

Tom Lonsdale Veterinary Surgeon

PO Box 6096
Windsor Delivery Centre
NSW 2756
Australia

Phone: +61 2 4577-7061
Fax: +61 2 4577-7019
E-mail: tom@rawmeatybones.com
Web: www.rawmeatybones.com

6 August, 2017

By email: Clerk to the Disciplinary Committee: c.newbold@rcvs.org.uk

The Returning Officer
The Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons
Belgravia House
62- 64 Horseferry Road
London SW1P 2AF
UK

Grounds for challenge to the validity of the 2017 RCVS Council election

For a successful challenge to the validity of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons election there must be evidence that the election was not a) in accordance with the provisions of the Election Scheme; or b) furthered by conduct, which if the election had been regulated by the *Representation of the People Act* 1983, would have been a corrupt practice by way of bribery, treating or undue influence under sections 113, 114 or 115 of that Act.

I wish to invoke Section 115 (1 & 2b) *Representation of the People Act* 1983.

115 Undue influence.

(1) A person shall be guilty of a corrupt practice if he is guilty of undue influence.

(2) A person shall be guilty of undue influence—

(b) if, by abduction, duress or any fraudulent device or contrivance, he impedes or prevents, or intends to impede or prevent, the free exercise of the franchise of an elector or proxy for an elector, or so compels, induces or prevails upon, or intends so to compel, induce or prevail upon, an elector or proxy for an elector either to vote or to refrain from voting.

Function of elections

A précis of the [Encyclopaedia Britannica list of functions](#) of elections includes the following functions in addition to the more recognised role of selecting individuals for office.

1. Facilitation of the expression of public opinion.
2. Political education of the electorate.
3. Facilitation of social and political integration.
4. Elections and the campaigns preceding them are dramatic events which call attention to the importance of participation in the event and an opportunity to express diversity.

As can be seen from the foregoing, elections are not just about separating winners from losers. Undue influence and restriction of the process inhibits the above functions, especially the educational aspect and thus becomes a significant and substantial factor regarding voter behaviour over time. In elections with small voter turnout a few votes either way are crucial.

Self-regulatory profession

Free and fair elections play a significant part in the 'self-regulatory' status of the veterinary profession within the regulatory framework of the *Veterinary Surgeons Act*, The Royal Charter of the RCVS and the Nolan Principles.

There is an inherent presumption that veterinary decisions are best carried out by those who have undertaken a long period of study. There's also an inherent assumption that vets will always and without fail serve the best interests of their patients and the wider community:

On admission to membership of the Royal College, veterinarians make the [undertaking](#):

I PROMISE AND SOLEMNLY DECLARE that I will pursue the work of my profession with integrity and accept my responsibilities to the public, my clients, the profession and the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, and that, ABOVE ALL, my constant endeavour will be to ensure the health and welfare of animals committed to my care.

[The Royal Charter of the RCVS](#) assigns the objects of the College: 'to set, uphold and advance veterinary standards, and to promote, encourage and advance the study and practice of the art and science of veterinary medicine, in the interests of the health and welfare of animals and in the wider public interest'. The Charter gives the College power to 'undertake any activities which seem to it necessary or expedient to help it to achieve its objects'.

Therein lays a presumption that the RCVS and its elected and un-elected representatives will perform to the highest standards of governance in keeping with the [Nolan Principles](#):

1. Selflessness

Holders of public office should act solely in terms of the public interest.

2. Integrity

Holders of public office must avoid placing themselves under any obligation to people or organisations that might try inappropriately to influence them in their work. They should not act or take decisions in order to gain financial or other material benefits for themselves, their family, or their friends. They must declare and resolve any interests and relationships.

3. Objectivity

Holders of public office must act and take decisions impartially, fairly and on merit, using the best evidence and without discrimination or bias.

4. Accountability

Holders of public office are accountable to the public for their decisions and actions and must submit themselves to the scrutiny necessary to ensure this.

5. Openness

Holders of public office should act and take decisions in an open and transparent manner. Information should not be withheld from the public unless there are clear and lawful reasons for so doing.

