a vote on the creation of a Southern Atlantic Sanctuary. A quorum could not be established for a vote and the meeting petered out into nothingness.

The following month, the CITES Standing Committee met as part of the preparations for CoP16, to be held in Bangkok in March 2013. The time-bound listing, proposed with the surreptitious aim of getting more marine fish species onto CITES Appendices, was fiercely opposed by all sides of the spectrum despite having strong support from the Secretariat. Another highly publicized issue was a proposal designed to lead to the abolition of the Secret ballot, which is important for the anti-use consortium because it enables them to threaten small nations with campaigns and boycotts if they vote "the wrong way". This discussion turned into a conflict between concepts of "Sovereignty" and "Transparency". The emotionally charged argument presented by the European Union (at the urging of the animal rights lobby) was that "CITES needed to operate in full transparency". This was countered by the rational argument "that CITES Parties, mainly developing nations, need to protect their sovereignty". The outcome was a weak request to the CITES Secretariat to produce a document outlining the history of the Secret ballot. We have to expect that the anti-use consortium

Published by IWMC World Conservation Trust, 3 Passage Montriond, 1006 Lausanne, Switzerland. Distributed free every month to supporters of IWMC and the World Conservation Trust Foundation. Editorin-Chief, Dr. Janice Henke. Advertising enquiries, subscription requests, article submissions, letters and comments should be sent to iwmc@iwmc.org. Please include name, email address and organization in all correspondence. Copyright © 2011 IWMC World Conservation Trust.

September-October 2011

In This Issue



www.iwmc.org
Promoting Sustainable Use

will be come back with its anti-democratic proposal prior to or at CoP16.

During the same meeting, IFAW raised the bar for arrogance by trying to prevent a discussion on a mechanism to authorize ivory sales. They asked: "We have much more important things to take care of, why should we waste money and time on this issue?" The Chairman quickly reminded IFAW's representative that the Conference of the Parties had unanimously requested the Committee to identify a mechanism to authorize ivory trade and that they were obliged to consider the issue. This comment by IFAW shows the fundamental lack of respect that animal-rightist NGOs have for international institutions, such as CITES.

Finally, in September 2011, I attended the Pacific Tuna Forum and observed the anti-fisheries NGOs - Greenpeace, Marine Stewardship Council, WWF, Earth Island Institute and Friends

of the Seas - criticizing each other, as each made claims that only they had the solution to conserve tuna worldwide.

Meanwhile, certain components of the tuna industry maintained their self-defeating association with WWF-US, the main promoter of listing tuna on CITES Appendices. Their joint International Seafood Sustainability Foundation will go down as one of the biggest own goals in history. Reflecting on the tactic used by WWF-US to get into bed with its designated targets, I remember a journalist once referring to the organization as PANDA PORN.

Eyebrows have indeed been raised but the battle for common sense continues. The next few years will be fascinating.

Eugene Lapointe IWMC President

Abusive Use of Polar Bear Drowning Misinformation

Top of the news in The New York Times and across the nation is the Interior Department Inspector General's investigation and suspension of Dr. Charles Monnett. Dr. Monnett is the Interior Department scientist who claimed to have spotted a drowned female polar bear and two cubs offshore of Alaska and then made the ridiculous extrapolation that 27 bears must have drowned in a storm. He was a flyover observer on an unrelated periodic whale survey. He did not stop to actually examine the bears and was only speculating as to the cause of their death. His extrapolation that 27 bears in total may have drowned took no account of the fact that no other presumed drowned bears were observed by him or anyone, that the cubs would have drowned because their mother drowned, or that they were relatively close to shore, etc. Accidental deaths are not extrapolated that way.

His supposed observation and questionable extrapolation was one of the pillars behind the polar bear listing determination. It was cited by the US Fish & Wildlife Service (USF&WS) in its proposal and listing and regularly quoted by the Center for Biological Diversity and many others with an advocacy agenda. Al Gore cited it in his 2006 book about global warming as proof that polar bears had been drowning in significant numbers while swimming the increasing distances between ice habitats during the early summer (but without saying it was only early summer).

Here at Conservation Force we have our own take on this, as we have watched the debate

evolve from its inception. Bears do drown in horrific sea storms and always have. It should be noted that they don't sink and are excellent swimmers. The distance the presumed mother and two cubs had to swim in this instance is of absolutely no consequence to polar bears, and the distance to the closest shore was negligible.

