

THE REGULATION OF PROMOTIONAL COMPETITIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA

by

DANIEL PETRUS STRACHAN

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF LAWS

in the

FACULTY OF LAW

UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA

April 2016

SUPERVISOR: PROF CM VAN HEERDEN

University of Pretoria

Declaration of originality

Full names of student: **Daniel Petrus Strachan**

Student number: **20072440**

Declaration

1. I understand what plagiarism is and am aware of the University's policy in this regard.
2. I declare that this thesis is my own original work. Where other people's work has been used (either from a printed source, Internet or any other source), this has been properly acknowledged and referenced in accordance with departmental requirements.
3. I have not used work previously produced by another student or any other person to hand in as my own.
4. I have not allowed, and will not allow, anyone to copy my work with the intention of passing it off as his or her own work.

Signature of student:

SUMMARY

Promotional competitions are competitions in which prizes are awarded by lot or chance in order to promote goods or services. Due to the chance element, these competitions are often categorised as lotteries or gambling. Initially, South African legislation did not make provision for the running of promotional competitions, but this situation changed when the Lotteries Act, 1997 came into force. Currently, promotional competitions are regulated by the Consumer Protection Act, 2008 (CPA).

This thesis examines the regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa. It commences with a background discussion, which touches on the relevant terminology and some sociological aspects. It then considers the consequences of gambling and the need for and nature of regulation, and deals with the marketing and consumer protection contexts. This is followed by a brief overview of the global and South African history of gambling, lotteries and promotional competitions, which includes a discussion of South African case law.

Foreign law relating to promotional competitions in New Zealand and Great Britain is explored in order to compare this to the South African position. This is followed by an examination of the current regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa, including a discussion regarding the interplay between the CPA and the Lotteries Act and a detailed analysis of the CPA's provisions. The self-regulation of promotional competitions is discussed as well. The concluding chapter of this thesis contains recommended solutions for the problems identified in the analysis of the relevant legislation.

KEY TERMS

Promotional competitions; consumer protection; gambling; lotteries; sales promotion schemes; prize promotions; prize competitions; sweepstakes; advertising; self-regulation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

With thanks and appreciation to:

- Prof Corlia van Heerden for her guidance, advice and effort, and for going the extra mile;
- Shirley Gilmore and her colleagues at the University of Pretoria's OR Tambo Law Library;
- my parents and brother for their support and motivation;
- my circle of friends for their encouragement; and
- my colleagues at Adams & Adams, the law firm at which I was introduced to promotional competitions.

PREFACE	i
1 : INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Research statement	1
1.2 Research aims and enquiries.....	2
1.3 Hypotheses	8
1.4 Significance of the research.....	9
1.5 Approach and method.....	9
1.6 Choice of comparative jurisdictions.....	10
1.7 Delineation	11
1.8 Outline of chapters	12
1.9 Reference techniques	13
2 : BACKGROUND	14
2.1 Introduction	14
2.2 Terminology	15
2.2.1 Opening remarks	15
2.2.2 Gambling	16
2.2.3 Gaming and other euphemisms.....	24
2.2.4 Lotteries.....	26
2.3 The Play Element.....	29
2.4 Policy and Regulation	35
2.4.1 Introduction.....	35
2.4.2 People’s reasons for gambling	35
2.4.3 Gambling’s negative effects.....	42
2.4.4 Economic impact of gambling.....	49
2.4.5 Opinions in respect of gambling	52

2.4.6	Law, vice and regulation	55
2.4.7	Replacing prohibition with regulation	59
2.4.8	Regulating gambling	61
2.4.9	Promotional competitions and regulation.....	67
2.5	The Consumer Protection Perspective.....	72
2.6	The Marketing Context.....	76
2.6.1	Introduction.....	76
2.6.2	Marketing and marketing tools.....	77
2.6.3	Sales promotion in general	79
2.6.4	Prize promotions.....	82
2.7	Conclusion	86
3	: AN OVERVIEW OF THE HISTORY OF GAMBLING, LOTTERIES AND PROMOTIONAL COMPETITIONS	89
3.1	Introduction	89
3.2	A brief history from a global perspective	90
3.2.1	Ancient times	90
3.2.2	The ancient Greeks	93
3.2.3	The ancient Romans	94
3.2.4	The development of lotteries	97
3.2.5	The rise of contests, sweepstakes, games and similar schemes	101
3.3	The South African historical context.....	107
3.3.1	Early history.....	107
3.3.2	Prize promotion judgements in the first half of the twentieth century ..	109
3.3.3	The times of the Gambling Act, 1965	113
3.3.4	Gambling reform at the end of the twentieth century	117
3.3.5	The Lotteries Act, 1997 and promotional competitions.....	120
3.3.6	The shift from lotteries legislation to consumer protection	123

3.4	Conclusion	124
4	: THE REGULATION OF PROMOTIONAL COMPETITIONS IN NEW ZEALAND AND GREAT BRITAIN	126
4.1	Introduction	126
4.2	New Zealand	127
4.2.1	Background	127
4.2.2	Gambling regulation and the NZ Gambling Act in general	129
4.2.3	Sales promotion schemes under the NZ Gambling Act	134
4.2.4	Prize competitions and spot prizes	142
4.2.5	Other requirements relating to promotional competitions	143
4.2.6	Remarks	146
4.3	Great Britain	148
4.3.1	Background	148
4.3.2	English case law relating to promotional competitions	152
4.3.3	The National Lottery Act 1993 and the Gambling Act 2005	157
4.3.4	Prize competitions under the Gambling Act 2005	161
4.3.5	The impact of European Union law on prize promotions	171
4.3.6	Compliance with industry codes	174
4.3.7	Remarks	181
4.4	Conclusion	182
5	: PROMOTIONAL COMPETITIONS UNDER THE LOTTERIES ACT AND THE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT	184
5.1	Introduction	184
5.2	Application of the Lotteries Act	185
5.2.1	Lotteries and competitions generally	185
5.2.2	The role of subscription	192
5.2.3	Lot or chance	196

5.2.4	Interplay between the Lotteries Act and the CPA	199
5.3	The promotional competition provisions that were repealed by the CPA ..	202
5.4	Promotional competitions under the CPA	207
5.4.1	Changes brought about by the CPA	207
5.4.2	Application of the CPA.....	210
5.4.3	Application of section 36.....	213
5.4.4	The role-players in section 36 of the CPA	221
5.4.5	Protection against misleading information	224
5.4.6	Consideration	226
5.4.7	Prizes and the awarding thereof	229
5.4.8	Competition rules.....	232
5.4.9	Offers to participate in promotional competitions.....	238
5.4.10	Consumers' rights in respect of competitions and prizes	240
5.4.11	Oversight of promotional competitions	242
5.4.12	Retention of information	244
5.5	Promotional competitions and consumer privacy	247
5.6	Sanctions	249
5.7	Conclusion	251
6	: SELF-REGULATION OF PROMOTIONAL COMPETITIONS	253
6.1	Introduction	253
6.2	Self-regulation in general	254
6.3	Examples of international self-regulation	257
6.4	Self-regulation of advertising in South Africa	262
6.4.1	Advertising Standards Authority of South Africa	263
6.4.2	Examples of ASA rulings relating to promotional competitions.....	267
6.4.3	Wireless Application Service Providers' Association	270
6.5	General	274

6.6	Conclusion	275
7	: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	278
7.1	Conclusion	278
7.1.1	Purpose and process of this research	278
7.1.2	Perspectives from the social sciences and other fields	279
7.1.3	The consumer protection perspective.....	286
7.1.4	The marketing context	286
7.1.5	The historical background.....	287
7.1.6	Promotional competitions in New Zealand and Great Britain.....	289
7.1.7	The current regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa....	292
7.1.8	Self-regulation of promotional competitions.....	295
7.2	Recommendations	296
7.2.1	Reinsert the “promotional competition” definition in the Lotteries Act .	296
7.2.2	Remove redundant provisions from the Lotteries Act	296
7.2.3	Authorise promotional competitions in the Lotteries Act	297
7.2.4	Amend provisions relating to competitions with low-value prizes	298
7.2.5	Increase the monetary threshold of prizes.....	300
7.2.6	Review section 56 of the Lotteries Act.....	300
7.2.7	Address the subscription element in the Lotteries Act	302
7.2.8	Application of the CPA to promotional competitions	303
7.2.9	The role of chance in promotional competitions	303
7.2.10	Amend provisions that exclude persons from participation	305
7.2.11	Clarify requirements regarding offers to participate in competitions	307
7.2.12	Clarify the CPA’s provisions relating to consideration	309
7.2.13	Clarify the CPA’s provisions relating to oversight of competitions ...	311
7.2.14	Reconsider the document and information retention requirements .	312
7.2.15	Amend the provisions regarding publicity	312

7.2.16	Clarify section 36(10)	313
7.3	Final remarks	314
7.4	Suggestions for further research	316
BIBLIOGRAPHY	318

PREFACE

Promotional competitions are everywhere. In the morning when you drive to work, the radio presenter might announce with great excitement that the first listener that calls in will win a hamper. While standing in the supermarket queue during lunch, a cardboard cut-out might stare at you, daring you to enter a competition in which you might win a shiny red car if your entry is drawn. Back at the office, you might receive a text message proclaiming that you have won a prize in a sweepstakes that you might not even have heard of. In the evening, while eating cookies in a wrapper that promotes an airtime competition, you might hear that your aunt has won a washing machine after submitting hundreds of entries in an online competition. When you are in bed, you might see a promotional newsletter on your phone and then fall asleep, dreaming that you have won that trip to France.

Businesses use these kinds of competitions to promote their products and services, and to increase sales. In many instances, the outcome of the competitions is determined by chance. Activities that involve the awarding of prizes by way of chance are typically regarded as lotteries, and lotteries form part of the broader field of gambling. The latter is a controversial pastime and industry, and people often hold strong views about gambling – whether they are in favour of or against it. The debate about gambling will probably not die down soon, if it all. Even while this thesis was written, there was great controversy in this author's home city regarding the establishment of a new casino complex.¹

Controversial topics are often the subject matter of legislation and regulation. Gambling is no exception and laws relating to gambling date back to ancient times. These laws focus on activities where people stake money or offer consideration in the hope that fortune will favour them and reward them with a prize. The key elements of gambling appear in legislation worldwide and are the subject matter of a myriad of

¹ See Mudzuli K “R8bn Menlyn casino faces challenges” 17 October 2014 *IOL News*, <http://www.iol.co.za/business/companies/r8bn-menlyn-casino-faces-challenges-1.1766514>, accessed on 24 July 2015; Mudzuli K “Menlyn casino gets go ahead” 12 December 2014 *IOL News*, <http://www.iol.co.za/news/crime-courts/menlyn-casino-gets-go-ahead-1.1795044>, accessed on 24 July 2015).

court cases. These laws keep on changing and community attitudes shift. Sociologists express their views and lawyers attempt to keep track with the developments while they have to advise their clients on an area of the law that is often complex and sometimes obscure.

This study seeks to deal with these issues. It touches on gambling and lotteries, lot and chance as well as skill. It explores some of the relevant history, and considers the sociological context of gambling. It ventures into advertising, marketing and promotions – the tools traders use to drive sales. It turns to consumer protection law and the need to shield people against powerful traders and examines some of the legal intricacies and anomalies. However, this remains a limited study of vast subject areas with many branches and it points to the need for continued research.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Research statement
- 1.2 Research aims and enquiries
- 1.3 Hypotheses
- 1.4 Value of the research
- 1.5 Approach and method
- 1.6 Delineation
- 1.7 Outline of chapters
- 1.8 Referencing techniques

1.1 Research statement

The law relating to gambling and lotteries might be regarded as complex or obscure.¹ It is not an area of the law that receives much attention in undergraduate legal studies or practical legal training in South Africa.² In this country it is difficult to find academic works dedicated to the law relating to promotional competitions in particular. Elsewhere, law firms have practices that focus mainly on gambling law or marketing and promotions law,³ and entire conferences focus on these topics.⁴ Even so, South

¹ On Prof I. Nelson Rose's website this subject area is described as follows:

"The law of gambling can be simple, or enormously complex. For example, all gambling requires three elements: prize, chance and consideration. But creating a successful game that has only two of those elements can be extremely difficult. Similarly, some forms of online gaming are legal, but only a legal professional can tell you whether your plans meet the requirements of the law."

(Rose IN "Gambling and the Law®", <http://www.gamblingandthelaw.com/>, accessed on 24 July 2015.)

² The author checked the undergraduate law curricula of a couple of South African universities and could not find a course dedicated to gambling law or marketing or promotions law specifically. Having said this, these areas of the law might be dealt with in wider legal subject areas, such as statutory crimes or consumer protection law or marketing studies.

³ Here are examples of American law firms with teams that specialise in advertising, marketing, sweepstakes and promotions law: Cohen Silverman Rowan (New York City and Boulder), Davis & Gilbert (New York City), Frankfurt Kurnit Klein & Selz (New York City), Greenberg Traurig (Chicago, Denver, Las Vega, New York), Loeb & Loeb (Chicago, Los Angeles and New York City), Manatt, Phelps & Phillips (New York City), Reed Smith (Washington DC and Chicago), and Winston and Strawn (Chicago).

⁴ For example, the Brand Activation Association's annual Marketing Law Conference. See Brand Activation Association "BAA's 37th Marketing Law Conference – Walking the Line: Between Innovation

Africa has a vibrant advertising industry and promotional competitions are ubiquitous.⁵ In view of this, it is submitted that there is a need for an extensive examination of the regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa. This research is aimed at fulfilling that need. Thus, this thesis will analyse how and to what extent promotional competitions are regulated in South Africa. This analysis will show that promotional competitions are regulated on a comprehensive basis and that the regulation is adequate and appropriate, if not slightly excessive. It will further be shown that there are inconsistencies between the statutes that regulate promotional competitions and that there is room for improvement of the relevant provisions.

1.2 Research aims and enquiries

In the course of this study, various issues and questions that arise in respect of the regulation of promotional competitions will be examined. At the outset, the meaning of various terms will be explored because this study field is replete with terminology. For example, section 36 of the Consumer Protection Act⁶ (“CPA”) refers to “promotional competitions”.⁷ This terminology was also used in the Lotteries Act,⁸ which regulated promotional competitions before the relevant provisions were repealed and replaced by the CPA’s provisions.⁹ However, other terms are used for this kind of competition and similar schemes as well.¹⁰ These include “sweepstakes”,¹¹ “prize competitions”,¹² “sales promotion schemes”¹³ and “trade promotion lotteries”.¹⁴ These terms are found in the context of “gambling” and “gaming” as well. Definitions for these terms will be

and Regulation”, <https://www.baalink.org/conference/show/id/BAALAW-NOV15>, accessed on 24 July 2015.

⁵ One need only visit a supermarket, page through a newspaper or explore social media to find numerous examples of promotional competitions in South Africa.

⁶ 58 of 2008.

⁷ S36(1)(d) of the CPA. See the full definition at page 213 below.

⁸ 57 of 1997 (the “Lotteries Act”).

⁹ Lotteries Act, s1: “‘promotional competition’ means a lottery conducted for the purpose of promoting the sale or use of any goods or services.” To be read with the definition of “lottery” in the same section: “ ‘lottery’ includes any game, scheme, arrangement, system, plan, promotional competition or device for distributing prizes by lot or chance and any game, scheme, arrangement, system, plan, competition or device, which the Minister may by notice in the Gazette declare to be a lottery”.

¹⁰ See also the various gambling related terms defined in Wiehahn NE (chairman) *Main Report on Gambling in the Republic of South Africa* (RP 85/1995) (“LGB Main Report”) 145-154.

¹¹ A term often used in the United States of America. See, for example, the Deceptive Mail Prevention and Enforcement Act.

¹² A term used in s339 of the United Kingdom’s Gambling Act 2005.

¹³ See New Zealand’s Gambling Act 2003.

¹⁴ This term is used in Australia. See LeGuay P “Australia” in *International Promotion Marketing Law Book* (2nd ed) (“LeGuay”) 14-16.

sought in legislation and other sources. They will be analysed and it will be determined whether an understanding of these terms will assist in examining the regulation of gambling and related activities.

Next, this thesis will turn towards the field of sociology in order to enquire into the nature of gambling activities.¹⁵ It will be investigated whether a play element underlies gambling, lotteries, competitions and similar pursuits.¹⁶ The general sociological discussion around play will be narrowed down when this thesis will look into the policy issues in respect of gambling. In considering the regulation of this activity, one should examine people's reasons for participating in gambling more closely. Attention should be given to gambling's negative effects – which often serve as justification for the prohibition or regulation of gambling and might point towards the reason for regulating promotional competitions.¹⁷ However, although gambling activities might have detrimental effects, one must enquire into their ability to generate revenue and have a positive impact on economies as well.¹⁸

The nature of and need for regulation will be explored and it will be considered why some laws are created. The author will examine why an activity is sometimes regarded

¹⁵ The American Sociological Association describes sociology as follows:

“Sociology is:

- the study of society
- a social science involving the study of the social lives of people, groups, and societies
- the study of our behavior as social beings, covering everything from the analysis of short contacts between anonymous individuals on the street to the study of global social processes
- the scientific study of social aggregations, the entities through which humans move throughout their lives'
- an overarching unification of all studies of humankind, including history, psychology, and economics.”

(American Sociological Association “What is Sociology?” <http://www.asanet.org/about/sociology.cfm>, accessed on 25 July 2015.)

¹⁶ Herman RD *Gamblers and Gaming: Motives, Institutions and Controls* 1-9; Downes DM, Davies, BP, David ME and Stone P *Gambling, work and leisure: a study across three areas* 11-14; Smith JF & Abt V “Gambling as Play” in Frey JH & Eadington WR (eds) *Gambling: Views from the Social Sciences. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 122 122-132; Reith G *HOMO ALEATOR: A Sociological Study of Gambling in Western Society* 199-253; Reith G “The Experience of Play” in Cosgrave JF (ed) *The Sociology of Risk and Gambling Reader* 255-287; Ottaway J *The UK National Lottery and Charitable Gambling* 91-127.