6. Honesty

Holders of public office should be truthful.

7. Leadership

Holders of public office should exhibit these principles in their own behaviour. They should actively promote and robustly support the principles and be willing to challenge poor behaviour wherever it occurs.

Returning Officer not a vet

Although the Returning Officer is not a vet, I believe that the Officer is nevertheless bound by the Nolan Principles and the other principles as if he or she were a veterinarian. As a solicitor she has obligations to uphold the highest professional standards in law.

I acknowledge Section 11.-(4) of the Election Scheme that states:

This paragraph shall not require the Returning Officer to circulate an election statement which he reasonably considers to be defamatory or otherwise unlawful, or factually misleading, and may in the absence of agreement with the candidate either edit the election statement before circulating it or decide not to circulate it.

In order to meet the ‘reasonableness’ test I believe that the Returning Officer should issue rulings in an open and transparent manner and wherever possible refer to Acts and Statutes that underpin his or her ruling.

Further, insofar that the annual elections allow the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons to be challenged on grounds of being unethical and corrupt, then it is incumbent on the Returning Officer to avoid actions that could be perceived as unethical or corrupt conduct or serve to cover up unethical or corrupt conduct.

Veterinary profession corruption

General abandonment of ethical, scientific and legal standards

I believe that the Election Challenge Committee needs a clear view of the widespread corruption, the context, in which the RCVS elections are fought. Armed with this understanding the Committee will be better placed to understand the motives and actions of the RCVS in regard to Council elections generally and to the 2017 election in particular.

In the first instance I offer *Raw Meaty Bones: Promote Health* as an overview of a profession that has lost its way. There are several indexed passages that refer to the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons.

The boiling frog analogy holds true for the veterinary profession that now finds itself in very hot water — the crisis started slowly and grew over time.

Until the 1950s the veterinary profession mostly concerned itself with farm animals and horses. However with the disappearance of horse drawn transport and the industrialisation of farming, the need

for individual care of large animals waned. Gradually vets turned their attention to pets — pets that were already being fed industrial junk food.

Thanks to the promotion of pet ownership by the junk pet-food companies and thanks to the widespread diseases so arising out of a monotonous diet of junk food, there was plenty of work for the increasing ranks of small animal vets. (At that time infectious diseases and parasitism were also factors.) Veterinary treatments were less sophisticated and matters of diet scarcely considered except insofar that vitamin or mineral deficiencies occurred.

Under the insidious guidance of various junk pet-food manufacturers there was an acceptance that domestic carnivores should be fed out of the can and then in due course fed junk dry kibbles out of a bag. Propaganda not science prevailed and acceptance of junk food evolved such that the vet profession came to promote carbohydrate based, chemical laced junk food as the most suitable, most healthy food for carnivorous dogs and cats!

Nowadays there's extensive cross-promotion between the companies, veterinary institutions and veterinary practitioners. Some junk products are promoted — especially those sold by vets — as superior to all others. Simultaneously the natural diet of free living wild carnivores and feral domestic animals is vilified for a variety of trumped-up reasons. The essential medicinal aspects of a natural diet are ignored or obscured.

Compartmentalisation of thought and over servicing

Vets, though, tend not to be consistent and trim their sails according to the prevailing wind.

When advising farmers regarding production animals, the relative merits and disadvantages of artificial diets are openly considered. High concentrate feeding gives rise to metabolic diseases, immune suppression, lameness and other 'production' diseases in cattle. However economic meat, milk and hide production are the farmer's priorities. Large animal vets hold honest discussions with their clients regarding trade-offs between diet, productivity goals and animal health risks.

For zoo animals, animals for which a long healthy life is desirable, every effort is made to ensure a diet as close to that of animals in the wild. Zoo vets tend to combine *theory*, *practical know-how* and *experience*, founded on biological imperatives, when advising their clients. Whole carcasses of other animals provide the foundation of wild and zoo carnivore diets.