The fact that there was a horrific, uncommon storm was not ever recognized or acknowledged in the USF&WS listing decision. The extrapolation that 27 bears must have drowned and the reliance upon that to bootstrap the listing and Al Gore's book on global warming was scientifically indefensible. It is not simply "shoddy science" as reported in The New York Times. It reeks of bias and its acceptance in the listing process more than suggests that a global warming-related agenda, not the polar bear's current and future status, was of primary interest to officials. The listing proposal should have been rejected as not meaningful from the outset.

This is one of the issues that Conservation Force, and Conservation Force alone, raised in its comments and litigation challenging the listing. Though the District Court deferred to the expertise of the Agency as a judicial policy to refrain from second guessing Agency decisions, this was a too often cited pillar of the listing decision that should have been suspect from the inception. Why and how could the Agency unconditionally cite the misinformation in support of its listing decision? The fact that the initial report was later published in a peer-reviewed journal demonstrates the politics hiding behind the cloak of science. (Source: Hunting News & Outfitter Reviews September 30, 2011)

John J. Jackson III, Conservation Force Chairman & President

Legitimate Whale Research Threatened by Criminality Again

Dr Janice Henke Anthropologist

In Japan, federal fisheries officials have announced the national decision to continue the whale/environmental research in the Antarctic. As usual, Richard Black, a British news organization reporter and commentator, has covered this in a misleading and biased manner, calling it a Japanese return to whaling in the Antarctic, as if it were a commercial rather than a scientific program. His rebuttal, and that of many other western reporters, would be that of course this is a commercial venture, since once the boats return home, the meat and blubber, which are byproducts of the research program, are sold in domestic markets.

Truth is, the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, to which Japan and 88 other nations belong, stipulates that all whaling research byproducts shall be used at the discretion of the nation issuing the research permit. Indeed, why should tons of edible product, traditionally used for food, be turned over the side to become ocean garbage, especially when Japan is still suffering from loss of fishing and coastal whaling vessels following the recent disastrous tsunami?

The Antarctic whale research is genuine and is the only example of ongoing data collection on the changing ecology of Antarctic wildlife systems. The reason why western culture nations decry it is that it will eventually support a commercial whaling venture that will be demonstrably sustainable. Sustainability of take is the entire focus of the ICRW, and of the original supporters. Today, cultural preferences that certain wildlife shall not be taken are driving the Whaling Commission political agenda in directions that are to the detriment of scientifically serious and necessary environmental research. In the present case of whaling research, it is absolutely necessary to kill a small representative sample of certain abundant whale species in order to determine trends in whale population numbers, population age structure, reproduction, and changes in the numbers and species of prey in the animals' stomachs. Japan should be commended for continuing this research, not vilified for pursuing it in these times of economic crisis.

Of course, the Sea Shepherds have responded to Japan's announcement with the "news" that they

shall return to the southern ocean in order to continue their (criminal and reprehensible) attacks on the research fleet, thus preventing it from the preordained research track which is necessary in order to ensure the samples taken are numerically appropriate, statistically random, and statistically sufficient. Once again a commercial film crew will record the criminal attacks for the entertainment of those who are willingly and theatrically misinformed about both Sea Shepherd and Japanese goals and impacts on the environment.

IWMC repeats a message for those who are searching for news of environmentally valid research and its implications for the future: EcoTheater and CyberPolitics are not the choice of conscientious citizens in their search for documentable evidence of the ways in which the earth and its inhabitants are changing in numbers and inter-relationships. There is no justification for polarizing the whaling issue and encouraging this culture war, under the guise of "saving" creatures that are abundant and traditional food resources.

An Old Man's Astonishment

I have just finished watching the most encouraging stroke of truth and justice that this old man has seen or heard in a long time. Jeffrey D. King's recent video production, "Crying Wolf" has buoyed my hope for the future amidst the growing dilemma resulting from the environmental/animal rights assault on the rights, freedom, culture, and traditions of the United States of America and the rest of the world. No small part of my utter astonishment is the fact that this movie was made by a young man while 18 to 20 years of age as his first production. My faith in future generations to provide for human society and the worldwide environment, despite the discouraging half-truths and lies that bombard them daily, is not only renewed but happily confirmed.