¹⁷ In the past, people have held strong views against gambling on the basis that it could harm society. Eadington WR “Understanding Gambling” in Eadington WR & Cornelius (eds) *Gambling: Public Policies and the Social Sciences* 3 4.

¹⁸ See, for example, Munting R *An economic and social history of gambling in Britain and the USA* 55; LGB Main Report 60-61; Clotfelter CT & Cook PJ *Selling Hope: State Lotteries in America* 219-221.

as a vice and a crime.¹⁹ The question arises whether gambling is regarded as a vice and a crime, and why people are in favour of or against gambling. It needs to be considered whether society's views about gambling are changing, leading to a shift from prohibition to regulation or liberalisation.²⁰ At the same time, the regulation of promotional competitions might be moving from gambling legislation to the field of consumer protection law.²¹ This raises the question whether promotional competitions still carry a gambling stigma.

In view of the apparent shift to consumer law, one should consider the nature of and need for consumer protection,²² and enquire into the development of consumer protection law in South Africa.²³ Further, one should investigate the meaning and role of advertising,²⁴ marketing²⁵ and sales promotion,²⁶ consider the tools used by businesses to attract sales and identify the place of promotional competitions in this context.

¹⁹ See, for example, Dixon D *From prohibition to regulation: bookmaking, anti-gambling, and the law* ("Dixon") 17; Leitzel J *Regulating Vice: Misguided Prohibitions and Realistic Controls* 4; Dombrink J "Gambling and the Legalisation of Vice: Social movements, public health and public policy in the United States" in McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* 43; Green SP "Vice Crimes and Preventive Justice" 10 October 2013 *Criminal Law and Philosophy* (published online at <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11572-013-9260-7>, accessed on 5 March 2015) 1-2.

²⁰ Dixon 6-7, 9.

²¹ In South Africa, promotional competitions used to be regulated by the Lotteries Act. However, when the CPA came into force it repealed the Lotteries Act's provisions relating to promotional competitions and the CPA now regulates same. See section 36 of the CPA.

²² See, for example, Woker T "Why the need for consumer protection legislation? A look at some of the reasons behind the promulgation of the National Credit Act and the Consumer Protection Act" 2010 *Obiter* 217-231 ("Woker 2010").

²³ See De Stadler E *Consumer Law Unlocked* ("De Stadler 2013") 1; Ramsay I *Consumer Law and Policy: Text and Materials on Regulating Consumer Markets* (3rd ed) ("Ramsay 2012") 1 for definitions of consumer law. For the process in terms of which the CPA was developed, see for example the memorandum accompanying the Consumer Protection Bill, 2008 as well as Du Preez ML "The Consumer Protection Bill: A few preliminary comments" 2009 *South African Law Journal* 58 59-60, Barnard J *The Influence of the Consumer Protection Act 68 of 2008 on the Common Law of Sale* 23-24, Van Eeden E *Consumer Protection Law in South Africa* 23, Stoop PN *The Concept 'Fairness' in the Regulation of Contracts under the Consumer Protection Act 68 of 2008* ("Stoop 2012") 68-71 and Eiselen S & Naudé T "Introduction and Overview of the Consumer Protection Act" in Eiselen S & Naudé T (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* 18-20.

²⁴ For the definition of "advertisement", see for example, s1 of the CPA and clause 4 of the Advertising Standards Authority of South Africa's Code of Advertising Practice.

²⁵ For a definition of "marketing", see for example American Association of Marketing "Definition of Marketing" <https://www.ama.org/AboutAMA/Pages/Definition-of-Marketing.aspx> (accessed on 20 April 2014).

²⁶ For the definition of "sales promotion", see for example Shimp TA *Integrated marketing communication in advertising and promotion* (international ed) 446.

Having examined the background and context of the promotional competitions, the focus will turn to a survey of the history of promotional competitions.²⁷ The historical roots of promotional competitions will be traced in order to establish how the regulation of these activities has developed. In addition to an international perspective, this study will explore the South African legal history in order to determine whether knowledge about the development of the law in this field can assist one in interpreting the current legal position.²⁸

One of the main purposes behind this research is to examine whether the current regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa needs to be amended or improved. Accordingly, before the local legal position is evaluated, the regulation of promotional competitions in other countries will be explored in order to establish whether lessons can be learned from the relevant legislation in those jurisdictions. The applicable laws of New Zealand²⁹ and Great Britain³⁰ will be considered in particular, and it will be seen whether the legislation and case law of those countries can assist one to interpret the relevant South African law and recommend changes to it.

Thereafter, the common law relating to lotteries and promotional competitions will be considered.³¹ The key elements of a lottery will be established and analysed, and it will be considered whether case law can be useful for interpreting the current legislation. The application of the Lotteries Act³² will then be investigated, and the interplay between the Lotteries Act and the CPA with regard to promotional competitions will be examined. Other authors' views on this interplay will be

²⁷ See, for example, C l'Estrange Ewen *Lotteries and sweepstakes*; Curtin L & Bernardo K *The History of Sweepstakes*; Ashton J *A History of English Lotteries*; Ezell JS *Fortune's Merry Wheel: The Lottery in America*; Kopp SW & Taylor CR "Games, Contests, Sweepstakes, and Lotteries: Prize Promotion and Public Policy" in Sheth JN (series ed) & Fullerton RA (ed) *Research in Marketing: Explorations in the History of Marketing* 151; Jones JP *Gambling Yesterday and Today*; LGB Main Report 37-44; Schwartz DG *Roll the Bones: The History of Gambling*; Brenner R with Brenner GA *Gambling and Speculation: A Theory, a History, and a Future of Some Human Decisions* 1-18.

²⁸ See, for example, Carnelley M "Offences relating to gambling and lotteries" in Milton JRL, Cowling MG and Hoorst SV *South African Criminal Law and Procedure Vol III: Statutory Offences* 2nd ed, service number 21, 2011 1-7;

²⁹ See s4 of New Zealand's Gambling Act 2003.

³⁰ See s339 and Schedule 2 of the United Kingdom's Gambling Act 2005.

³¹ Regarding the common law position, see for example Bell, Dewar & Hall *Kelsey Stuart's The Newspaperman's Guide to the Law* (5th ed) 204; Dendy M "Lotteries and the Law" 1989 *Witwatersrand University Student Law Review* 1 43 49-50; Dendy M "Pitfalls of Advertising – II. Lotteries." 1988 *Businessman's Law* 17 77-78; Carnelley 2011 59.

³² 57 of 1997.

questioned,³³ and it will be determined whether it will be possible for promoters to navigate through this interplay in order to run lawful promotional competitions. The discussion will then turn to those provisions of the Lotteries Act that used to govern promotional competitions in the past.³⁴ Some of the problems experienced with those provisions will be dealt with, and it will be examined whether repealed provisions are similar to the current legislation. It will be uncovered how the CPA has changed the regulation of promotional competitions and it will be determined whether the position has been improved. The focus will be on section 36 of the CPA and the related regulations that govern promotional competitions in South Africa at present.³⁵

When one considers the provisions of section 36 and the related regulations, a number of questions arise. For example, are the traditional elements of a lottery (consideration, chance and prize) present within the regulation under the CPA as well?³⁶ Does section 36 only apply to competitions in which chance determines the outcome, or does the section's reach extend to those competitions in which participants have to display their skill? The CPA's provisions relating to consideration might create some uncertainty and, in particular, it will be investigated whether promoters are allowed to require consumers to purchase their goods or procure their services in order to enter a promotional competition. Further, one needs to consider the wording which implies that a promotional competition must be conducted in the ordinary course of business in order to be governed by the CPA and whether competitions may be conducted for

³³ See for example Louw J, quoted in Koenderman T "Don't bet on it" *Finweek* 4 March 2010 50-51; Louw J "Consumer Protection Act 2008 and Promotional Competitions. Promotional Competitions – The End of the Line: Lawful No Longer". (Internet article accessed on 23 February 2014, but no longer available online. Article on file with author hereof.)

³⁴ S54 of the Lotteries Act and the Promotional Competition Regulations, 2002.

³⁵ Van Heerden C "Section 36" in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014) ("Van Heerden 'Section 36'") paras 1-22; De Stadler 2013 66-78; Van 2013 169-174; Du Preez 77; Jacobs W, Stoop PN & Van Niekerk R "Fundamental Consumer Rights under the Consumer Protection Act 68 of 2008: A Critical Overview and Analysis" 2010 13:3 *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal* 302 342-344; Strachan D "Promotional competitions under the CPA" 2010 (December) *Without Prejudice* 34-35; Taylor N "Promotional competitions – let the promoter beware" 2011 (April) *Without Prejudice* 17-20 ("N Taylor"); Monty S "The money or the box – getting competition rules straight" 2012 (May) *Without Prejudice* ("Monty") 57-58; Mncwango S "The complex rules for promotional competitions" 2013 (April) *Without Prejudice* ("Mncwango") 82; Honey E & Mare A "Promotional competitions in terms of the CPA" (10 August 2011) <http://www.bowman.co.za/News-Blog/Blog/promotional-competitions-in-terms-of-CPA> ("Honey & Mare"), accessed on 30 May 2015.

³⁶ Regarding the elements of a lottery, see for example Williams FE *Lotteries, Law and Morals* ("FE Williams 1958") 69; *R v Cranston* 1914 AD 238; *R v Lew Hoi* 1937 AD 215 220; *Minister of Mineral and Energy Affairs v Lucky Horseshoe (Pty) Ltd* 1994 (2) SA 46 (A) 52.

other purposes. The author will also examine the situation that will arise if a promotional competition does not fall within the CPA's scope.

It needs to be explored how the CPA protects consumers against misleading marketing of competitions. One needs to enquire whether these provisions are adequate or whether there is room for possible improvement. In particular it will be determined whether the CPA sets minimum standards for competition offers and rules. Further, it will be examined whether a legal relationship is created between a promoter and consumers who accept the promoter's offer to participate in a competition, and the rights that may arise as a result thereof will be identified. In addition, the study will focus on some other consumer rights in the CPA, including the rights to privacy³⁷ and responsible marketing.³⁸ This research will also focus on challenges that might be experienced by promoters in interpreting and complying with the CPA's provisions. For example, the CPA's requirements regarding record-keeping and oversight of competitions will be questioned. Some drafting errors will be identified as well.

In order to be effective, regulation must be coupled with proper sanctions in order to serve as a deterrent. While this research will not deal with the enforcement of the CPA and other relevant legislation, the applicable sanctions will be identified and considered.

The thesis will investigate the role of self-regulation in the running of promotional competitions. It will enquire into the nature and value of self-regulation,³⁹ and examine some rulings of self-regulatory bodies in order to determine whether promoters can learn from such rulings and apply the principles in order to structure compliant promotional competitions.

Last, it will be determined whether the current legislation relating to promotional competitions can be improved. Typographical errors and drafting issues will be

³⁷ See s14 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996; s11 of the CPA; s45 of the Electronic Communications and Transactions Act, 2002; Van Zyl E & De Stadler E "Section 11" in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014); and the Protection of Personal Information Act 4 of 2013.

³⁸ See, for example, Van Heerden C "The Regulation of Marketing under the CPA" in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014).

³⁹ Regarding industry codes under the CPA, see for example Woker 2010 221-223; Melville N & Yeates J "Section 82" in Eiselen S & Naudé T (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act*; De Stadler 2013 93-94, 182; Regarding self-regulation, see also Boddewyn JJ "Advertising Self-Regulation: True Purpose and Limits" 1989 *Journal of Advertising* 18:2 19; Gunningham N & Rees J "Industry Self-Regulation: An Institutional Perspective" 1997 *Law & Policy* 19:4 363.

identified and uncertainties will be pointed out. Recommendations will then be made as to how these issues can be resolved. This will include proposals relating to amendments to the legislation.

1.3 Hypotheses

It is assumed that this research will show that background knowledge of disciplines outside the legal field will assist one to understand the potential need for legislation that regulates gambling and related activities. It is submitted that sociological literature, in particular, might be useful to understand the role of gambling activities in society and people's need for gambling, and especially people's opinions in favour of or against gambling, thus informing the policy that underlies or should underlie gambling legislation.

It is submitted that one must explore the terminology that is used in respect of gambling and associated activities in order to interpret the relevant legislation and categorise promotional competitions in particular. Further, because promotional competitions lie at an intersection of gambling and marketing, it will be useful to understand the advertising, marketing and promotional context within which promotional competitions are situated in order to identify the nature and purpose of these competitions.

This research will demonstrate that the historical context of promotional competitions is valuable for understanding the regulation of promotional competitions and the relevant policy considerations. The history of the pertinent legislation and the surrounding case law should serve as an important basis for evaluating and interpreting the current legal position.

When it comes to the current regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa, it is expected that some uncertainties regarding the interplay between the Lotteries Act and the CPA will be encountered, but it is assumed that it will be possible to resolve these. Further, it is foreseen that some of the CPA's relevant provisions will prove to be unclear, deficient or challenging to interpret. A number of recommendations will be made to deal with these issues. It is submitted that a study of the relevant legislation in New Zealand and the United Kingdom may assist in this regard.

A discussion of the applicable self-regulatory industry codes will round off this analysis of the regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa, while a discussion of

some self-regulatory rulings will give a practical perspective on the running of promotional competitions.

Overall, it is expected that this thesis will provide a comprehensive evaluation of the state of the regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa. It is anticipated that it will come to the conclusion that this regulation is appropriate and extensive, but it will also uncover some problems with the relevant legislation and provisions. It is submitted that these issues can be remedied by way of amendments to the pertinent provisions.

1.4 Significance of the research

It is submitted that this study will be a valuable contribution to the academic literature pertaining to the law relating to promotional competitions, particularly from a South African perspective. It is hoped that its exploration of the sociological and policy issues, the historical background as well as the consumer protection and marketing considerations will provide context to a study of these competitions. It is submitted that the analysis of the current legislation will assist both lawyers and competition promoters in interpreting the law. It is hoped that the recommendations relating to improvements and amendments to the legislation may be taken into account if the relevant legislation is reviewed at some point in the future. Ultimately, it is anticipated that this thesis will provide an all-encompassing appraisal of the regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa and an evaluation of the relevant law.

1.5 Approach and method

To a large extent, this research will involve use of the doctrinal method in order to examine South Africa's regulation of promotional competitions. This will involve a literature study to synthesise the relevant legislation, case law and other materials and to conduct an extensive critical analysis thereof.

Interdisciplinary research will be undertaken as well. In particular, the author will draw from sociological literature in order to provide background and context to the topic. This will be complemented with a cursory exploration of the field of advertising, marketing and sales promotion.

Historical research will play an important role in the writing of the thesis. It will be useful to consult materials such as draft legislation, explanatory memoranda, commission reports, submissions by the public, news articles, previous legislation and older case law in order to understand the history and context of the subject matter and how it has influenced the current legislation. Repealed legislation and older case law may assist in the interpretation process.

The comparative method will be employed too. The relevant laws of New Zealand and Great Britain will be examined. The regulation of promotional competitions in those countries will be compared with the position in South Africa. It may be informative to do so and to determine whether the other countries' legislation may assist one in interpreting South Africa's legislation or in order to suggest improvements to same.

1.6 Choice of comparative jurisdictions

For a number of reasons, Great Britain was chosen as a comparative jurisdiction. Great Britain and South Africa have close historical ties and both countries employ common law systems. This similarity assists one in comparing the two jurisdictions and determining if provisions from the British legislation could be used in South Africa. Due to the use of the common law system, case law plays an important role in Great Britain. There is an abundance of British decisions relating to lotteries and prize promotions in particular. The reasoning found in these cases can be useful in interpreting South African provisions, especially because of the similarity between English and South African law when it comes to the essential elements of a lottery. South African courts have recognised this similarity and various British lottery cases have been cited by our courts.⁴⁰ In addition, the volume of British case law relating to lotteries and prize promotions provide an abundance of practical examples of lotteries and competitions and the factors that one needs to take into account when determining whether or not a scheme is lawful.

It must be borne in mind that there is a particular similarity between certain provisions of South Africa's Lotteries Act and the United Kingdom's former Lotteries and

⁴⁰ See, for example, *R v Lew Hoi* 1937 AD 215; *R v Gondo* 1951 (3) SA 509 (A); *S v Midas Novelty (Pty) Ltd* 1966 (1) SA 492 (A); *FirstRand Bank v National Lotteries Board* [2008] 3 All SA 121 (SCA).

Amusements Act.⁴¹ In view of this, case law on the British provisions can cast a light on the relevant South African legislation. Furthermore, it needs to be noted that comprehensive self-regulatory industry codes complement Britain's legislation relating to promotional competitions. Those codes are far more wide-ranging than the ones found in South Africa. As such, they serve as practical comparative sources.

New Zealand was chosen partly due to its influence on the current British legislation regarding prize promotions. In particular, it has been pointed out that the British provisions relating to the costs that may be charged in respect of competition entries have been modelled on the "New Zealand model".⁴² New Zealand is a smaller and younger country than Great Britain, but it employs a common law system too. Although it has a lengthy gambling statute, it appears that the country's legislature attempted to use clear and understandable language. The legislation merely authorises promotional competitions, known as sales promotion schemes in that country, and they are not regulated by way of extremely comprehensive or complex provisions. It is therefore interesting to compare those provisions with the extensive ones found in South Africa.

1.7 Delineation

The scope of this thesis will cover the sociological, marketing and consumer contexts of promotional competitions by way of background. However, the discussion of these contexts is based on a literature study only and is not exhaustive. Empirical research and surveys will not be conducted. For research on the social and economic impact of gambling, readers are referred to the reports issued by the National Gambling Board.⁴³ It is submitted that a study of the prevalence, impact and efficacy of promotional competitions in South Africa might be a useful topic for future research, although such research might lie within the field of marketing studies.

The thesis will deal with the history of gambling and lotteries, and promotional competitions in particular. This overview is based on existing literature. While a

⁴¹ 1976. See the similarity between s56 of the Lotteries Act and s14 of the Lotteries and Amusements Act.