Unfortunately due to the culture prevalent in the veterinary schools and regulatory bodies, most vets graduate with *no theory*, *no practical know how* and definitely *no experience* of feeding domestic carnivores according to biological imperatives.

Of course vets are cognizant of the move against junk food and drinks for humans and the modern day promotion of the health benefits of unprocessed foods and drinks. They are also aware that much human dietary and dental advice derives from animal research experiments. But when it comes to domestic dogs (modified wolves), cats (modified desert predators) and ferrets (modified polecats) most vets ignore common sense and common knowledge about junk food diets. Instead they are emphatic that the natural carnivore diet should be *avoided* and that the animals should be fed grain (carbohydrate) based slops from the can or desiccated, compressed junk in the bag. It's 'Prescription

food', 'Scientifically Formulated' and 'Vet Recommended' they say as they seek to justify their over-inflated prices.

All wild creatures keep their teeth in good order by eating their appropriate foodstuffs. Small animal vets mostly ignore that edict and instead recommend tooth brushing and expensive surgical procedures. Clients are given no inkling that the white coated professional is peddling dangerous mythologies emanating from junk pet-food company and veterinary school propaganda mills.

Junk foods have many different adverse impacts on the health, vitality and longevity of pet carnivores. By virtue of most vets' refusal to remove the disease producing junk from their patients' diet, but at the same time embarking on massive over servicing then animals are needlessly tormented, nay tortured, to death. Simultaneously owners are fleeced of many thousands of pounds and subjected to constant anxiety regarding their chronically (sometimes acutely) ill pet.

Maria Kuljanic's cat provides a case in point. Ms Kuljanic suffered the severe misfortune of [consulting 20 vets indoctrinated in junk pet-food dogma](#). Her cat suffered the diabolical effects of a junk food diet, periodontal disease, obesity, diabetes and ultimately mouth cancer.

In my own practice every client is effectively seeking a second opinion. Never has a client received correct, biologically appropriate nutritional advice from their previous vet. Oftentimes the client arrives clutching many pages of case history — over-servicing writ large. Most often the animals need dental care and a change of diet. In many instances the improvements are immediate, impressive and long lasting. Animals suffering from diabetes or pancreatic insufficiency often make dramatic recoveries. [George the diabetic cat](#) is one such example.

[Elizabeth Farrelly writing in the Sydney Morning Herald](#) commented about her exorbitant vet fees and the junk food pushed by her vet:

Before remortgaging the house, I did what you do. Googled, found a website called [Raw Meaty Bones](#). The message was obvious and compelling. I decided to try it. For a month, I gave them each a daily, raw chicken wing. Period. Pretty soon both cats were bouncing. No trouble peeing. No bad-breath or sore inflamed gums. Their coats became thicker and glossier. Two happy cats.

Of course the majority of pets treated by conventional junk-food indoctrinated vets are wracked with pain. We made a video featuring Wally Muir ([Stop the Mass Poisoning of Pets by Vets](#)) who was at death's door until we removed all 42 of his teeth. He was just eight years old.

Of course I accept that veterinary opinions vary. However the issues under consideration do not fit into that limited category. All of modern day small animal medicine is predicated on the mass poisoning of pets by vets. (Poisons, by definition, reduce health or bring about premature death.)

By contrast naturally fed animals enjoy superb health and reach their full genetic potential. In 1993, in recognition of my work, I was asked to write the [definitive chapter on diet and oral disease](#) by Dr Douglas Bryden of Sydney University. In 2004 Dr Bryden and Dr Richard Malik nominated my work and the attached book *Raw Meaty Bones* for the [College Prize of the Australian College of Veterinary Science](#). In 2014 the [Australian Working Dog Rescue Group](#) nominated our practice for the Australian 'Most Supportive Vet' of the year award. Here is our [winning questionnaire](#).

RCVS Cover-up

History

Many small animal practitioners see the immense good health benefits of a natural diet for their carnivore patients. Consequently I receive consistent support from over 400 MsRCVS at [RCVS Council elections](#). That the RCVS refuses to acknowledge and investigate what I describe as the Mass Poisoning of Pets by Vets shows that *undue influence*, whether by errors of omission or commission, is at the core of the RCVS *modus operandi*.