I recommend that everyone form urban dog owner to rural animal owner; from grade school student to University professor; from hiker to birdwatcher; from hunter to urban nature-program watcher; from bureaucrat to politician watches this film. It is as relevant to American ranchers and university students as it is to Italian shepherds and Kazak horsemen. Human culture, traditions, and development transcend borders and suffer the same threats today that are covered so well in this film. It is a film for all societies in the 21st century: it is a morality tale for all people. Jeffrey King is 20 years old. He grew up in rural Montana with a love of God, His creation, and film-making, he wanted to have his first major

project to include all three. After some thought, he decided to make a film about wolves. Two years of searching, questioning, and many eye-opening interviews later, what was going to be a film about wolves turned into something much bigger: an exposé of one of the most covered-up, big-government and environmental frauds of his generation. Crying Wolf - Exposing the Wolf Reintroduction to Yellowstone National Park is about exposing the lies and proclaiming the truth about what the movement to bring back wolves to

Yellowstone, the rest of America - indeed the rest of the world - was, and is, really about.

The movie is about one (very short) hour long. It can be seen, obtained or you can donate at: http://cryingwolfmovie.com/ Consider buying or getting your organization to buy copies of Crying Wolf and then circulating them throughout your community and beyond. Every journey starts with the first step.

James M. Beers, Wildlife Biologist

The Green Thing

In the line at the grocery store, the cashier told an older woman that she should bring her own grocery bags because plastic bags weren't good for the environment.

The woman apologized to him and explained, "We didn't have the green thing back in my day."

The clerk responded, "That's our problem today. Your generation did not care enough to save our environment."

He was right -- our generation didn't have the green thing.

Back then, we returned milk bottles, cold drink bottles and beer bottles to the store. The store sent them back to the factory to be washed and sterilized and refilled, so it could use the same bottles over and over. So they really were recycled. But we didn't have the green thing back in our day.

We walked up stairs, because we didn't have an escalator in every shop and office building. We walked to the grocery shop and didn't climb into a 300-horsepower machine every time we had to go two blocks. But he was right. We didn't have the green thing in our day.

Back then, we washed the baby's nappies because we didn't have the throw-away kind. We dried clothes on a line, not in an energy gobbling machine burning up 220 volts -- wind and solar power really did dry the clothes. Kids got hand-me-down clothes from their brothers or sisters, not always brand-new clothing. But that clerk is right; we didn't have the green thing back in our day.

Back then, we had one TV, or radio, in the house -- not a TV in every room. And the TV had a small screen the size of a handkerchief (remember them?), not a screen the size of the Vaal dam.

In the kitchen, we blended and stirred by hand because we didn't have electric machines to do everything for us.

When we packaged a fragile item to send in the mail, we used a wadded up old newspaper to cushion it, not Styrofoam or plastic bubble wrap.

Back then, we didn't fire up an engine and burn fuel just to cut the lawn. We used a push mower that ran on human power. We exercised by working so we didn't need to go to a health club to run on treadmills that operate on electricity. But he's right; we didn't have the green thing back then.

We drank from a fountain when we were thirsty instead of using a cup or a plastic bottle every time we had a drink of water.

We refilled writing pens with ink instead of buying a new pen, and we replaced the razor blades in a razor instead of throwing away the whole razor just because the blade got blunt. But we didn't have the green thing back then.

Back then, people took the tram or bus and kids rode their bikes to school or walked instead of turning their moms into a 24-hour taxi service.

But we didn't have the green thing back then. When we were cold, we had to dress with natural fur coats, instead of the super-polluting- modern-faux-fur, made of petroleum..."

We had one electrical plug in a room, not an entire bank of sockets to power a dozen appliances. And we didn't need a computerized gadget to receive a signal beamed from satellites 2,000 km's out in space in order to find the nearest pizza shop. But isn't it sad the current generation laments how wasteful we old folks were just because we didn't have the green thing back then?

(Unknown source)

Noteworthy

23-25 May 2012 Tuna 2012 Bangkok - 12th Infofish World Tuna Trade Conference & Exhibition Info@infofish.com

Excerpts from the Zimbabwe Conservation Task Force
Only after the last tree has been cut down.
Only after the last river has been poisoned.
Only after the last fish has been caught.
Only then will you find that money cannot be eaten.
Cree Indian Prophecy