⁴² Dresden B "United Kingdom" in *International Promotion Marketing Law Book* (2nd ed) ("Dresden 2010") 276.

⁴³ See National Gambling Board "Research" <http://www.ngb.org.za/organisational-areas/research.aspx>, accessed on 27 July 2015.

moderate quantity of international material was accessible for this purpose, much less information was available regarding the South African history of this topic. This might be a subject for future research.

The self-regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa will be explored, with particular focus on the Advertising Standards Authority's Code of Advertising Practice ("ASA Code"). Only the relevant provisions of the ASA Code will be dealt with and the entire ASA Code will not be discussed in detail. While selected Advertising Standards Authority rulings will be discussed as well, the thesis does not contain a full survey of all applicable rulings.

Although the thesis touches on the privacy aspects of promotional competitions as well as the general marketing provisions of the CPA, those aspects and provisions will not be explored in detail. The enforcement of the CPA's provisions, particularly those relating to promotional competitions, will not be investigated, although the relevant sanctions will be considered.

1.8 Outline of chapters

This thesis commences with the introduction contained in this Chapter 1. Thereafter, in Chapter 2, the terminology relating to gambling, lotteries and promotional competitions will be examined. The play element of gambling will be discussed, in addition to people's reasons for gambling, the consequences of gambling, opinions relating thereto as well as policy considerations. The chapter will contain a discussion of the advertising, marketing and promotional context of promotional competitions as well as the consumer protection perspective.

Chapter 3 contains a brief history of the subject from a global perspective. In addition, it will describe the development of the relevant legislation in South Africa and related case law will be discussed.

The law relating to promotional competitions in New Zealand and Great Britain will feature in Chapter 4. This will include a discussion of some case law as well as rulings by self-regulatory authorities.

Chapter 5 contains a detailed analysis of the CPA's provisions that relate to promotional competitions. The relevant provisions of the Lotteries Act will be discussed, and the interplay between the Lotteries Act and the CPA will be examined.

Self-regulation is the focus of Chapter 6. It will include a brief discussion of international industry codes as well as a more detailed study of self-regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa. In particular, the relevant provisions of the ASA Code as well as the Code of Conduct of the Wireless Application Service Providers' Association will be covered.

This thesis concludes with Chapter 7, in which conclusions will be drawn and recommended improvements of or amendments to the relevant legislation will be proposed.

1.9 Reference techniques

In this work, the author may refer to some statutes, organisations and the like on repeated occasions. Where a frequently used term is referred to for the first time, the reference will be in full. It will be accompanied by an abbreviation that will appear between inverted commas and brackets, for example: National Consumer Commission ("NCC").

Where a source is referred to, the full reference will be reflected in the relevant footnote. If a source is referred to more than once, the first full reference will be accompanied by an abbreviated citation or "mode of citation", which will appear between inverted commas inside brackets. For sake of brevity, further citations will display the abbreviated citation instead of the full reference. Where an abbreviated citation is displayed the reader can also find the full reference by consulting the bibliography at the end of this thesis. The bibliography is displayed in table format. In the table, each full reference of a source is accompanied by its "mode of citation" in a separate column alongside the full reference.

CHAPTER 2

BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Terminology
- 2.3 The play element
- 2.4 Policy and regulation
- 2.5 The consumer protection perspective
- 2.6 The marketing context
- 2.7 Conclusion

2.1 Introduction

At first glance, promotional competitions might appear to be simple marketing gimmicks. Yet, upon closer examination, one discovers a network of disciplines that converge in these activities. These disciplines range from law and criminology to sociology and marketing studies. In order to evaluate the regulation of promotional competitions properly, these study fields need to be taken into consideration. Accordingly, this chapter will explore the background and context of promotional competitions.

The chapter commences with an explanation of the relevant terminology and the key elements of the relevant concepts. Thereafter, promotional competitions will be considered from a sociological perspective. In essence, promotional competitions are play activities and it is useful to understand the role of play in people's lives and in society as it may impact on regulatory policy. Since this thesis is about the regulation of promotional competitions, there will also be a discussion surrounding the nature of vice, crime and regulation. It will be explained that promotional competitions are in fact gambling activities. Gambling is a particularly controversial topic and there are various arguments for and against the prohibition, legalisation and regulation of this activity. These arguments will be discussed and it will be considered whether gambling, and promotional competitions in particular, should be prohibited or regulated. Since consumer protection law also regulates promotional competitions, this perspective will

also be afforded attention. True promotional competitions are conducted for marketing purposes. As such, the marketing perspective will be considered as well.

2.2 Terminology

2.2.1 Opening remarks

This thesis examines the regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa, a topic which lies in a subject field that is awash with terminology. In order to consider this, one needs to be aware of the context within which these competitions are found and to understand the meaning of all relevant concepts. It is therefore necessary to explore the various relevant terms and their meanings in order to have a clear reference frame when considering the matters discussed in this thesis.

The term “promotional competition” is one of the key terms used in this thesis. It features in South Africa’s Consumer Protection Act, 2008 (“CPA”) to denote a chance based competition that has the purpose of promoting goods or services.¹ The term was also employed in the Lotteries Act,² which regulated promotional competitions before the relevant provisions were repealed and replaced by the CPA’s provisions.³ However, other terms are also used for this kind of competition and similar schemes.⁴ These terms are found in the legislation that regulates promotional competitions in other countries, and include “sweepstakes”,⁵ “prize competitions”,⁶ “sales promotion schemes”⁷ and “trade promotion lotteries”.⁸ These terms and a couple of other related terms will be referred to again later in this thesis and will be defined in further detail.

¹ CPA, s36(1)(d). See the full definition and analysis in Chapter 5.

² 57 of 1997 (“Lotteries Act, 1997”)

³ Lotteries Act, 1997 s1: “‘promotional competition’ means a lottery conducted for the purpose of promoting the sale or use of any goods or services.” To be read with the definition of “lottery” in the same section: “‘lottery’ includes any game, scheme, arrangement, system, plan, promotional competition or device for distributing prizes by lot or chance and any game, scheme, arrangement, system, plan, competition or device, which the Minister may by notice in the Gazette declare to be a lottery”.

⁴ See also the various gambling related terms defined in the LGB Main Report 145-154.

⁵ A term often used in the United States of America. See for example the Deceptive Mail Prevention and Enforcement Act, which defines a “sweepstakes” as “a game of chance for which no consideration is required to enter”.

⁶ A term used in, for example, s339 of the UK Gambling Act 2005.

⁷ See s4 and s18 of the NZ Gambling Act 2003.

⁸ A term used in, for example, Australia. See LeGuay P “Australia” in *International Promotion Marketing Law Book* (2nd ed) (“LeGuay”) 14-16.

Essentially, a promotional competition consists of a competition that a person enters in order to stand a chance to win a prize.⁹ One of the key elements of a promotional competition lies in the fact that the outcome of the competition is determined by lot or chance. Due to the chance element, this type of competition constitutes a form of gambling (even if in the wider sense of that word). This is because such a game can display most, if not all, of the key elements of gambling or a lottery, which is a species of gambling. In actual fact, promotional competitions would in the past have fallen within the purview of South Africa's Gambling Act, 1965, and in many countries they are still governed by gambling legislation.¹⁰ After the repeal of South Africa's Gambling Act, 1965, the regulation of promotional competitions moved to the Lotteries Act, 1997. However, as Carnelley and Schrage point out, South Africa applies dual regulation of gambling in the form of national and provincial gambling titled legislation on the one hand, and the Lotteries Act, 1997 on the other.¹¹ As such, all of those statutes together still constitute gambling legislation. Even though promotional competitions might now be regulated by the CPA, they are still referred to in the Lotteries Act, 1997, and consequently retain their connection to gambling.

The focus of this thesis is on promotional competitions and the regulation thereof, but it needs to be kept in mind that those competitions are in fact forms of gambling. To an extent, this thesis is therefore also (at least peripherally) about gambling and its regulation. In order to consider the regulation of promotional competitions, one must therefore consider the regulation of gambling as well.

2.2.2 Gambling

Gambling can be defined in different ways and in a broad and narrow sense.¹² Generally, gambling is explained as an activity in which money or something of value

⁹ The CPA's definition of "promotional competition" will be fully analysed in Chapter 5 below.

¹⁰ For example Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom.

¹¹ Carnelley M & Schrage E "Gambling Regulation: A comparison between the Roman and South African gambling laws" in Hoctor SV & Schwikkard PJ (eds) *The Exemplary Scholar: Essays in Honour of John Milton* ("Carnelley & Schrage") 264.

¹² McMillen notes that, although the concept appears to be generally understood, "gambling has no intrinsic meaning". In his view, gambling can have different meanings according to the "socio-historical context in which it occurs". [McMillen J "Understanding Gambling: History, concepts and theories" in McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* ("McMillen") 6] Munting finds that it is not easy to give a meaning to gambling, although people understand the concept "intuitively" and that "almost any area of risk or chance" could form part of this. As he notes, expressions such as "life is all a gamble" are quite common. [Munting R *An economic and social history of gambling in Britain*

is staked on an uncertain future event in the hope of winning a prize.¹³ In other words, the following three key elements usually feature in definitions of gambling:

- (a) participants contribute money or something of value in order to participate;
- (b) the outcome of the activity is unknown and will be determined by an event that will happen in the future; and
- (c) one or more persons will win a prize or receive some kind of reward.

To a greater or lesser extent, these elements also feature in promotional competitions.

2.2.2.1 Gambling definitions in foreign sources

A comprehensive definition for gambling is found in Devereux's sociological work on the topic. He defines gambling as "an activity in which two or more persons engage, under certain rules and conditions specified in advance, to make a transfer of any specified amount of property contingent upon the outcome of a future and uncertain event".¹⁴ The money or thing of value is called the "stake" and the agreement between the participating parties can be described as a "wager" or a "bet".¹⁵

In the United Kingdom, the Gambling Commission, under chairmanship of Lord Rothschild (the "Royal Commission"), analysed the definition of "gambling" thoroughly.¹⁶ Before crafting a more comprehensive definition, the Royal Commission provided the following, simpler definition of gambling:

and the USA ("Munting") 1; Reith G "The Culture of Gambling in Great Britain: Legislative and Social Change" in Spapens T, Littler A and Fijnaut C (eds) *Crime, addiction, and the regulation of gambling* 165 ("Reith 2008") 167 fn 2] Becker notes that there is a distinction between the economic and legal definitions of gambling, the principal difference being that the degree of randomness and the amount of money involved does not play a role in the economic definition. [Becker T "The German Market for Gambling and Betting" in Spapens T, Littler A and Fijnaut C (eds) *Crime, addiction, and the regulation of gambling* 141 ("Becker") 142]

¹³ See Collins P *Gambling and the public interest* ("P Collins") 15; McMillen 6-7; Rose I N "The International Law of Remote Wagering" 2007 *John Marshall Law Review* Vol 40 ("Rose 2007") 1161; Rose I N *Gambling and the Law* ("Rose 1986") 75.

¹⁴ Devereux EC *Gambling and the Social Structure: A sociological study of lotteries and horse racing in contemporary America* (Vol. 1) ("Devereux") 28.

¹⁵ Devereux 28-29.

¹⁶ Royal Commission on Gambling Final Report, July 1978 ("1978 Commission Report") 1 and 449-450.

Almost everyone knows intuitively what gambling is – buying the chance of making money; taking a calculated risk because of the potential reward; engaging in an action or a series of actions resulting in a favourable, unfavourable or neutral outcome; and so on.¹⁷

In Appendix A to its report, the Royal Commission then formulated this definition:

Gambling consists of an agreement between parties with respect to an unascertained outcome that, depending on the outcome, there will be a redistribution of advantage (usually but not always monetary) among those parties. This redistribution may be achieved directly (as in a game of poker) or through an agent (as in the case of football pools and lotteries).¹⁸

The Royal Commission's definition seems to give prominence to the contractual nature of gambling, to such an extent that one could perhaps say that the Commission describes gambling as a type of agreement.¹⁹ The definition focuses on the redistribution aspect of gambling as well. One must bear in mind that the Commission had to devise a definition for gambling for purposes of the Commission's evaluation of gambling and its regulation in the United Kingdom. Not all gambling activities would

¹⁷ 1978 Commission Report 1.

¹⁸ 1978 Commission Report 449.

¹⁹ In practice, gambling can give rise to an actual agreement (contract) between gambler and gambler, or between gambler and casino, and agreements often lead to disputes. As such, the enforceability of gambling agreements has been an issue through the ages, with such agreements being unenforceable or enforceable during different time periods and in different countries. See, for example, Carnelley & Schrage 252-263 regarding gambling in ancient Roman times and Roman laws relating to gambling debts and gambling claims. Gambling debts are unenforceable under the common law, although gambling in itself is not prohibited by such law. Christie 393; Carnelley M "Post-Constitutional Legal Developments in the South African Gambling Law through Judicial Precedent" 2001 *Stellenbosch Law Review* 1 131-154 ("Carnelley *Stell LR*") 131. In a modern South African context, see s65 of the Lotteries Act, 1997 and s16 of the National Gambling Act, 2004 pursuant to which gambling debts are enforceable (although there are some exceptions). Regarding the enforcement of gambling debts and related agreements in South Africa and some related court judgements, see, for example, Carnelley M "Inter-party enforcement of legal gambling debts. Sea Point Racing CC v Wilkinson [1999] 2 All SA 626 D" 1999(1) *Obiter* 218-223; Carnelley M "Enforcement of lawfully incurred gambling debts" 2001(5) *De Rebus* 57; Carnelley M "Tata 'ma millions? The enforceability of a gambling debt between the lottery operator and the ticket-holder; and the enforceability of a partnership agreement to share lottery winnings already paid to one of the partners" 2006 (1) *Obiter* 358-368. The enforceability of foreign judgements relating to gambling debts is also discussed in Carnelley M "The role of public policy in the non-enforcement of foreign judgments arising from gambling debts in South African courts: A comparative overview" 2007 *Journal for Juridical Science* 32:2 1-17. In respect of public policy and wagering contracts, see for example Hawthorne L "Public policy: the origin of a general clause in the South African law of contract" 2013 *Fundamina* 19:2 300-320 ("Hawthorne") 315-319. See also Christie 392-39 regarding gambling contracts in the context of illegality and unenforceability. The *locus classicus* in South African case law is *Dodd v Hadley* 1905 TS 439, in which the court held that wagers were not enforceable. (Hawthorne 318) In circumstances where gambling debts cannot be enforced under the Lotteries Act, 1997 or the National Gambling Act, 2004 they will be governed by the common law and will be unenforceable on public policy grounds. (Hawthorne 318, citing *Gibson v Van der Walt* 1952 (1) SA 262 (A) at 270.)

have fallen in the Commission's terms of reference and its definition has a limited scope.²⁰

2.2.2.2 Gambling definitions in South African sources

One can find definitions of gambling in a South African context as well. Although its predecessor, the Howard Commission,²¹ did not discuss the meaning of gambling, the Lotteries and Gambling Board provided a detailed glossary of gambling related terminology in its Main Report of the Lotteries and Gambling Board ("LGB Main Report").²² The LGB Main Report's definition of gambling is virtually identical to the simpler definition contained in the 1978 Commission Report,²³ but it adds that "[i]n the most general sense of all, gambling refers to any activity engaged in for the sake of a return of which the outcome is uncertain".²⁴ Wiehahn recounts how the Lotteries and Gambling Board conducted wide research into the meaning of the term "gambling" and that the Board resolved to use it as a "generic term" encompassing lotteries, gaming and wagering.²⁵

South Africa's National Gambling Act, 2004 does not define "gambling" as a concept on its own.²⁶ Perhaps, the legislature did this to avoid devising a comprehensive

²⁰ 1978 Commission Report 449. The Commission stated that, in a broad interpretation, "gambling" could include "any activity engaged in for the sake of a return which is uncertain".

²¹ The Commission of Inquiry into Lotteries, Sports Pools, Fund-Raising Activities and certain Matters relating to Gambling (RP 80/1993) ("Howard Report"). For more on that Commission, see page 117-118 below.

²² The Main Report on Gambling in South Africa (RP 85/1995) ("LGB Main Report"). See the more detailed discussion at pages 118-120 below.

²³ See page 18 above.

²⁴ LGB Main Report 149.

²⁵ Wiehahn NE *Gambling in South Africa – A New Challenge* ("NE Wiehahn 1995") 3-4. In respect of the word "gambling", Carnelley notes that "the term includes lotteries, wagering on horse races as well as casino gaming". Carnelley M "Guarding the Guardians: Non-Judicial and Judicial Control over Unlawful Decisions by the South African Gaming Boards" 2001 *Obiter* 74-101 ("Carnelley *Obiter* 2001") 74 fn 1. Christie and Bradfield note that the courts use "gambling, gaming, wagering and bettering [...] as more or less interchangeable terms". Christie RH & Bradfield GB *Christie's The Law of Contract in South Africa* (6th ed) ("Christie") 393. Wiehahn draws a distinction between lotteries, gaming and wagering. He argues that a lottery is a "slow-response activity" (perhaps because there is a time lapse between the moment when the lottery ticket is purchased and the moment winners are made known during the actual lottery draw). On the other hand, he describes gaming as a "quick-response activity", while wagering consists of "betting on human and animal sport". (NE Wiehahn 1995, 3-4)

²⁶ Although the National Gambling Act, 2004 does not contain a definition for "gambling", some of the provincial gambling statutes do contain such a definition. The North West Gambling Act, 2001, defines "gamble" ("gambling" having a corresponding meaning) as follows:

"the wagering of a stake of money or anything of value on the unknown result of a future event at the risk of losing all or a portion thereof for the sake of a return, irrespective of whether any measure

definition that might lead to divergent interpretations, debates and litigation.²⁷ Or, the legislature did not want to codify a concept that already has so many different meanings. Whatever the reason may be, the legislature decided on defining and regulating specific “gambling activities”, without reference to “gambling” in general. According to section 3, the following activities classify as gambling activities:

- (a) placing or accepting a bet or wager in terms of section 4(1);
- (b) placing or accepting a totalisator bet, in terms of section 4(2); or
- (c) making available for play, or playing -
 - (i) bingo or another gambling game in terms of section 5;
 - (ii) an amusement game, to the extent that applicable provincial laws require such games to be licensed, or
 - (iii) an interactive game.