The history of RCVS incompetence and corruption — and I believe the failure to meet the expected standards of a self-regulating profession — likely predates my standing for election. However it is the RCVS undue and improper influence in support of the junk pet-food culture at all times, during past elections and especially during the 2017 election that must occupy our thoughts now.

Subject matter at the core of my candidacy

Since 1992 I have had many interactions with the RCVS administration and quite a few Presidents. Most staff have been personable and the 2014 meeting with Professor Stuart Reid was enjoyable — although unsatisfactory. In general though, I consider the past Presidents and employed senior staff to be incompetent. I don't label any one individual corrupt. But I do say that taken together their conduct has either been corrupt or they have been engaged in covering up corruption.

It is enough for one pet owner to lodge a complaint against a vet alleging negligence and/or cruelty to an animal patient to initiate a full-blown investigation. Yet year after year [in RCVS elections](#), I have alleged that many thousands of vets have tortured millions of pets and have fleeced millions of pet owners. I have alleged that most if not all veterinary schools accredited by the RCVS are engaged in the unconscionable brainwashing of vulnerable vet students. Most of these so called centres of higher education have slimy deals with the multi-national junk pet-food producers Mars, Nestlé and Colgate-Palmolive.

Each year, for 21 successive years, around 9% of voters have supported my allegations. Yet despite the alleged massive criminality by vets regulated by the RCVS and trained in RCVS accredited institutions the RCVS Executive has maintained unyielding denial.

The information in *Raw Meaty Bones* and the following links give an inkling of the RCVS interactions and malfeasance since 1992.

Selected RCVS correspondence

[1992 President acknowledges and circulates Pandemic of Periodontal Disease \(Ref: Pandemic of Periodontal Disease: A malodorous condition\)](#) The monograph contains an eminent NSW lawyer's opinion on the serious illegality of the vet promotion of junk pet food.

[1995 Past President comments on Mars Inc influence in the veterinary profession.](#) Henry Carter acknowledged the Mars corporations undue influence, but sidestepped the obligations of the College.

[2004 Record of meeting with Professor Richard Halliwell, President of the RCVS](#) I informed Professor Halliwell that on the basis of our research I could confidently say that the veterinary profession is responsible for the mass poisoning of domestic pets. Professor Halliwell treated my comments with disdain. He did, as I recall, admit to having been paid by junk pet-food companies for research and opinion.

[2014 Freedom of Information Enquiry](#) The links in this document provide much useful background information 22 years after first alerting the President of the RCVS to the huge and still growing crisis.

[2014 Record of meeting with Professor S Reid, President of the RCVS](#) Prof Reid understood the gravity of the situation. As I recall he said ‘If only 10% of what you say is true then this is a very serious issue’. Of course I cannot stray even slightly from the 100% truth. The incompetence and corruption, as recognised by Professor Reid, is a gigantic issue.

[2016 Email Correspondence with journalist Sarah Kidby](#) This correspondence indicates the vet profession again putting up smoke screens. The fundamental issue of the mass poisoning of pets is obscured and denied. Simultaneously the profession generally and the RCVS particularly seeks to distract attention with ‘alternative facts’.

Whilst the Presidents and administrators have the main responsibility for the RCVS performance, I believe it’s instructive to consider the role of the other Council members. Twenty four members are elected. To my knowledge, not one of those elected this past 21 years has mentioned a word about the mass poisoning of pets, the fraudulent over-servicing of medical cases nor the brainwashing of students in corrupt veterinary schools.

Of the un-elected Councillors, the majority come from the UK veterinary schools. All schools brainwash their students to believe natural food is harmful and that junk food is the only sustenance needed by pets. In the absence of correct dietary advice, the students are brainwashed in the art and practice of over servicing. They are encouraged to preside over the life-long poisoning and thus cruel torture of the pets under their ‘care’.