The scope of this work does not allow for a detailed analysis of all of these activities. However, some comments will suffice.

As one would expect, the placing of bets or wagers is regarded as a gambling activity.²⁸ According to section 4(1), someone will be regarded as placing a bet or wager if that person:

of skill is involved or not and encompasses all forms of gambling but, excludes the operation of an amusement machine”.

The KwaZulu-Natal Gaming and Betting Act, 2010 contains the following definition for “gambling”:

“engaging in any activity whereby money or any other thing of value is staked on the unknown result of a future event at the risk of losing all or a portion of the money or valuable thing so staked for the sake of a return and is the generic term encompassing all forms of ‘gaming’ and ‘betting’ as defined in this section, but excludes –

- (a) any lawful lottery; and
- (b) any recognised investment activity undertaken with a recognised financial institution”.

See Carnelley *Obiter* 2001 74 fn 1.

²⁷ On the other hand, this could lead to a situation where an activity might be gambling in the traditional sense but, due to the lack of a general definition of “gambling”, does not fall within the scope of the provisions of the National Gambling Act, 2004. In such a situation, the activity will not be regulated by that Act, but it might still be covered by the common law. The common law did not prohibit gambling. However, gambling agreements were not enforceable under the common law – mostly likely to dissuade people from participating in gambling. (Carnelley M “Gambling, Gaming and Lotteries” in Joubert WA (founding editor) *The Law of South Africa* 2nd ed 10:2 164; Carnelley *Stell LR* 129; Christie 393)

²⁸ The National Gambling Act, 2004 does not define the terms “bet” and “wager”. As such, from the context of the wording of section 4(1), one must deduce that a “bet” or “wager” refers to money (or something of value) staked on a contingency. However, some of the provincial gambling statutes do contain definitions for “betting” and “wagering”. See, for example, the KwaZulu Natal Gaming and Betting Act, 2010 and the North West Gambling Act, 2001.

- (a) being a player, stakes money or anything of value on a fixed-odds bet, or an open bet, with a bookmaker on any contingency; or
- (b) being a bookmaker -
 - (i) accepts a stake of money or anything of value on a fixed-odds bet, or an open bet, from a player on any contingency; or
 - (ii) stakes money or anything of value on a fixed-odds bet, or an open bet, with another bookmaker on any contingency;
- (c) stakes or accepts a stake of money or anything of value with one or more other persons on any contingency; or
- (d) expressly or implicitly undertakes, promises or agrees to do anything contemplated in paragraph (a), (b) or (c).

As can be seen from section 4(1), bets and wagers involve the staking of money or something of value on a contingency. The National Gambling Act, 2004 does not define the terms “bet” or “wager”, although it does contain definitions for specific kinds of bets. It does define “contingency” as “an event or occurrence of which the outcome is uncertain or unknown to any person until it happens”.²⁹ As such, the activity of betting or wagering contains some of the traditional characteristics of gambling, but, interestingly, there is no mention of a prize.³⁰ When it comes to bets and wagers, it seems that the bookmaker plays a key role, because the Act states that betting or wagering takes place if money is staked with a bookmaker³¹ or takes place if a bookmaker accepts or makes the stakes.³²

Returning to gambling activities as classified in section 3 of the National Gambling Act, 2004, we see that betting and wagering are not the only activities that qualify as gambling activities. Bingo, amusement games and interactive games are classified as gambling activities too.

2.2.2.3 General remarks regarding gambling as a concept

Despite the various definitions that exist, there is no ultimate, general definition for gambling. As Collins points out, some activities fall within the scope of gambling even

²⁹ National Gambling Act, 2004, s1.

³⁰ As mentioned above (page 17), the prize or reward is one of the three traditional key elements of gambling. Accordingly, the absence of the prize element is striking. In fact, the term “prize” is not even defined in the National Gambling Act, 2004.

³¹ S4(1)(a)

³² S4(1)(b)

though people might not ordinarily regard those activities as gambling.³³ In this regard, he mentions examples such as lotteries, prize draws and newspaper competitions.³⁴ McMillen notes that gambling generally has a restricted definition in academic writing, which excludes activities such as private gambling (where the money does the rounds within a closed group of players) or even insurance.³⁵ He points out that the meaning of the concept depends on the culture, society and era in which it takes place.³⁶ He notes that the meaning of the term normally centres on the financial element – the staking of money or something of value.³⁷ However, he informs the reader that it can play a social or even a religious role in some cultures or societies.³⁸

One aspect of gambling that is certain³⁹ is that it is based on an event that is uncertain.⁴⁰ This uncertainty is central to the definition of gambling. Devereux explains that an event is uncertain if “the outcome cannot be adequately controlled or predicted by the parties engaged on the basis of knowledge and techniques legitimately

³³ P Collins 15.

³⁴ P Collins 15. Many authors point to the fact that stock broking could be considered gambling. See, for example, the 1978 Commission Report 449 and McMillen 6. Munting notes that when Barings Bank collapsed in the 1990s due to derivative market losses, many people linked the speculation on such markets to gambling. (Munting 2-3) Before that, during the 1960s, a council of churches classified the British government’s Premium Bonds as gambling products. (Munting 4)

³⁵ McMillen 6-7. Van Niekerk examines the relationship and distinction between insurance and gambling in detail, specifically in the context of the insurance law’s development in the Netherlands. Van Niekerk JP *The Development of the Principles of Insurance Law in the Netherlands from 1500 to 1800* (“Van Niekerk”) 89-174. See also Rose IN “How Insurance Became (Mostly) Not Gambling” 2014 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 18:9 (“Rose 2014”) 864-872 for a discussion of insurance and gambling and the history of the relationship between those two. Rose remarks that “[i]nsurance is, of course, gambling”, and points out that “unlike traditional gambling, the buyer usually hopes the future event will not happen”. (Rose 2014 864)

³⁶ McMillen 6.

³⁷ McMillen 6. Herman also raises the point that money adds thrill, excitement and purpose to gambling. He states: “Things done casually, without effort, including playing games, tend to be regarded as frivolous. Thus, a small bet helps a game come alive, and a large bet generates more interest [...] Putting one’s money where one’s mouth is produces a challenge which is difficult to take lightly.” Herman RD *Gamblers and Gaming: Motives, Institutions and Controls* (“Herman 1976”)

³⁸ McMillen 6-7. In this regard, McMillen refers to “pre-capitalist societies, such as Bali, China, Africa and Australian Aboriginal communities” in which gambling did not have much of a profit making purpose.

³⁹ The interplay between certainty and uncertainty has led to many paradoxes and popular quotes. For example: “[...] one unchangeable certainty is that nothing is certain or unchangeable.” (John F. Kennedy, State of the Union Address, January 11, 1962)

⁴⁰ 1978 Commission Report (Vol 2) 450; LGB Main Report 149. In the context of legal history, Van Niekerk explains that jurists distinguished between different types of uncertainty in chance based transactions, particularly absolute (objective) uncertainty and relative (subjective) certainty. Van Niekerk 96.

available”.⁴¹ No matter to what degree, the outcome of gambling always depends on external factors that cannot be controlled.⁴²

Even though chance plays a key role in gambling, some gamblers regard particular types of gambling as games of skill.⁴³ Herman warns that one cannot make an absolute, clear-cut distinction between gambling games, because the player’s perspective must be taken into account.⁴⁴ When playing roulette, one person might have the view that he is taking part in a game of skill, while another might regard the activity merely as a game of chance.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, as Reith points out, chance is found in all types of gambling to one degree or another.⁴⁶

Roger Caillois divided the human activity of play into four categories.⁴⁷ Authors often divide gambling games into two of Caillois’s four categories: agonistic games and aleatory games.⁴⁸ Agonistic games involve skill, while the outcome of aleatory games is determined by chance.⁴⁹ Subject to his warning about making clear-cut distinctions, Herman is of the view that gambling games can actually be divided into all four of Caillois’s categories.⁵⁰ For example, he classifies backgammon, poker and handicapping (sports betting, horse playing and even stock market playing) as agonistic games. Under aleatory games, he includes dice games, blackjack, roulette,

⁴¹ Devereux 28.

⁴² The Royal Commission notes that, although gambling might involve one uncertain event or a series of such events, “the outcome is in all cases uncertain tot the parties”. 1978 Commission Report 450.

⁴³ From a legal perspective, it is often crucial to determine whether or not an activity involves chance or skill. For example, in order to decide whether or not an activity can be classified as a “promotional competition” under the CPA, one must analyse whether the outcome of the competition is determined by lot (chance) or by skill. If a mixture of the two is present, the scheme will still be regarded as a promotional competition. However, Becker points out that it is difficult to determine whether a game is one of skill or chance, and that it is often a relative, subjective analysis. He mentions, for example, that poker could be deemed to be a game of skill when a newcomer plays against a season player, but it could be seen as a game of chance when both players are professionals. (Becker 142-143)

⁴⁴ Herman 1976 7.

⁴⁵ Herman 1976 7.

⁴⁶ Reith G *The Age of Chance: Gambling in Western Culture* (“Reith 1999”) 94.

⁴⁷ See the more detailed discussion at pages 32-33 below. The four categories are: agonistic games, aleatory games, mimicry and vertigo.

⁴⁸ In evaluating gambling activity, authors often make the distinction between games of skill (agonistic games) and aleatory games (chance based games). See, for example, Stevens M & Young M “Who Plays What? Participation Profiles in Chance Versus Skill-based Gambling” 2010 *Journal of Gambling Studies* Vol 26 89-103 (“Stevens & Young”) 90-92.

⁴⁹ Caillois R *Man, Play, and Games* (“Caillois”) 14-19; Stevens & Young 90-92.

⁵⁰ Herman 1976 7.

lotteries and hedging.⁵¹ He regards games that involve cheating and misleading as mimicry, and marathons and plunging as vertigo games.⁵²

In view of the broad scope within which gambling can be defined, it is not difficult to categorise promotional competitions as a sub-species of this activity. Further, since it is often argued that gambling should be regulated due to the central part played by chance, one should realise that this argument in favour of regulation will also have a bearing on promotional competitions and the potential need to regulate those activities.

2.2.3 Gaming and other euphemisms

A term that is often used in conjunction with gambling or even as a synonym of gambling is the term “gaming”. Some authors make a clear distinction between “gambling” and “gaming”, while others are of the view that “gaming” is a euphemistic alternative for the term “gambling”. In the LGB Main Report, “gaming” is given a meaning which is separate and distinct from the definition of “gambling”. The authors define “gaming” as “[t]he playing of a game of chance (or of chance and skill combined) for winnings in money or money’s worth”.⁵³ In contrast, they define “gambling” as follows: “Buying the chance of making money; taking a calculated risk because of the potential reward, engaging in an action or a series of actions, resulting in favourable, neutral or unfavourable outcome.”⁵⁴

According to Rose, the whole subject area involving gambling, lotteries and the like should accurately be classified as “gambling”.⁵⁵ He describes gaming as “betting on games of chance”.⁵⁶ However, he points out that individuals often prefer to use the

⁵¹ Herman 1976 7. In these games, luck plays the dominant role. (Herman 1976 21) Although some purchasers of lottery tickets might differ, luck is so pervasive in a lottery that it would be very difficult to display any element of skill in such an activity.

⁵² Herman 1976 8. He mentions “gaffs”, “Three Card Monte” and “bluffing” as mimicry based gambling games. He also explains how both mimicry and vertigo can be a part of poker playing. (Herman 1976 15-17)

⁵³ LGB Main Report 149.

⁵⁴ LGB Main Report 149. The authors add: “In the most general sense of all, gambling refers to any activity engaged in for the sake of a return of which the outcome is uncertain.” As such, the authors assign an extremely wide meaning to gambling. If one considers their definition, life itself could be regarded as gambling.

⁵⁵ Rose 1986 75. This is in line with NE Wiehahn’s comments regarding the view taken by the Lotteries and Gambling Board, after they examined a variety of definitions. See page 19 above.

⁵⁶ Rose 2007 1163. The Lotteries and Gambling Board labelled gaming as a “quick response activity”. NE Wiehahn 1995 3.

term “gaming” instead of “gambling”.⁵⁷ By way of example, he mentions that attorneys who specialise in gambling law would rather refer to “gaming law” than “gambling law”.⁵⁸ Although he does not explicitly state this, one can infer from his discussion that persons prefer to use the term “gaming” instead of “gambling” because the term “gambling” might have negative connotations associated with it.

It seems that not all sources agree on the meaning of the term “gaming”. Although some authors point out that “gaming” has a distinct meaning, others regard it as a synonym for “gambling”.⁵⁹ For example, in Haugen’s glossary of gambling terminology, he states that “gaming” and “gambling” are identical terms.⁶⁰ He explains that people use the term “gaming” instead of “gambling” in order to avoid the negative undertone associated with the term “gambling”.⁶¹ Thompson describes “gaming” as a euphemism for “gambling”, and indicates that “gambling”, “gaming” and “wagering” are used as interchangeable terms.⁶²

Although it seems to be the trend for industry associations and role-players to refer to the “gaming” industry, Collins criticizes this practice and states that it could create the implication that the industry has “something to hide”.⁶³ He suggests that the industry should be frank about the field of activity in which it operates.⁶⁴ It should not hold back

⁵⁷ Rose 1986 75. Perhaps this is because “gambling” might sound like a vice to some people, while they might regard “gaming” as a leisure activity.

⁵⁸ Rose 1986 75. Prof Rose’s website describes him as “one of the world’s leading authorities on gambling law”. (“Gambling and the Law”, www.gamblingandthelaw, accessed on 28 February 2015.) However, in one of his articles, he refers to the need to involve specialist “gaming” lawyers in matters. Rose NI “Why Gaming Lawyers Are Important” 2011 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 15:7/8 419-421.

⁵⁹ Carnelley, for example, mentions that there is no clear difference between “gambling” and “wagering” and that “in South Africa the terms are used loosely and interchangeable”. However, in her view, the key element of “gaming” lies in the fact that “the person placing the stake, participates in a game that determines whether and to whom the winnings are paid – irrespective of whether the outcome of the game is determined by skill and/or luck”. (Carnelley *Obiter* 2001 74 fn 1)

⁶⁰ Haugen DM *Legalized Gambling* (“Haugen”) 141.

⁶¹ Haugen 141.

⁶² Thompson WN *Legalized gambling: a reference handbook* 276.

⁶³ P Collins 20. The use of the word “gaming” is becoming commonplace, to such an extent that the public might reach a point where “gambling” and “gaming” are regarded as synonyms. Legislation reflects this too. For example, KwaZulu-Natal’s legislation on this topic is called the “KwaZulu-Natal Gaming and Betting Act, 2010”, although it deals with both “gaming” and “gambling”. The Act defines “gaming” as “playing any casino game, bingo or any gaming machine or limited payout machine”. See fn 26 above for its definition of “gambling”. In the context of that Act, it seems that “gaming” has a more limited definition, if compared to “gambling”.

⁶⁴ P Collins 20.

from asserting that gambling affords entertainment to many people, while pointing out that in a few cases gamblers do battle with problem gambling.⁶⁵

It seems therefore that, in the narrow sense, “gaming” refers to an activity where persons bet on the outcome of a game. However, in a broader context, the term “gaming” is also used as a “softer” alternative for the term “gambling”.⁶⁶

In a similar manner, terms like “promotional competition”, “sweepstakes”, “prize competition” and “sales promotion scheme” could perhaps be regarded as euphemisms for “soft” gambling as well. These terms might serve to set the relevant activities apart from regular gambling and shield them against an inquiry into the regulation of gambling. Some persons may regard gambling as a vice, but still participate in promotional competitions. (It would be interesting to see whether their participation would continue if those competitions bore the gambling label.) Perhaps these euphemisms also highlight a difference in nuance: gambling could be regarded as a hard core activity, while promotional competitions are the soft core version. This distinction might call for different levels of regulation, similar to the different forms of regulation of hard core and soft core pornography.

2.2.4 Lotteries

Lotteries and gambling are activities that seem to go hand-in-hand. As such, one needs to investigate whether these activities differ, if at all. The LGB Main Report describes a lottery as “the distribution of prizes by chance where the persons taking part, or a substantial number of them, make a payment or consideration in return for obtaining their chance of a prize”.⁶⁷ Clotfelter and Cook explain that “[t]he essence of a lottery is the purchase of a chance to win a prize, based on a random drawing”.⁶⁸ According to them, lotteries can be found in a myriad of varieties, but one can identify four general types of lotteries: “passive drawings, instant scratch-off games, numbers,

⁶⁵ P Collins 20.

⁶⁶ “Gaming” might be described as a “vanilla” term or euphemism.

⁶⁷ LGB Main Report 151. In the Lotteries and Gambling Board’s Interim Report, the authors noted that there seems to be a distinction between lotteries and gambling, but remarked that the “distinction appears to be more academic than real”. (“Lotteries and Gambling Board Interim Report”, reproduced in *The Complete Wiehahn Report on Gambling in South Africa* 6). NE Wiehahn also mentioned that the Board labelled lotteries as “slow-response activities”. (NE Wiehahn 1995 3)

⁶⁸ Clotfelter CT & Cook PJ *Selling Hope: State Lotteries in America* (“Clotfelter & Cook”) 51.

and lotto”.⁶⁹ Despite all the varieties, most sources identify three common elements in a lottery: consideration, chance and prize.⁷⁰ To an extent, these elements are also contained in the definition provided by the Lotteries Act, 1997:

“lottery” includes any game, scheme, arrangement, system, plan, promotional competition or device for distributing prizes by lot or chance and any game, scheme, arrangement, system, plan, competition or device, which the Minister may by notice in the Gazette declare to be a lottery.⁷¹

It is interesting to note that the Lotteries Act, 1997 does not provide a closed definition of the term “lottery”. Instead, in the definition, it states that the term “includes” the various items mentioned in the definition. This means that there might be other games, schemes and the like that could be considered to be lotteries, even though they might not be expressly mentioned in the definition contained in the Lotteries Act, 1997. However, it is not clear what those games would be and how one would identify them. This could create problems in practice for persons that would like to conduct games of chance, since it is not entirely clear when a particular game would qualify as a lottery. Even though some games might not fall within the scope of the description provided in the Lotteries Act, 1997, they might be regarded as lotteries if one considers definitions provided by the legislation of other countries or in dictionaries.