Most perhaps all veterinary schools have corrupt arrangements with the multinational junk pet-food makers.

See improper junk pet-food influence on UK veterinary schools [here](#).

See improper junk pet-food influence on Australian veterinary schools [here](#).

Under these disgraceful conditions the lay members of the RCVS Council are helpless to protest.

Conduct of elections

If the RCVS is corrupt, and I believe that it is, then every act of omission or commission that furthers its corrupt objectives is, in my view, also corrupt. Similarly any act of omission or commission designed to cover up the fundamental corruption only serves to increase the seriousness of the corruption.

Throughout the 21 years that I have contested RCVS elections I have encountered varying degrees of obstruction. For several years I retained the services of specialist defamation lawyer [Richard Potter](#) in our attempts to demonstrate to the RCVS that their arguments about my manifestos being libellous were without foundation.

In this 2017 election, the year subject to the Challenge, I did not consult Mr Potter. The [Correspondence re Biography and Manifesto](#) reveals the arbitrary nature of the RCVS rulings. (My Biography and Manifesto as submitted can be found [here](#).)

There were four key decisions made by the Returning Officer that I believe had an undue influence on the 2017 RCVS Election under the terms of the *Representation of the People Act*.

1. Summary denial of hypertext links in the online manifesto.
2. The removal of names of pet-food manufacturers that are currently the subject of a Class Action legal case in the USA.
3. The refusal to host my RCVS Q&A video.
4. Double standards for favoured candidates.

I will detail these in turn.

1. Summary denial of hypertext links in the online manifesto

From 2007 to 2013 links were permissible in both the online and paper versions of the [Biography and Manifesto](#). In an increasingly digital age it was a natural progression into the 21st Century for the RCVS to adopt this function within manifestos. The electorate could thereby gain a better understanding of the candidates and cross-check any electioneering statements. This was especially relevant for candidates such as me wishing to promote new, creative, beneficial but otherwise obscured and controversial ideas.

The drawback, at least in the printed version, was that expanded html links took up space — one link potentially taking as much space as several words.

In my published [2014 online manifesto](#) there are no links. I believe that it was about this time that the expanded links were discontinued from both printed and online documentation. However, Mr Hockey the Registrar, subsequently agreed that ‘hotlinks’ within the text were permissible as a means to better inform the electorate.

My [2015 and 2016 online](#) manifestos both contain ‘hotlinks’. The 2016 Candidate Guidance form contained the statement: ‘Links to websites etc are not permitted.’ Clearly, however, the Returning Officer treated that ruling as only being applicable to the printed version.

It is true that other candidates have tended not to employ links in their election material — although of course they were free to do so.

In 2017 the Returning Officer, without any discussion, [took the retrograde step](#) of banning online links.

After ten years of permitting links, the RCVS now stymies proper in-depth discussion of any subject, but particularly the subjects that the veterinary press, the universities and vet associations seek to suppress.

Seen in context of their interdependent relationship with the junk food makers, veterinary schools and veterinary associations, I believe this action of the RCVS to be an example of their exercising undue and improper influence

2. The removal of names of pet-food manufacturers that are currently the subject of a Class Action legal case in the USA

A pet-owner [\\$Multi-Billion Class Action](#) has been launched in the USA against [Mars Petcare](#); [Nestlé](#) [Purina](#), [Hill's Pet Nutrition](#), [PetSmart](#), [Banfield Pet Hospitals](#) and [Blue Pearl Specialist Centres](#). This is a matter of public knowledge and is widely discussed in pet-owner circles. That the RCVS deems that this information should not be made known to MsRCVS in the course of an election beggars belief.

Are the sensibilities of vets too delicate for discussion of these robust issues?

How could the named companies possibly object to re-publication of a news item? If they are innocent they will surely welcome their day in court.

A much more sinister issue arises. The RCVS enjoys privileged status as the self-regulatory body for the veterinary profession. Over two decades the RCVS has refused to acknowledge concerns about the mass poisoning of pets and the defrauding of pet-owners as is now countenanced in the USA Class Action.