Furthermore, it is noteworthy that the definition in the Lotteries Act, 1997 does not refer to consideration. In other countries (for example the United Kingdom⁷² and the United States⁷³) consideration is one of the key elements of a lottery. A lottery functions on the basis that all the participants contribute to the pool of prizes by purchasing their entries into the lottery. The consideration element is important from a regulatory

⁶⁹ Clotfelter & Cook 51.

⁷⁰ See, for example, Williams FE *Lotteries, Law and Morals* (“FE Williams 1958”) 69; *R v Cranston* 1914 AD 238; *R v Lew Hoi* 1937 AD 215 220; *Minister of Mineral and Energy Affairs v Lucky Horseshoe (Pty) Ltd* 1994 (2) SA 46 (A) 52.

⁷¹ Lotteries Act, 1997 s1.

⁷² S14(1) of the United Kingdom’s Gambling Act 2005 states that an arrangement will be a “lottery” if it meets the criteria of a “simple lottery” (defined in s14(2)) or a “complex lottery” (defined in s14(3)). In both cases, one finds the following criterion: “persons are required to pay in order to participate in the arrangement”.

⁷³ See, for example, the definitions of the term “lottery” in the Texas State Lottery Act and Georgia’s lottery legislation. [Lord TH & Miller LC “Playing the Game by the Rules: A Practical Guide to Sweepstakes and Contest Promotions” *Franchise Law Journal* 3-9 (“Lord & Miller”) 3 and fn 1] The Federal Communications Commission defines a “lottery” as “any game, contest or promotion that combines the elements of prize, chance and consideration”. (Federal Communications Commission “Broadcasting Contest, Lotteries, and Solicitation of Funds” <http://www.fcc.gov/guides/broadcasting-contests-lotteries-and-solicitation-funds>, accessed on 28 February 2015.)

perspective, too because entrants contribute money to participate in lotteries and checks should be put in place to ensure that this element is controlled in order to curb potential abuse. In many countries, organisers of promotional competitions and similar schemes avoid their schemes from falling within the scope of lotteries or gambling legislation by removing the consideration element.⁷⁴ Due to the wide definition in the Lotteries Act, 1997, it might seem that an activity could qualify as a lottery, even if entrants do not have to pay to participate. However, section 63 of the Lotteries Act, 1997 states that it will not apply “in relation to any lottery, sports pool or competition in respect of which there is no subscription”.⁷⁵

Although lotteries have distinct terminology attached to them, they seem to display the characteristics of gambling. Just like gambling, participants normally have to pay to purchase their entries into a lottery. The outcome of a lottery is also determined by an uncertain future event and participants take part in the activity in the hope of winning a prize.

It is submitted that a promotional competition can be regarded as a sub-species of the lottery. Typical promotional competitions involve games in which the outcome is determined by an uncertain event – chance. Entrants participate in these games in order to win prizes. If a promotional competition can be regarded as a lottery, such a competition could also be regarded as a gambling activity in the broader sense. One could therefore say that a lottery is merely a particular form of gambling.

Since lotteries can be regarded as gambling, the policy issues that need to be considered in relation to gambling should be relevant in the case of lotteries as well.⁷⁶ It then follows that if typical promotional competitions could be classified as lotteries

⁷⁴ See, for example, Lord & Miller, where the authors suggest that a promoter can avoid breaching United States lottery laws by structuring a competition in such a way that one of the traditional elements of a lottery (chance, consideration or prize) is left out. (Lord & Miller 3) See also Cabot AN, Light GJ & Rutledge KF “Economic Value, Equal Dignity and the Future of Sweepstakes” 2010 *UNLV Gaming Law Journal* 1:1 1-38 (“Cabot *ea*”), in which the authors discuss the elements of gambling in the context of sweepstakes, and how one of those can be removed in order to make a competition lawful. They focus on the consideration element in particular. This approach can also be followed in the United Kingdom in order to avoid a competition from being classified as a lottery under the Gambling Act 2005. (Dresden B “United Kingdom” in *International Promotion Marketing Law Book* 2nd ed 275-276)

⁷⁵ The term “subscription” is defined as “the payment, or delivery of any money, goods, article, matter or thing, including any ticket, coupon or entry form, for the right to compete in a lottery”. (Lotteries Act, 1997, s1) As such, if no consideration is payable, a competition will not be subject to the Lotteries Act, 1997. See the more comprehensive discussion below at pages 192-196.

⁷⁶ See section 2.3 below.

or gambling, the public policy considerations become relevant for such competitions as well. Those considerations therefore require closer scrutiny. But, before they can be examined, it is useful to understand the play element which underlies gambling, since it provides some background to the public policy considerations.

2.3 The Play Element

People might have various reasons for taking part in gambling, lotteries, promotional competitions and activities of a similar nature. They may wish to win a prize, make some money or put their luck to the test. But, on a macro level, what action takes place when people participate in these activities? Before one analyses these activities to examine issues such as the need to regulate gambling, people's reasons for being involved in these activities or the legal definitions that apply, it is useful to understand the context from a social sciences perspective.

In general, gambling, lotteries and promotional competitions display a common element of play.⁷⁷ When people participate in gambling and lotteries, at a very basic level, they participate in play and games. Herman's view is that "gambling is best understood as game playing, and game playing is both normal and thoroughly integrated with the rest of the culture in which it occurs".⁷⁸

In 1938, Johan Huizinga published *Homo Ludens*,⁷⁹ in which he identified the role of play in society and how it shapes culture.⁸⁰ Although he warned that it would be "a little cheap, to call all human activity 'play'", Huizinga recorded his conviction that "civilization arises and unfolds in and as play".⁸¹ His view is that "culture arises in the

⁷⁷ Herman 1976 1-9; Downes DM, Davies, BP, David ME and Stone P *Gambling, work and leisure: a study across three areas*. ("Downes ea") 11-14; Smith JF & Abt V "Gambling as Play" in Frey JH & Eadington WR (eds) *Gambling: Views from the Social Sciences. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 122 ("Smith & Abt") 122-132; Reith G *HOMO ALEATOR: A Sociological Study of Gambling in Western Society* ("Reith 1996") 199-253; Reith G "The Experience of Play" in Cosgrave JF (ed) *The Sociology of Risk and Gambling Reader* 255-287 ("Reith 2006"); Ottaway J *The UK National Lottery and Charitable Gambling* ("Ottaway") 91-127.

⁷⁸ Herman 1976 1.

⁷⁹ Huizinga J *Homo Ludens: A study of the play-element in culture*. The work was first published in German in Switzerland in 1944, then translated by RFC Hull and published in England in 1949. "Homo Ludens" can be translated as "Man the Player", and describes a characteristic of man alongside others such as "Homo Sapiens" and "Homo Faber" ("Man the Maker"). (Foreword to *Homo Ludens*, page unnumbered.) Reith continues with the terminology used to describe man and casts the light on "Homo Aleator" ("Man the Gambler"). (Reith 1996 1)

⁸⁰ See Herman 1976 1-3, Downes ea 11-14, Smith & Abt, 122-132.

⁸¹ Forward to *Homo Ludens*, page unnumbered.

form of play, that it is played from the very beginning”.⁸² Further, he identifies a very important element of play, namely “fun”.⁸³ In his work, Huizinga distinguished various characteristics of play: it is voluntary and free, it is independent from “ordinary life”, play is limited and comes to an end, and it has rules and creates order.⁸⁴ The function of play can be found in two basic aspects: play is “a contest *for* something” and “a representation *of* something”.⁸⁵ Ultimately, the “civilizing function” of play and contests is one of the key concepts in Huizinga’s work.⁸⁶

Although Huizinga refers to gambling in his work,⁸⁷ it seems that he does not have a high regard for games of pure chance and their value in society.⁸⁸ When it comes to games of chance, he reasons that “for the development of culture as such we must call them unproductive” and that these games are “sterile, adding nothing to life or the mind”.⁸⁹ He points out that tension and uncertainty are general characteristics of play and that games have value because of the tension they create in people that watch them being played.⁹⁰ Based on this, he seems to argue that games of chance do not have value, because “the tension felt by the player is only feebly communicated to the onlooker”.⁹¹ In his view, games of skill have more value for the improvement of civilization. Accordingly, Downes and his colleagues state that in Huizinga’s work

⁸² Huizinga 46. Ottaway points out that Huizinga builds on Plato’s views regarding the link between play and culture. (Ottaway 91 and fn 1 on that page.) Reith also refers to Plato’s influence on Huizinga, particularly with regard to “sacred play”. (Reith 1996 4)

⁸³ Huizinga 3.

⁸⁴ Huizinga 7-13. See Ottaway’s discussion of these characteristics. (Ottaway 94-97.)

⁸⁵ Huizinga 13. Huizinga identified how play could be “pointless” on the one hand, but “significant” on the other. (Smith & Abt 123, citing Huizinga 15)

⁸⁶ Huizinga 46-75. He also shows how play has a role in various disciplines, such as art, philosophy, poetry and even law and war. One could reinterpret Huizinga’s view on the role of play as follows: Although play could be regarded as merely “fun and games”, it fulfils key roles in human life, culture and society. (Dictionary.com defines “fun and games” as “frivolously diverting activity”. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/fun%20and%20games>, accessed on 12 January 2015).

⁸⁷ See Huizinga 11, where he discussed the “tension of play” and how that tension is at its height in athletics and gambling.

⁸⁸ Reith observes that Huizinga is “dismissive of games of chance”, and she finds this remarkable because Huizinga seems to place so much value on play’s key function in society. (Reith 1996 4)

⁸⁹ Huizinga 48.

⁹⁰ Huizinga 47-48.

⁹¹ Huizinga 48. Perhaps that might have been Huizinga’s view in the middle of the 1900s, but in present times there are websites dedicated to live broadcasting of poker tournaments. See, for example, PokerStars (www.pokerstars.tv, accessed on 28 February 2015). As such, gambling must have spectator value to some people.

“gambling is given short shrift as a parasitic, materialistic and entirely negative activity: the dark side of play”.⁹²

Although Huizinga argues that play in itself has no real purpose, he reasons that the outcome of play does have significance.⁹³ A match or a game might be played momentarily and come to an end, but the players gain satisfaction and the delight increases if someone watches the outcome of the game.⁹⁴ In this regard, Huizinga stresses the importance of “winning” and the “prize” in play and games.⁹⁵ He states:

Pure avarice neither trades nor plays; it does not gamble. To dare, to take risks, to bear uncertainty, to endure tension – these are the essence of the play spirit. Tension adds to the importance of the game and, as it increases, enables the player to forget that he is only playing.⁹⁶

It is in this vein that Huizinga does see some significance in games of chance, despite the fact that he argues that games of chance have no real value for the improvement of civilization. As mentioned above, he points out that value lies in the outcome of play. Thus, he argues that winning in itself has significance and therefore it does not matter whether chance or skill led to the winning. He states: “Luck may have a sacred significance; the fall of the dice may signify and determine the divine workings; by it we may move the gods as efficiently as by any other form of contest.”⁹⁷

It is insightful to examine the player’s state of mind when playing a game. Reality and the game might become blurred. Huizinga shows how there is a fine line between play and seriousness. He points out that “playing” and “gambling” are terms used in relation to stock exchanges and that while a “gambler at the roulette table will readily

⁹² Downes *ea* 11. Yet, the authors regard Huizinga’s work as “the most consummate attempt yet to give play its due in the creation of culture”.

⁹³ Huizinga 49. According to Herman, Huizinga identifies how players want to get something out of the activity. They take up a challenge, with the hope of gaining a reward. (Herman 1976 2)

⁹⁴ Huizinga 49-50. Herman summarises this by saying: “The ‘magic’ of the play experience is retained after the game is over.” (Herman 1976 2)

⁹⁵ Huizinga 50-51.

⁹⁶ Huizinga 51. Herman remarks how Huizinga identifies players’ drive to both seek tension, but to relive it as well. (Herman 1976 2)

⁹⁷ Huizinga 56. Here, Huizinga also refers to the sacred. Ottaway observes how play has a sacred, transcendental nature for Huizinga. (Ottaway 91, 93) See also Herman 1976 1.

concede that he is playing; the stockjobber will not”.⁹⁸ In his view, both the gambler and the stockbroker have the same purpose: “the hope of gain”.⁹⁹

Despite its contribution to literature, there is some criticism of Huizinga’s *Homo Ludens*. Herman’s view is that “there remain problems and ambiguities in his work” and that it was “an important beginning but perhaps too abstract”.¹⁰⁰ He mentions that people experience play in different ways and that “play itself is variable and differs in general characteristics from one occasion to another.”¹⁰¹ Yet, Herman states that Huizinga’s contribution is important because it focuses on the attractiveness of play and people’s motivation for engaging in play.¹⁰² Herman mentions that Huizinga’s work points out that the distinctions between work and play “are exaggerated and misleading”.¹⁰³

Another prominent figure in the study of play is Roger Caillois. He conducted a ground breaking analysis of play, published under the title *Man, Play, and Games*. In his work, Caillois sought to classify the various forms of play and divide it into four categories: *agôn*, *alea*, mimicry and *ilinx*.¹⁰⁴ *Agôn* (agonistic play) involves competition between people.¹⁰⁵ In agonistic play, the intention is to level the playing field in order for competitors to be evaluated on an equal footing.¹⁰⁶ This form of play can test various qualities, such as skill, strength and speed, and can manifest in broad spectrum of activities which can range from football, tennis and boxing to chess, checkers and

⁹⁸ Huizinga 52.

⁹⁹ Huizinga 52. Comparing the mindset of the stockbroker with that of the gambler, Huizinga finds that “the difference of mentality is exceedingly small”.

¹⁰⁰ Herman 1976 2-3. Ottaway has some criticism of Huizinga’s theories as well, particularly in respect of the way in which Huizinga treats play as a “transcendental signifier” and because he then does not maintain this concept throughout his work. (Ottaway 92, 104-106) Ottaway notes that Caillois also criticised some of Huizinga’s theories as. (Ottaway 94, 100-101)

¹⁰¹ Herman 1976 2-3.

¹⁰² Ottaway also finds Huizinga’s theory useful to interpret the opposition between play as an everyday phenomenon and play as an elevating social tool. (Ottaway 92)

¹⁰³ Herman 1976 3.

¹⁰⁴ Caillois 12. In his work, Caillois also deals with the concepts of *paidia* (“improvisation and joy”) and *ludus* (“gratuitous difficulty”). Caillois 27. According to Reith, Caillois saw some shortcomings in Huizinga’s work and sought to improve this with his four categories of play. (Reith 1996 4)

¹⁰⁵ Caillois 14-17. See Ottaway 101. Herman translates this form of play as “competitive struggle”. (Herman 1976 4)

¹⁰⁶ Caillois 14. Caillois points to *alea*’s potential of summarily changing a person’s life even though they might not have earned it and, in this regard, Ottaway refers to a slogan used by the United Kingdom’s National Lottery: “Forget it all in an Instant!” (Ottaway 102 and fn 1 on that page.)

billiards.¹⁰⁷ *Alea* (aleatory play), on the other hand, involves play where the outcome is determined independently from the participant.¹⁰⁸ Fate, destiny, luck or chance is the determining factor in this form of play.¹⁰⁹ Caillois mentions dice, lotteries, “heads or tails” and roulette as some examples of aleatory play.¹¹⁰

While *agôn* and *alea* involve play in circumstances where participants are given equal opportunities by playing according to rules, *mimicry* involves the escape from reality.¹¹¹ A person participates in mimicry if they imagine themselves to be something or someone else.¹¹²

Ilinx, Caillois’s last form of play, is distinguished by activities that involve vertigo. He describes this form of play as involving “an attempt to momentarily destroy the stability of perception and inflict a kind of voluptuous panic upon an otherwise lucid mind”.¹¹³ Examples of *ilinx* can be found in children’s spinning games, acrobatic movement, dancing and amusement park rides.¹¹⁴

Whereas Huizinga does not think much of gambling as a form of play, Roger Caillois recognises it at least and examines its function in society.¹¹⁵ He mentions that governments use lotteries to generate funds and how the chance of winning a big prize in a lottery gives hope to people of lesser financial means.¹¹⁶ Further, he points out how sport (games of skill) has to be subsidised by governments, while games of

¹⁰⁷ Caillois 14. Caillois also questions whether, as they become more developed, societies shift from play based on simulation and vertigo to agonistic and aleatory play. (Caillois 97; See Reith 5 and Downes *ea* 13)

¹⁰⁸ Caillois 17. Ottaway 101-102.

¹⁰⁹ Caillois 17. Smith and Abt picks up on this and point out that, in Caillois’s definition of play, uncertainty constitutes a key element – both during the play and in respect of its result. (Smith & Abt 123)

¹¹⁰ Caillois 17. Caillois points out that “alea” is the Latin term used for the game of dice. Contrary to Huizinga, Caillois therefore recognises the role of gambling games in play.

¹¹¹ Caillois 19. Ottaway observes that escape takes place by way of “alternation of identity”. (Ottaway 102)

¹¹² Caillois 19. Children display mimicry when they pretend to be nurses or pilots, and mimicry is also manifested in theatre, drama and masquerades. (Caillois 21)

¹¹³ Caillois 23.

¹¹⁴ Caillois 23-26. Herman observes that “children’s play behaviour” inspired Caillois’s play categories of mimicry and vertigo. (Herman 4)

¹¹⁵ Reith 1999 3. Smith and Abt also point to the fact that gambling activities can be categorised into the forms of play identified by Caillois. However, they point out that play can become commercialised, that this can have an influence on play and that it also displays its surrounding culture. (Smith & Abt 123)

¹¹⁶ Caillois 115.

chance are often, conversely, used to fund governments.¹¹⁷ At the same time, however, he implicitly criticizes gambling, by stating: “To gamble is to renounce work, patience, and thrift in favour of a sudden lucky stroke of fortune which will bring one what a life of exhausting labor and privation has not [...]”¹¹⁸ Still, he does not refrain from stating that games of chance do have cultural significance.¹¹⁹

In discussions of the play element, the work of Erving Goffman features as well, although Goffman’s focus was more on action in particular.¹²⁰ In his essay titled “Where the Action Is”,¹²¹ Goffman points out that human action and chance-taking go hand-in-hand.¹²² He specifically analyses human action with reference to betting and gambling.¹²³ Downes and his co-authors are of the view that Goffman elevates gambling from the lowly position imposed upon it by morality.¹²⁴

It is important to be cognisant of the play element in gambling, lotteries, promotional competitions and the like because it constitutes one of the factors that motivate people to participate in those activities. When one considers the regulation of gambling, one must keep in mind that it does have meaning to participants, and that it should not merely be regarded as frivolous and devoid of value. Promotional competitions and other games of chance and gambling activities, being forms of play, fulfil a function in

¹¹⁷ Caillois 156. In other words, state lotteries are often created in order to raise funds for charitable, public or other causes, but governments are obliged to provide funding for sport development. See, for example, Ottaway 144-161 regarding lotteries and charity, and Clotfelter and Cook regarding the lottery as a form of “voluntary tax”. (Clotfelter & Cook 215-234).

¹¹⁸ Caillois 115.

¹¹⁹ Caillois 156. However, Downes and his co-authors are of the view that Caillois could have examined the role of gambling in different societal classes more critically, particularly since he refers to gambling’s value to fund some parts of society, yet it is extremely popular amongst the upper classes that are already wealthy. (Downes *ea* 14)

¹²⁰ See, for example, Downes *ea* 14-19 Smith & Abt 126-127; Ottaway 106-112; Reith 1996 6; McMillen 15.

¹²¹ The essay is contained in Goffman E *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior* 149-270 (“Goffman 1976”).

¹²² Goffman 1976 149.

¹²³ Goffman 1976 149 and further on. Goffman starts his analysis with an example of two boys that pick up a coin and decide to do a coin toss. He states: “They agree, then, to engage in a *play* or, as probabilists call it, a *gamble* - in this case one go at the *game* of cointossing.”

¹²⁴ Downes *ea* 17. (McMillen 15) Goffman’s work is useful in its discussion of aspects such as human interaction, challenging and “squaring off”. (Smith & Abt 126-127). See also the evaluation of Goffman’s contribution to risk-taking discourse in Cosgrave JF “Goffman Revisited: Action and Character in the Era of Legalized Gambling” 2008 *International Journal of Criminology and Sociological Theory* 1:1 80-96. Although Reith recognises Goffman’s contribution, she remarks that “the modesty of his observation is masked by the gratuitous complexity of the language in which it is expressed”. (Reith 1996 6)

many people's lives.¹²⁵ Even so, one needs to consider if and how these activities should be regulated, even though they might display such a distinct element of play.

2.4 Policy and Regulation

2.4.1 Introduction

The focus of this study is on the regulation of promotional competitions. As such, a consideration of the regulatory side of the topic is essential. From a policy perspective it needs to be considered why some things need to be regulated, or even prohibited, and how regulation takes place or should take place.

As has been explained above, promotional competitions can, in certain circumstances, be regarded as gambling and/or lotteries in the broader sense of the word.¹²⁶ Although Herman might argue that "gambling is not separate or unique" and that it is intertwined with the rest of the social world, it still remains a controversial topic from a policy perspective.¹²⁷ Therefore, one needs to pause to examine some views and perspectives on gambling, its regulation and legalisation. Furthermore, since the regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa has shifted from lottery legislation to the sphere of consumer protection law, it is necessary to consider the regulation from a consumer protection perspective as well. These views inform and set the context for the regulation of promotional competitions in particular.

In order to find answers to this question, one should first consider the nature of gambling, why people gamble and the effects of gambling on people. That will then lead one to some of the views in respect of gambling as well as the actual regulation thereof.

2.4.2 People's reasons for gambling

In order to regulate a particular behaviour, it is important to understand why someone engages in that behaviour in the first place. It is submitted that if one understands what motivates a person to do something, it will be easier to control the factors that lead to such behaviour and the circumstances in which the behaviour is manifested, if such

¹²⁵ According to Taylor and Kopp, many people participate in competitions because they regard them as "fun and exciting". [Taylor CR & Kopp SW "Games, Contests, and Sweepstakes Run Afoul: A State of Legal Disorder" 1991 *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* 10:1 199-213 ("Taylor & Kopp 1991") 201]

¹²⁶ See page 16 above.

¹²⁷ Herman 1976 1.

control is necessary. One can also control the manner in which others enable the person's behaviour.

In section 2.2 above, the play element of gambling and promotional competitions was examined. The discussion touched on people's need for play and play's function in society. The focus, though, was more on the nature of gambling as a form of play and the various types of play. In this section the scope will be narrowed to people's reasons for engaging in gambling and promotional competitions.

When it comes to gambling, one can consider various factors that motivate a person to participate. The opportunity for financial gain might be the most obvious reason.¹²⁸ Clotfelter and Cook suggest that some people are drawn to lotteries by the mere chance of winning money, even if just a little, since it can better their lives.¹²⁹ However, they also argue that some participants might be misled into playing lotteries because they do not properly understand the small odds of winning.¹³⁰ In this regard, they point out that, despite the odds, some people still take part in lotteries because they feel that they are lucky, that they can devise a system to win or even because they are purely superstitious.¹³¹ Rosecrance adds that some people might gamble to show that they are wealthy, even though they might know that they will not make money out of it.¹³² Brenner and Brenner suggest that competition between peers motivate people to

¹²⁸ Brenner R with Brenner GA *Gambling and Speculation: A Theory, a History, and a Future of Some Human Decisions* ("Brenner & Brenner") 19. The authors argue that it may be easy to reason that some people gamble because it gives them a chance to make money which they would not otherwise be able to generate. However, they warn that the issue is more complex, particularly if one considers that there would not be opposition to gambling if it was purely a means of making money. According to Binde, the opportunity to win is the primary driver behind gambling, but he also identifies other factors such as "the dream of hitting the jackpot" (a moment that will change one's life), "social rewards" and "intellectual challenge". (Binde P "Why people gamble: a model with five motivational dimensions" 2013 *International Gambling Studies* 13:1 81-97)

¹²⁹ Clotfelter & Cook 71. Rule S & Sibanyoni C *The Social Impact of Gambling in South Africa* ("Rule & Sibanyoni") 30-33.

¹³⁰ Clotfelter & Cook 71; Taylor & Kopp 1991 201. As such, a lack of information and disclosure could lead to financial abuse of gambling participants. This could be the reason why odds of winning in a promotional competition need to be disclosed in the United States of America. See, for example, Sprott, DE, Hardesty DM & Miyazaki AD "Disclosure of Odds Information: An experimental Investigation of Odds Format and Numeric Complexity" 1998 *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing* 17:1 11-12. Some authors suggest that odds information should be displayed in an understandable manner on lottery tickets. For instance, Ariyabuddhiphongs suggest that such information could, for example, be conveyed in the following manner: "[I]f you bought a ticket every day from birth and lived to be 100 it would take you 383 life times to win a lotto." [Ariyabuddhiphongs V "Lottery Gambling: A Review" 2011 *Journal of Gambling Studies* 27 15-33 ("Ariyabuddhiphongs") 27-28]

¹³¹ Clotfelter & Cook 71.

¹³² Rosecrance J *Gambling without Guilt: the Legitimation of an American Pastime* ("Rosecrance") 63.

take risks and gamble. If someone's friend becomes wealthy, that person might start gambling in order to try and catch up with their friend.¹³³

However, as the saying goes, money is not everything. As Walker points out, the motivation behind gambling behaviour is not simple and economic reasons on their own are not sufficient to explain why people gamble.¹³⁴ Although persons might gamble in order to make money and improve their circumstances, research shows that gambling is not a profitable activity.¹³⁵ It has the promise of big wins, but gamblers' losses exceed their winnings. Most people waste their money on gambling and lotteries.¹³⁶ Walker states that if gambling was a financial investment, a gambler would quickly change his bankers due to the negative results yielded.¹³⁷ Yet, people are still attracted to gambling and lotteries. In Walker's view, only a few people would gamble if economic reasons were the only drivers behind gambling – perhaps only those with “economically masochistic urges”.¹³⁸ As such, he suggests that psychological rather than economic reasons stimulate people to gamble.¹³⁹ In this vein, Kusyszyn remarks: “During gambling, money loses its economic value. The gambler is seen to be playing with money rather than for it.”¹⁴⁰

If pure economic gain is not the real or only reason for gambling, why do people participate in it? Various other factors have been identified. Walker mentions that people like challenges, such as mountain climbing, running, gardening and other hobbies.¹⁴¹ In his view, gambling is for many people a challenge with the promise of a

¹³³ Brenner & Brenner 21-22. The authors also note that once someone has obtained that wealth, they would take fewer risks in order to preserve their money.

¹³⁴ Walker, MW “A Sociocognitive Theory of Gambling Involvement” in Eadington WR & Cornelius JA (eds) *Gambling and Commercial Gaming: Essays in Business, Economics, Philosophy and Science* (“Walker 1992”) 371.

¹³⁵ Walker 1992 372. See also Rosecrance 63-64. Rosecrance is of the view that there must be other factors that motivate people to gamble, because they would not gamble if they knew that they were going to lose their money.

¹³⁶ Clotfelter & Cook 119-120.

¹³⁷ Walker 1992 372.

¹³⁸ Walker 1992 372. Rosecrance suggests other factors that motivate people to gamble, such as some people's need to show off their societal class. (Rosecrance 63)

¹³⁹ Walker 1992 372. See also Rosecrance 53-58. He gives a broad overview of the history of psychiatric perspectives on gambling, and points out that even Sigmund Freud analysed gambling behaviour. Rosecrance mentions that people's failure to realise their slim chances of winning as well as the things that they can do with their winnings might also move them to gamble. (Rosecrance 63)

¹⁴⁰ Kusyszyn I “The Psychology of Gambling” in Frey JH & Eadington WR (eds) *Gambling: Views from the Social Sciences. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 133 (“Kusyszyn”) 134.

¹⁴¹ Walker 1992 373.

big prize.¹⁴² It can be a problem solving activity too.¹⁴³ A true gambler commits to the challenge to beat the system and the odds in the hope of being the exception and accumulating great wealth.¹⁴⁴

An important feature of gambling is that it offers entertainment to people.¹⁴⁵ It acts as a diversion from life and gives people the opportunity to have some fun.¹⁴⁶ According to Collins, pleasure plays a big role in the gambling experience and particularly in the offering provided by casinos.¹⁴⁷ In this regard, he distinguishes between various forms of pleasure, such as the “pleasure of playing games”, the “pleasure of fantasizing about being rich”, the “pleasure of being intoxicated” (in his view, gambling can function as a drug) and the “pleasures of escape”.¹⁴⁸

Apart from finding pleasure in the challenge of gambling, people also seem to participate in gambling because they enjoy playing with chance and risk.¹⁴⁹ Moody suggests that people gamble because risk and chance are part of their daily lives.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴² Walker 1992 373. However, Walker mentions that some people are merely occasional gamblers that do not participate in gambling for the challenge. He suggests that those people gamble for entertainment or cultural reasons. (Walker 1992 374)

¹⁴³ Frey JH “Gambling: A Sociological Review” in Frey JH & Eadington WR (eds) *Gambling: Views from the Social Sciences. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 107 (“Frey”) 110.

¹⁴⁴ Walker 1992 374-375.

¹⁴⁵ See, for example, LGB Main Report 53. The authors of the report remark: “Gambling has become a great national pastime and entertainment.” Basham and Luik argue that gambling has particular recreational and entertainment value, that it makes people happy and that gamblers should have “the right to do what they want with their own money” without regulatory interference. Basham P & Luik J “The Social Benefits of Gambling” March 2011 *Economic Affairs* 13:1 (“Basham & Luik”) 9-13.

¹⁴⁶ Clotfelter & Cook 118-119; Rule & Sibanyoni 30-31.

¹⁴⁷ P Collins 21. Gambling operators and casinos capitalise on gamblers and the public’s need for entertainment by constructing entertainment complexes and go to great lengths to make their venues attractive and to ensure that visitors have a pleasurable experience. See, for example, Mayer K, Johnson L, Hu C and Chen S “Gaming customer satisfaction: An exploratory study” 1998 *Journal of Travel Research* 37 178-183; Mayer KJ & Johnson L “A Customer-based Assessment of Casino Atmospherics” *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal* 7:1 21-31; Lam LW, Chan KW, Fong D & Lo F “Does the look matter? The impact of casino servicescape on gaming customer satisfaction, intention to revisit, and desire to stay” 2011 *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 30 558-567.

¹⁴⁸ P Collins 22.

¹⁴⁹ On fate and risk, see Giddens A “Fate, Risk and Security” in Cosgrave JF (ed) *The Sociology of Risk and Gambling Reader* (“Giddens”) 29. While some people have to take risks in life (such as driving) others actively seek out risks in life, such as fast driving or smoking (despite its health risks). (Giddens 42-44)

¹⁵⁰ Moodie GE “Perspective on Gambling” in Eadington WR & Cornelius JA (eds) *Gambling and Commercial Gaming: Essays in Business, Economics, Philosophy and Science* (“Moodie 1992”) 441. Moody GE “The Roots, Significance, Value and legislation of Gambling” 1995 *Journal of Gambling Studies* 11:1 35-59 (“Moody 1995”). A family visit to an amusement arcade prompted Moody’s analysis of chance and risk taking within a gambling context. He recounts how excited his children were to watch roulette playing and remarks that it was the activity that caught their attention rather than the winnings. Moody 1995 37-39.

His view is that people gain excitement from gambling because it allows them to take risks and chances they would not take in real life.¹⁵¹ As such, he proposes that life experiences often inspire gambling activity.¹⁵²

Moody's view accords with that of Erving Goffman, who is of the view that modern life has become controlled and measured and that people engage in gambling because it can serve as a "surrogate for risk taking".¹⁵³ In a similar vein, Frey notes that gambling can be a form of "protest", because it allows people who have ordinary, controlled, routine jobs to break out of the norm and enjoy an activity that is filled with risk and uncertainty.¹⁵⁴ However, in what may seem to be a contradiction, he mentions that some persons enjoy gambling because it gives them the opportunity to regain control and autonomy and to escape frustrating jobs that make them feel "powerless".¹⁵⁵

Gambling might fulfil other needs too. James Smith remarks that it presents people with the opportunity to achieve "a clearly defined conclusion" – winning or losing – while life is often indeterminate and uncertain.¹⁵⁶ Further, he points out how gambling plays a particular role amongst members of certain classes of society, particularly the middle class. Since anyone can play the lottery and be a winner, he remarks that "[i]n lotto games where no player has a particular advantage, Americans may have found an ultimate democracy".¹⁵⁷

Ultimately, Moody argues, gamblers are attracted to gambling because it stimulates them.¹⁵⁸ In his view, it is the "chance/risk", "win/lose" thrill of gambling that compels gamblers.¹⁵⁹ They are driven by the adrenaline of the game, just like a low flying pilot that might hit the ground or a sailor that is sailing so close to the wind that his yacht

¹⁵¹ Moody 1992 443. In Moody's view, gambling's value lies in "the experience of controlled stimulation it provides". He further argues that, in order to help people who struggle with problem gambling, one needs realise that problem gamblers find value and satisfaction in gambling. (Moody 1995 50)

¹⁵² Moody 1992 443. He states: "If I had it right, the roots of gambling do lie deep in our general human experience." (Moody 1995 50)

¹⁵³ Rosecrance 61.

¹⁵⁴ Frey 110.

¹⁵⁵ Frey 111.

¹⁵⁶ Smith JF "When it's Bad it's Better: Conflicting images of gambling in American culture" in McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* 101 ("JF Smith") 105.

¹⁵⁷ JF Smith 110.

¹⁵⁸ Moody 1992 443-447.

¹⁵⁹ Moodie 1992 445.

may capsize.¹⁶⁰ Collins describes this as the “intoxicating pleasure of gambling”, an adrenaline rush that has a psychophysical effect on participants.¹⁶¹ Kusyszyn holds a similar view.¹⁶² He argues that gambling fulfils an existential need – in the thrill of gambling people confirm to themselves that they are alive.¹⁶³

Chance and luck are elements that are beyond human control. As such, when people gamble, some might be stimulated by a situation where the outcome of the activity is determined by fate.¹⁶⁴ In this regard, Newmark points out that gambling might fulfil a religious function in some gamblers’ lives.¹⁶⁵ He argues that some gamblers might find satisfaction in gambling because it connects them to a “higher power”.¹⁶⁶ In his view, it is possible that some people enjoy gambling because it gives them the opportunity to rise above their ordinary lives.¹⁶⁷ Winning gives them self-confidence and improves their image; the ability to predict the outcome of the game makes them feel special.¹⁶⁸

People’s circumstances and external factors can also motivate them to gamble. Some argue that boredom might lead people to gamble and this has been confirmed in research surveys.¹⁶⁹ Yet, some experts are not convinced that boredom leads to gambling.¹⁷⁰ In Newton’s view, “boredom” is a vague term and a situation that could

¹⁶⁰ Moodie 1992 445-446. Moodie queries whether people’s reliance on thrill seeking could become destructive and whether there might even be a risk of addiction. He asks: “Can there be a substance involved in all this? Can there be, even, an addiction to adrenalin?” (Moodie 1995 50)

¹⁶¹ P Collins 22.

¹⁶² Kusyszyn 136-137.

¹⁶³ Kusyszyn 137. Kusyszyn argues that “[t]he gambler replaces Descartes’s dictum, ‘I think, therefore I am,’ with ‘I feel, therefore I am.’”