Now in the face of the Class Action, the RCVS seeks to suppress the details and thereby assist the accused junk pet-food companies and their acolytes.

This appears as another instance of the RCVS exercising undue, improper influence on behalf of its friends and the benefactors of its friends in the universities, the British Veterinary Association and British Small Animal Veterinary Association.

3. The refusal to host my Q&A video

The [Correspondence re Video](#) reveals that I submitted my 2017 video early. Unfortunately the RCVS response arrived after an unnecessary delay:

Broadly the video is fine – we have just one area that causes some concern. In the answer to your second question, you mentioned governing bodies in the plural (around 1m 08s into the video and thereafter in your answer to that question) and refer to them in various terms including that they are corrupt. While robust criticism of the RCVS would be a matter for us in these election videos, we are concerned that you may have, even if inadvertently, been making the same assertions about other governing bodies that apply to you and such defamatory comment should be excluded.

Apart from being disadvantaged by insufficient time to make the changes, it's my contention as per the [Correspondence re Video](#) that no changes were necessary. Throughout the 21 years that I have

contested RCVS elections I have mounted vigorous criticism of the veterinary establishment as illustrated by this passage from my 2010 biography and manifesto:

Since 1992 I have worked to solve the gravest issue facing pet health and the veterinary profession in the 21st century.

From the outset a corrupt veterinary establishment fought back. I was subjected to several bogus disciplinary actions and threatened with jail.

According to the RCVS it seems that the veterinary establishment can launch bogus disciplinary actions, whilst I as a candidate in 2017 am not allowed to point out in general terms the possibility that veterinary organisations are suspect, even corrupt.

Again it appears to me that the RCVS abuses its power to gain undue, improper influence. (The collection of banned RCVS videos, including the 2017 video can be found [here](#).)

4. Double standards for favoured candidates

The RCVS ruling on naming companies in the manifesto and the RCVS ruling regarding the video reveal a double-standard in their effort to suppress the names of companies as per this quote:

The feedback that I have received from the Registrar is that she felt that organisations were implicitly identifiable in the video even if they were not directly named. In UK defamation law it is not necessary for an organisation or individual to be directly named in order for it to be defamatory – it is enough that the material can be reasonably understood to be referring to a particular individual or organisation.

Despite this ruling about my video, the RCVS approved the publication of two videos containing highly disparaging remarks about readily identifiable veterinary surgeons who practise Complementary and Alternative Veterinary Medicine (CAVM).

Miss Sarah Brown video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yFEuVExqr70>

Mr Danny Chambers video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yDu8zfUdDyI>

It's instructive to note that whether aided by their videos or due to other attributes the authors of the videos finished second and third in the ballot and now sit on the Council of the RCVS.

I should declare that I hold no brief for Complementary and Alternative Veterinary Medicine modalities. However I am aware that much in this world remains to be investigated and understood; that there are veterinary surgeons who have made discoveries and will continue to make discoveries of immense benefit to animals, animal owners and the wider community, but which discoveries often run counter to conventional wisdom.

At the 2017 elections the RCVS favoured two candidates who show a crusading zeal in their efforts to persecute a small group of fellow vets on mere matters of CAVM opinion. Simultaneously the RCVS hampered my attempts to disseminate information on systematic incompetence and corruption affecting the integrity and standing of the entire profession.

I suggest that the RCVS is engaged in systematic corruption, employs double standards and employed undue influence.

Conclusion

It would seem that the RCVS has predetermined views, is markedly out of step with community values, shows distinct bias and has exerted Undue Influence in support of those who wish to maintain the *status quo*.

It is my contention that any Undue Influence exercised by a demonstrably corrupt RCVS has significant and or substantial effects as per the functions and purposes of elections as mentioned above.

Accordingly I believe that the Challenge Committee should void the 2017 RCVS Council Election result and call for new, free and fair elections.

Signed,



Tom Lonsdale

Attached: Electronic copy of *Raw Meaty Bones: Promote Health*