¹⁶⁴ Giddens denies that fate and destiny have a role in modern life. Instead, he argues, chance and risk are by-products of the lives we lead. Giddens 29.

¹⁶⁵ Newmark DL “Covert Religious Aspects of Gambling” in Eadington WR & Cornelius JA (eds) *Gambling and Commercial Gaming: Essays in Business, Economics, Philosophy and Science* (“Newmark”) 449. On the role of “ontological beliefs”, witches, spirits and the like in certain South African people’s reasons for playing the lottery, see Van Wyk I “Bad luck, slippery money and the South African lottery” in Cassidy R, Pisac A & Loussouarn C *Qualitative Research in Gambling*.

¹⁶⁶ Newmark 450. Moody also refers to the context of “higher powers” and people’s questions about whether there is meaning in life and a “creator”. In his view, all of this uncertainty can in fact lead to gambling. (Moody 1995 39)

¹⁶⁷ Newmark 453. In a study that focussed on the narratives of a few problem gamblers in Hong Kong, the researchers found that gambling makes some people feel “extraordinary” and that they gamble in order to gain recognition and because they yearn for “connection”. Wong Y-L R, Leung YKT & Lau CWD “Behind the allure of gambling: A qualitative exploration of the existential yearning of Chinese men with problem gambling in Hong Kong” 2009 *International Gambling Studies* 9:3 189 199-201.

¹⁶⁸ Newmark 453.

¹⁶⁹ Rule & Sibanyoni 29-30. Reith acknowledges the role of boredom in gambling. She highlights the thrill of gambling, but also points to its fleeting nature and the disappointment that sets in once the activity is over. (Reith 1996 214-216)

¹⁷⁰ Newman O *Gambling: Hazard and Reward* (“Newman”) 14-15.

lead to various activities, not necessarily gambling.¹⁷¹ Some people might perhaps be influenced by others. In one study, participants remarked that peer pressure or family members made them gamble.¹⁷² Despite this, Martinez remarks that most people gamble out of their own free will.¹⁷³

The television and media seem to play a role in encouraging gambling.¹⁷⁴ Casinos and lotteries use advertising and publicity as effective tools to promote gambling and lottery participation. Organisations sometimes go to great lengths to lure people in.¹⁷⁵ Some authors argue that those activities and gambling publicity in general motivate people to gamble or even cause problem gambling.¹⁷⁶

In the course of committing to the gambling challenge, gamblers rely on various assumptions and beliefs. As Walker points out, these beliefs and assumptions are often mistaken.¹⁷⁷ Eventually, gamblers become trapped in their behaviour.¹⁷⁸ This entrapment leads to the negative consequences of gambling behaviour, such as financial distress, emotional turmoil as well as family and marital problems.¹⁷⁹

The factors that motivate people to gamble can be applied in the context of promotional competitions as well. In some instances, people participate in such competitions because they would like to win a prize, which often consists of money. Therefore, economic reasons might motivate participation. However, there might also be others who participate to relieve boredom or because they seek a challenge. A different group of people may enjoy entering promotional competitions because of the thrill element or because they can associate with the chance or fate element involved. They

¹⁷¹ Newman 14-15.

¹⁷² Rule & Sibanyoni 30, 32-33.

¹⁷³ Martinez TM *The Gambling Scene: Why People Gamble* ("Martinez") 108.

¹⁷⁴ Martinez 93-107.

¹⁷⁵ Moodie 447. Popkin J "Tricks of the Trade" in Riconda A (ed) *Gambling* 71. Popkin describes the research casinos undertake to develop techniques that will help them to make visitors gamble longer. These techniques include ensuring gamblers' comfort, manipulating time perception and even the use of scents.

¹⁷⁶ Moodie 447. Collins AF "The Pathological Gambler and the Government of Gambling" in Cosgrave J *The Sociology of Risk and Gambling Reader* ("AF Collins") 355. Collins quotes in article in *The Times* (15 June 1995) that proclaimed "the identification of 'lotto-mania', a 'delusional illness triggered by publicity' surrounding the UK's national lottery".

¹⁷⁷ Walker 1992 377-387. In his research, Walker found that gamblers often displayed irrational thinking and behaviour, such as speaking to and bargaining with gambling machines, carrying lucky charms and thinking that they are luckier than other people. Walker MB "Irrational Thinking Among Slot Machines Players" 1992 *Journal of Gambling Studies* 8:3 245 ("Walker *Irrational Thinking*") 251-252, 258-259.

¹⁷⁸ Walker 1992 387-390. If a gambler encounters a big win, they pursue another. On the other hand, if they lose, they feel that they should try again.

¹⁷⁹ Walker 1992 391-394.

might wish to contain the uncertainty that permeates their lives by attempting to win the prize. Since promotional competitions are conducted with the purpose of promoting sales, the marketing for such competitions is ubiquitous, and present in all forms of media, including on television and radio as well as in the press and in social media. This will drive some people to participate in promotional competitions as well.

People's reasons and motivations for participating in promotional competitions give context to the regulation of those competitions. This might point to participants' vulnerability and susceptibility to potentially harmful schemes or abuse. As such, protection of the public could be a basis for regulating such competitions. The economic motivation might also indicate a need for regulating the prizes that are awarded. Furthermore, the reasons and motivations can highlight ancillary matters that need to be considered, such as the advertising of promotional competitions and the related marketing material. Perhaps, the psychological motivation for participating in promotional competitions might even point to a possible risk: some participants could be led into compulsive or destructive behaviour.

2.4.3 Gambling's negative effects

It can be argued that promotional competitions need to be regulated because they are forms of gambling. However, in order to understand this argument, one then needs to know why gambling should be regulated. Perhaps the reason lies in that fact that gambling is not merely a form of entertainment without consequence. It has an impact or influence on individuals, society and the economy.¹⁸⁰ This is often perceived as negative or harmful and, as such, many countries prohibit or regulate gambling. Accordingly, in considering the regulation or prohibition of gambling (and, by extension, promotional competitions), one should be aware of and evaluate gambling's effect on people and society at large.

¹⁸⁰ In its review of gambling, the Lotteries and Gambling Board pointed out that gambling's social and economic effects receive the most attention. (LGB Main Report 53) In the past, societies held strong views against gambling on the basis that "permitted gambling posed a threat of social disruption". Eadington WR "Understanding Gambling" in Eadington WR & Cornelius (eds) *Gambling: Public Policies and the Social Sciences* 3 4.

Gambling's impact on people and society can be identified in various dimensions.¹⁸¹ Since gambling gives people the opportunity to make money in exchange for little effort, some argue that gambling could potentially be detrimental to people's work ethic.¹⁸² Some opponents of gambling contend that gambling causes crime and other ills too.¹⁸³ In general, gambling may have an effect on society because it could polarise people. For example, it can create tension between proponents of gambling and religious communities that may have strong views against it.¹⁸⁴

In considering the impact of gambling on society and individuals, a lot of attention is given to problem gambling.¹⁸⁵ This relates to the situation where a gambler becomes so entrenched in the activity that they lose control over their gambling behaviour.¹⁸⁶ According to Collins, gambling becomes problem gambling when it harms the participants and those around them.¹⁸⁷ This behaviour is also known as or mentioned in the context of addictive gambling or gambling addiction, compulsive gambling, pathological gambling, excessive gambling, immoderate gambling or disordered gambling or gambling disorder.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸¹ Anti-gambling views are divergent and numerous. Only some of the arguments against gambling are mentioned here, but there are various others. For example, Brenner & Brenner point out that some people hold the view that legalisation of gambling might divert money away from the stock market or investment, although they argue that the amount of money spent on gambling is not sufficient to have any remarkable effect on stockbroking and investment. (Brenner & Brenner 134)

¹⁸² LGB Main Report 55-55. Brenner & Brenner offer a contrary view. According to them, it is arguable that gambling gives some people an opportunity to rise in society and that they will then work harder. They also argue that some might work harder in order for them to have funds that can be spent on gambling. (Brenner & Brenner 134)

¹⁸³ However, some researchers like McGowan questions this. He argues that there is limited evidence that gambling is a substantial cause of crime. McGowan R "Casinos or No Casinos: What Are the Relevant Considerations?" 2012 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 16:1&2 27-42 ("McGowan") 36-38.

¹⁸⁴ LGB Main Report 54-55. See also the Howard Report 17-23. Within Christianity, for example, there are divergent views surrounding gambling. Some denominations argue that it is a sin, while the Catholic Church maintains that it is not a sin as long as it does not prohibit the person from fulfilling religious duties. (Cabot ea 4-5)

¹⁸⁵ LGB Main Report 55-58.

¹⁸⁶ Blaszczynski & Nower explain problem gambling as follows:

"the defining feature of a problem gambler is not only the emergence of negative consequences but also the presence of a subjective sense of impaired control, construed as a disordered or diseased state that deviates from normal, healthy behaviour. Impaired behavioural control, defined by repeated, unsuccessful attempts to resist the urge in the context of a genuine desire to cease, is the central, diagnostic and foundational feature of pathological gambling."

(Blaszczynski A & Nower L "A pathways model of problem and pathological gambling" *Addiction* 97 487-499 at 488)

¹⁸⁷ P Collins 137.

¹⁸⁸ See P Collins 135-147. Clotfelter & Cook 125. "UNLV Gaming Law Journal: Gambling Disorder and the Law Symposium Issue" http://law.unlv.edu/sites/default/files/glj_call_for_abstracts.pdf (accessed

Problematic gambling behaviour is formally classified as a disorder by the American Psychiatric Association. The fifth edition of the Association's *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* contains a separate category for behavioural disorders and gambling disorder is classified under this category.¹⁸⁹ The previous version of the manual referred to "pathological gambling" instead of "gambling disorder".¹⁹⁰ Reilly and Smith suggest that the change in terminology might remove the stigma association with "pathological gambling".¹⁹¹ This could also make it easier for individuals to seek treatment for this disorder.¹⁹²

Persons that display problem gambling behaviour should be distinguished from professional gamblers.¹⁹³ Research shows that pathological gamblers' impulsivity seems to be the main distinguishing factor between them and professional gamblers.¹⁹⁴ According to Martinez, persons that display problem gambling behaviour become emotionally involved in the activity, take risks, make irresponsible decisions when playing, get involved in disagreements with other gamblers and lose frequently.¹⁹⁵ Professional gamblers,¹⁹⁶ on the other hand, see gambling as a

on 21 May 2014). There seems to be no single, generally accepted definition of "problem gambling". Carnelley remarks that due to "the vagueness of the definition, the exact incidence of problem gambling is unknown". Carnelley M "The Proliferation of Gambling, Problem Gambling and Public Policy" 2000 *Obiter* 192-199 ("Carnelley 2000") 194. See also the various definitions quoted by the Gambling Review Commission. In essence, problem gambling presents itself when a person cannot control their desire to gamble and the situation leads to harm. [Gambling Review Commission *Review of the South African Gambling Industry and its Regulation* September 2010 ("2010 Gambling Review") 379]

¹⁸⁹ American Psychiatric Association "DSM 5 Fact Sheet. Substance-Related and Addictive Disorders" http://www.psychiatry.org/dsm5_1 ("APA Fact Sheet") (accessed on 24 May 2014).

¹⁹⁰ Pathological gambling first featured in the third edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. In that edition, it was classified as an impulse control disorder. See Reilly C & Smith N, National Centre for Responsible Gambling "The Evolving Definition of Pathological Gambling" http://www.ncrg.org/sites/default/files/uploads/docs/white_papers/ncrg_wpdsm5_may2013.pdf (accessed on 24 May 2014). Reilly & Smith explain that pathological gambling has also been reclassified as an addiction instead of an impulse control disorder. (Reilly & Smith 3.) Walker, in a contribution that predates the formal reclassification of pathological gambling as an addiction, argues against classifying gambling as addictive. In his view, gambling can be seen as a game of skill or a leisure activity in which losses could be a side-effect. He questions why persons would be praised for persisting in other activities, such as sport and hobbies, but criticised for heavy gambling. (Walker 1996 232-239.)

¹⁹¹ Reilly & Smith 4.

¹⁹² APA Fact Sheet 1.

¹⁹³ Martinez 46.

¹⁹⁴ Weinstock J, Massura CE & Petry NM "Professional and Pathological Gamblers: Similarities and Differences" 2013 *Journal of Gambling Studies* 29 205-216 ("Weinstock *ea*") 213.

¹⁹⁵ Martinez 47-49. Weinstock *ea* have observed that pathological gamblers have lower self-esteem and "elevated levels of psychiatric distress", and that they also gamble as a result of stress or to "regulated mood". (Weinstock *ea* 212)

¹⁹⁶ Martinez refers to professional gamblers as "hard rocks".

“business venture”.¹⁹⁷ They do not take unnecessary risks and focus on the game, instead of getting involved in conflict with other players.¹⁹⁸

It seems that not all forms of gambling may necessarily lead to problem gambling. The amount of money required to participate in gambling might dictate whether or not someone can be led into problem gambling.¹⁹⁹ Walker points out that pathological gamblers are normally involved in casino and racing gambling, because those forms of gambling involve substantial amounts of money.²⁰⁰ In his view, people who play lotteries or bingo are unlikely to become problem gamblers because much money cannot be spent on those gambling activities.²⁰¹

Views regarding problem gambling are divergent. Although a lot of research has been done regarding this subject, it seems that there is still a lack of consensus and clarity regarding problem gambling and its extent.²⁰² This might be because the formal studying of pathological gambling is a rather young science. Alan Collins proposes that the shift from gambling prohibition to gambling regulation might have caused the birth of this science.²⁰³ When governments started regulating gambling, they had to start examining the consequences of allowing the activity and how to deal with those that become addicted to it.

¹⁹⁷ Martinez 47. It appears that professional gamblers mainly participate in gambling to generate profit. (Weinstock *ea* 213.) In the long run, professional gamblers also seem to win often. (Martinez 49)

¹⁹⁸ Martinez 47. Professional gamblers seem to be able to control their behaviour and are able to put mechanisms in place to prevent them from gambling irresponsibly. (Weinstock *ea* 213)

¹⁹⁹ Walker 1992 394. The various forms of gambling require varying levels of skill and involve differing levels of continuity. As such, the different forms of gambling do not involve the same types of human behaviour. The differences between various forms of gambling also have an influence on the occurrence of problem gambling. Dickerson M “Internal and External Determinants of Persistent Gambling: Problems in Generalising From One Form of Gambling to Another” 1993 *Journal of Gambling Studies* 9:3 225-245 (“Dickerson”) 226, 241-243.

²⁰⁰ Walker 1992 394.

²⁰¹ Walker 1992 394. However, research shows that lotteries can still be addictive, even if to a smaller extent. Ariyabuddhiphongs 22-23. Welte JW, Barnes, GM, Wieczorek WF, Tidwell MO & Parker JC “Risk factors for pathological gambling” 2004 *Addictive Behaviors* 29 323-335 (“Welte *ea*”) 323-333.

²⁰² P Collins 131-132. In addition, there is also a need for broader research and studies in countries outside the Western world and in different cultures. Raylu N & Oei TPS “Pathological gambling: A comprehensive review” 2002 *Clinical Psychology Review* 22 1009-1061 (“Raylu & Oei”) 1047. The Gambling Review Commission noted that one cannot accurately measure the prevalence of problem gambling. (2010 Gambling Review). However, its report reflects that some South Africans do struggle with problem gambling and that its levels exceed those seen in Europe. (2010 Gambling Review 87-88)

²⁰³ AF Collins 380. See also Raylu & Oei 1011 and the sources cited by them.

Some authors do not readily accept that there is a disorder such as compulsive gambling.²⁰⁴ Vatz and Weinberg, for example, challenge some of the grounds on which compulsive gambling is classified as a disorder.²⁰⁵ They argue that some gamblers might use the disorder as an excuse for their behaviour while they can in fact control themselves and their gambling activities.²⁰⁶ Yet, it seems that most authors recognise the existence of problem gambling. Some authors also note that as gambling becomes increasingly deregulated, the number of people that struggle with problem gambling will increase as well.²⁰⁷ The LGB Main Report briefly deals with the different views, but quite quickly comes to the conclusion that compulsive or addictive gambling exists and that it is a problem that needs to be dealt with.²⁰⁸

Problem gambling needs to be dealt with due to its negative impact on the gambler and those around him. The consequences of problem gambling behaviour are wide-ranging. One of the most obvious effects relate to the gambler's financial situation.²⁰⁹ If a gambler cannot control his spending on gambling, it is bound to deplete his finances. In order to maintain their habit, gamblers often incur great amounts of debt – which might ultimately lead to financial ruin and bankruptcy.²¹⁰

Apart from the actual money spent on gambling, gamblers may incur other costs too. Lesieur observes that problem gambling can sometimes lead to medical conditions and gamblers need to pay for the treatment of those conditions.²¹¹ In order to keep on gambling, some gamblers cancel their insurance or fall behind on debt instalments, the consequences of which can be ruinous.²¹² The costs of problem gambling are not restricted to monetary costs. Problem gambling exacts its toll emotionally and psychologically as well. It can make the person depressed and despondent and lower

²⁰⁴ LGB Main Report 56. Other authors aver that problem gambling is not very prevalent, because “most people bet with their heads, not over them, and realize that gambling and speculation are good servants and bad masters”. (Brenner & Brenner 139)

²⁰⁵ Vatz RE & Weinberg LS “Refuting the Myths of Compulsive Gambling” in Riconda A (ed) *Gambling* (“Vatz & Weinberg”) 167-174.

²⁰⁶ Vatz & Weinberg 173-174.

²⁰⁷ P Collins 136; Clotfelter & Cook 127. Lesieur HR and Custer RL “Pathological Gambling: Roots, Phases & Treatment” in Frey JH & Eadington WR (eds) *Gambling: Views from the Social Sciences. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 146 (“Lesieur & Custer”) 148-149.

²⁰⁸ LGB Main Report 56-57.

²⁰⁹ Martinez 64-65. Lesieur H “Compulsive Gambling” in Riconda A (ed) *Gambling* (“Lesieur”) 155-157.

²¹⁰ Lesieur 155-157.

²¹¹ Lesieur 157.

²¹² Lesieur 157. Rule & Sibanyoni 35-39.

their self-esteem.²¹³ However, gamblers develop coping mechanisms to deal with the negative effects of gambling.²¹⁴ Nevertheless, Martinez notes that problem gamblers ultimately hit “rock bottom”.²¹⁵ Alan Collins mentions how gamblers are urged to question themselves about their gambling behaviour in order to determine whether their behaviour has become problematic, but also that they may realise the threat to their psychological health if their gambling behaviour is out of control.

Gambling’s effect is not limited to gamblers themselves. If a person’s gambling spirals out of control it impacts upon the persons around the gambler as well.²¹⁶ Problem gambling has a negative impact on the gambler’s relationships and can destroy families.²¹⁷ This concern in respect of gambling is not new – Carnelley and Schrage point out that Justinian already identified this problem in ancient Roman times.²¹⁸ Problem gamblers display behaviour that can interfere with interpersonal relationships, such as withdrawal, lying, irritation and anger.²¹⁹ Walker notes how gambling can keep gamblers away from their families, creating so-called “gambling widows”.²²⁰ Problem gambling can affect persons that are not close to the gambler as well. The gambling need might force some people to commit crimes in order to sustain their habit.²²¹ Gambling might have a negative impact on the individual’s health and work performance.²²² In serious cases it could even lead to suicide.²²³

In order to protect gamblers and society in general, problem gambling needs to be addressed. The LGB Main Report notes the risks associated with problem gambling and recognises pathological gambling as a “psychological abnormality” that requires

²¹³ Martinez 67-68.

²¹⁴ Rosecrance 123-128.

²¹⁵ Martinez 68-70.

²¹⁶ Carnelley 2000 195.

²¹⁷ LGB Main Report 57. Rule & Sibanyoni 22, 39-42. Carnelley & Schrage 269-270.

²¹⁸ Carnelley & Schrage 270.

²¹⁹ Walker 1992 392.

²²⁰ Walker 1992 393.

²²¹ Lesieur 161-163. LGB Main Report 57.

²²² Rule & Sibanyoni 21-23, 42-44. However, gambling does not necessarily have a negative effect on a person in all cases. There might be evidence of some health benefits brought about by recreational gambling. (Humphreys B, Nyman J & Ruseski J *The Effect of Gambling on Health: Evidence from Canada* Working Paper No. 2011-18, available online at <http://uofa.ualberta.ca/-/media/arts/departments-institutes-and-centres/economics/wps/WP2011-18-Humphreys-Ruseski.pdf>)

²²³ LGB Main Report 57. Martinez recounts the tale of a gambler that committed suicide by jumping of the Golden Gate Bridge. His suicide note referred to “the cards, always the cards”. Martinez 69.

specialist treatment.²²⁴ The Board even recommended the setting up of facilities where pathological gamblers can be treated and rehabilitated.²²⁵ Such institutions are not currently functioning under the National Gambling Act, 2004. However, the South African Responsible Gambling Foundation NPC is operating a National Responsible Gambling Programme.²²⁶ The aim of the Programme is to limit problem gambling, provide counselling, raise awareness and do research regarding the subject.

Problem gambling is often treated in a manner similar to that in which alcohol addiction is treated. This is often done through “step based” programmes hosted by dedicated organisations in support group format. These programmes involve steps such as confession and surrender. Professional counselling is also available for treatment of the disorder.²²⁷ The goal of the treatment is usually to achieve abstinence.²²⁸

However, it seems that the goal of treating problem gambling does not need to be abstinence in all cases. Instead, authors argue that some problem gamblers can still participate in controlled gambling.²²⁹ Rosecrance, for example, suggests that some gamblers struggle with problem gambling because they follow “ineffective gambling strategies”.²³⁰ As such, he proposes that their problem gambling might be solved if one assists them to improve their gambling strategies.²³¹ Peter Collins emphasises the importance of education to combat problem gambling too. In his view, gambler’s failure to grasp gambling odds often leads to problem gambling and he suggests that teaching people about money management strategies could reduce gambling problems.²³² Solonsch deals with this aspect as well and stresses the importance of

²²⁴ LGB Main Report 56.

²²⁵ LGB Main Report 58.

²²⁶ National Responsible Gambling Programme “History, Structure and Function of the NGRP” <http://www.responsiblegambling.co.za/content/?37> (accessed on 25 May 2014). See also Collins P *ea* “Addressing Problem Gambling: South Africa’s National Responsible Gambling Programme” *South African Medical Journal* 101:10 722-723.

²²⁷ Lesieur & Custer 153-156.

²²⁸ Martinez 74-92. McGurrin MC “Treatment of Pathological Gambling” in Riconda A (ed) *Gambling* 174.

²²⁹ Rosecrance 118-119.

²³⁰ Rosecrance 118.

²³¹ Rosecrance 118-119. See also Walker M “The Medicalisation of Gambling as an ‘Addiction’” in McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* 223 (“Walker 1996”) 238.

²³² P Collins 148-149.

educating gamblers in order to improve their gambling behaviour.²³³ This will assist them to control their losses and motivate them to gamble skilfully.²³⁴

The negative effects of gambling need to be borne in mind when one considers the regulation of promotional competitions. In themselves, promotional competitions might seem innocuous. However, those competitions could be regarded as entry level gambling activities and introduce people to lotteries. As such, it is submitted that legislatures might have viewed this a reason for regulating promotional competitions in order to protect the public, particularly since participation in those competitions might stimulate vulnerable persons to get involved in more serious forms of gambling which might, in certain instances, lead to problem gambling.

2.4.4 Economic impact of gambling

It has to be kept in mind that gambling has a constructive side to it because it can have a positive economic impact. Many countries run state lotteries with the aim to generate revenue.²³⁵ The income from such lotteries can be spent on projects that benefit society.²³⁶ Indirectly, gambling contributes to community and upliftment projects due to the social responsibility programmes operated by casinos.²³⁷ Moreover, authors argue that gambling can stimulate the economic growth of a country in general.²³⁸ In a South African context there seems to be substantiation for the positive effects of gambling on the economy as well.²³⁹ In this regard, the Gambling Review Commission

²³³ Solonsch M “An Analysis of Skill in Gambling” in Eadington WR & Cornelius JA (eds) *Gambling and Commercial Gaming: Essays in Business, Economics, Philosophy and Science* 477 (“Solonsch”) 484.

²³⁴ Solonsch 484.

²³⁵ Rule & Sibanyoni quote the then Minister of Finance who, in relation to gambling, “quipped that the government had ‘introduced a new form of tax’ that was mainly for people ‘who do not understand mathematics’”. (Rule & Sibanyoni 8). Various countries attempt to gain profit from lotteries. For example, Brenner *ea* note that the revenue generating potential of lotteries is attractive to African countries that struggle financially. See Brenner AB, Lipeb M & Servet J-M “Gambling in Cameroon and Senegal” in McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* 167. In this context, lotteries can sometimes be seen as “consumer goods” and be regulated as such. (Scott 19; Clotfelter & Cook 219-221.) Munting remarks that governments have been running lotteries to generate revenues during various periods in history. For example, during the 1700s, lotteries were close on annual events. (Munting 55)

²³⁶ LGB Main Report 61.

²³⁷ Ligthelm, AA, Mango T & Jonkheid E *Socio-Economic Impact of Legalised Gambling in South Africa* (“Ligthelm *ea*”) 106.

²³⁸ LGB Main Report 60-61.

²³⁹ 2010 Gambling Review” 39-72; Carnelley & Schrage 266; Tyawa B “Regulating Gaming in the New South Africa” 2012 *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal* 16:1 93-96 (“Tyawa”) 94-95.

recommended that South Africa's National Lottery should continue with its "revenue maximisation mandate".²⁴⁰

Gambling may benefit the tourism industry too.²⁴¹ Casinos often form part of resort complexes, which attract visitors because of the entertainment and recreational activities they offer. Sun City and Montecasino are examples of such venues in South Africa. In a foreign context, the casinos in Nevada, Monte Carlo and Macau demonstrate how gambling can have a positive impact on the economy and growth of cities.²⁴²

Gambling can benefit individuals as well by generating employment and other forms of income.²⁴³ Many people are directly employed by the gambling industry and work in the management and operations of casinos and lottery operators. Other persons are employed by suppliers to the gambling sector or generate an income by providing their services to this industry. The Gambling Review Commission confirmed gambling's job creation potential in finding that "the gambling industry is a significant employer in the economy".²⁴⁴

Quite a bit of research has been conducted regarding the positive economic effect of gambling.²⁴⁵ However, some scholars caution that one should not merely assume that legalised gambling will always have a positive economic effect.²⁴⁶ Kaplan argues that

²⁴⁰ 2010 Gambling Review 134, 138. The Commission found that the National Lottery plays an important role in the generation of funds for various causes, and that the "revenue maximisation" approach seemed to have been successful. Yet, it indicated that some changes had to be made in order to deal with challenges that had been experienced. (2010 Gambling Review 68)

²⁴¹ It seems that gambling venues near a country's borders particularly attract tourists if gambling is illegal in the neighbouring country. Leiper N "Tourism and Gambling" 1989 *GeoJournal* 19:3 269-275 ("Leiper") 274. The Lotteries and Gambling Board considered gambling's effect on tourism as well, but concluded that it is not a direct contributor to tourism growth although it might have a positive influence on same. (LGB Main Report 61.)

²⁴² Leiper 271-272. Many casino cities rely on tourists, particularly those from countries that prohibit gambling. However, it seems that the growth of internet gambling may have an effect on those industries because some people might choose to gamble on the internet instead of visiting gambling venues. Au N & Perry Hobson JS "Gambling on the Internet: A Threat to Tourism?" 1997 *Journal of Travel Research* 35:4 ("Au & Perry Hobson") 77-81.

²⁴³ LGB Main Report 59-60; P Collins 3.

²⁴⁴ The Commission's research showed that the gambling industry was responsible for the formal employment of 2.64% people in South Africa (if indirect employment is taken into the equation as well). 2010 Gambling Review 133.

²⁴⁵ See, for example, Ligthelm ea 101-106 and Ligthelm AA & Mabaso LT *Economic Impact of Legalised Gambling in South Africa* 63-76.

²⁴⁶ For example, Rose cautions that lottery revenues are often overrated when considered in the context of governments' need for funds. (IN "The Danger of Not Caring About Gambling" 2011 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 15:10)

gambling is not such an effective tool to generate revenue for a country.²⁴⁷ He points out that a significant portion of the revenue created by lotteries flows to other parties, such as service providers and winners.²⁴⁸ As such, the net income that can be distributed to beneficiaries is much less than the revenue that initially flows in from lottery proceeds.²⁴⁹ He criticises governments' reliance on lotteries for revenue generation, suggesting that more "dependable" sources should be used.²⁵⁰ Kaplan argues that gambling creates a "moral paradox" for governments, because they encourage people to gamble so that revenue can be generated, while they allow them at the same time to participate in an activity that could lead to financial hardship and even addiction.²⁵¹

Peter Collins suggests that legalised gambling can create revenue flow into a country from foreign gamblers visiting the country.²⁵² At the same time, he points out that illegal gambling creates various policing and enforcement expenses arising from combating illegal gambling and its related activities.²⁵³ However, he argues that legalised gambling does away with many of those problems, resulting in cost savings.²⁵⁴

²⁴⁷ Kaplan HR "The Social and Economic Impact of State Lotteries" in Frey JH & Eadington WR (eds) *Gambling: Views from the Social Sciences. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 91 ("Kaplan") 94-99.

²⁴⁸ Kaplan 98. Abbott also point to significant "legal, economic, social and health" costs associated with gambling. In his view, gambling is "more like tobacco or alcohol than soft drink or cosmetics". Abbott M "The Impact of Gaming on the Community" in Scott M (ed) *Lotteries, gaming and public policy* ("Abbott") 78.

²⁴⁹ Kaplan 98.

²⁵⁰ Kaplan 100. Some other authors also question lotteries' potential to generate funds for governments. In a United States context, some researchers have concluded that lotteries generate relatively small revenues that are undependable and are coupled with proportionally high administration costs. Mikesell JL & Zorn CK "State Lotteries as Fiscal Savior or Fiscal Fraud: A Look at the Evidence" 1986 *Public Administration Review* 46:4 311-320 ("Mikesell & Zorn") 318-319.

²⁵¹ Kaplan 103. Some critics argue that lotteries are regressive sources of revenue because, proportionally, poorer people tend to spend more on lottery tickets than wealthier persons. (Mikesell & Zorn 319) Altshuler and Gómez-Ibáñez explain these sources of revenue as follows: "A progressive revenue source requires poor households to pay a smaller share of their income than rich households, while a regressive revenue source asks the poor to pay a larger portion of their income than the rich." (Alshuler AA & Gómez-Ibáñez JA *Regulation for Revenue: The Political Economy of Land Use Exactions* 107)

²⁵² P Collins 121. See also, for example, Leiper 274 and Au & Perry Hobson.

²⁵³ P Collins 121. Illegal gambling operators might also evade tax and could reduce countries' tax revenues or divert business from legal operators, leading to a reduction in tax revenue. (See the comments of the Casino Association of South Africa in SAPA "Illegal gambling costs SA millions" *Business Report* 20 February 2015 (<http://www.iol.co.za/business/news/illegal-gambling-costs-sa-millions-1.1821553#.VPd-e3kcRMs>, accessed on 4 March 2015)

²⁵⁴ P Collins 121.

The economic impact of gambling is also relevant in the context of promotional competitions in particular. Since gambling and lotteries are sources of revenue for gambling and lottery operators as well as governments, many legislatures have decided to regulate gambling in order to ensure that gambling and lotteries are operated in a controlled environment and in an attempt to deal with the criminal activities that might be stimulated by the money involved in gambling and lotteries. Promotional competitions could also be a source of revenue for the promoters that conduct them and many legislatures have therefore chosen to regulate the economic aspects of promotional competitions. It can be argued that promotional competitions are often exempted from the more onerous requirements of gambling legislation because they should only promote goods and services and generate revenue through sales and transactions instead of competition entry fees. This may be the reason why the relevant legislation often prohibits the organisers of promotional competitions from charging entry fees or requiring consideration for participation in promotional competitions.²⁵⁵ The prohibition might also be in place to protect the lotteries operated by licensed lottery operators against competition and a reduction in revenue caused by promotional competitions.

2.4.5 Opinions in respect of gambling

This thesis evaluates the regulation of promotional competitions. The regulation of these activities forms part of the broader regulation of gambling. Accordingly, in examining the regulation of promotional competitions, one should take into account the considerations that are relevant in appraising the regulation of gambling. In this appraisal process, the question is whether gambling should be legal or illegal; whether it should be prohibited, regulated or legalised and unregulated. When reflecting on this question, authors usually refer to the various views in favour of or against gambling. As such, some of these views will be considered below.

One of the most significant arguments against legalised gambling centres on the argument that gambling instils in people the belief that they can get “something for nothing”.²⁵⁶ In other words, it encourages people to participate in an activity in which

²⁵⁵ See, for example, the provisions of sections 36(3)(a) and 36(4) of the CPA.

²⁵⁶ See, for example, Kaplan 104. Studies have shown that the “something for nothing factor” motivates some persons to gamble. (Nyman JA, Welte JW & Dowd BE “Something for nothing: A model of

they can achieve a gain without putting in effort. Caillois points out how governments often wish to regulate games of chance because it mocks the principles that encourage people to work for a living.²⁵⁷ Along the same line of argument, Kaplan argues that gambling “promote[s] a no-work ethic”.²⁵⁸ He takes the argument to the extreme by pointing out that some lottery winners resign their employment and are thereby removed from the workforce.²⁵⁹ According to Brenner and Brenner, there is no evidence to support this argument.²⁶⁰

In a similar vein, some contend that gambling promotes false hope. Kaplan argues that gambling could even function as a form of “social control”, because governments use it as an “escape mechanism” to divert people’s attention from their circumstances and challenges.²⁶¹ (In this context, Frey notes that gambling could be in line with Marxist theories.²⁶²) Instead, Kaplan reasons, governments have a responsibility to look after their citizens and to guard against the ills that can be created by activities such as gambling.²⁶³ In his view, gambling should not be used as an easy, temporary tool to generate revenue.²⁶⁴ Rather, governments should face the challenge and take on the problems in society, deal with difficult questions and come up with sustainable solutions for improving their countries’ economies.²⁶⁵ Kaplan concludes that lotteries are not effective tools to generate revenue for governments.²⁶⁶ Instead, they “are

gambling behaviour” 2008 *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 37 2492-2504). Many opponents of gambling argue that people should earn their wealth through labour and in no way else. Aasved argues that this is a moralist view shaped by “Western European Protestant capitalistic societies”. Aasved M *The Sociology of Gambling* (“Aasved”) 6-7. The phrase “something for nothing” often features in debates about the merits of gambling. It seems that it might have its origin in the following quotation from George Bernard Shaw: “Gambling promises for the poor what property does for the rich: Something for nothing”. (Quoted in Eadington WR “Understanding Gambling” in Eadington WR “Understanding Gambling” in Eadington WR and Cornelius JA (eds) *Gambling: Public Policies and the Social Sciences* 6) Wilson Mizner played with the “something for nothing” words when he said the following about gambling: “The sure way of getting nothing for something”. (Quoted in Abbot 77)

²⁵⁷ Caillois 157.

²⁵⁸ Kaplan 104.

²⁵⁹ Kaplan 104.

²⁶⁰ Brenner & Brenner 50.

²⁶¹ Kaplan 104.

²⁶² Frey 112. Frey notes that, from a Marxist perspective, sport and gambling can be used to alleviate the tension and alienation caused by ordinary life.

²⁶³ Kaplan 105. There are various views about the extent to which governments should be involved in gambling and its regulation. Scott asserts that public policy must be clear about government’s role in this regard. Scott C “Lotteries and Gaming: Some Public Policy Issues” in Scott M (ed) *Lotteries, gaming and public policy* (“Scott”) 26. See the further discussion at pages 61-67 below.

²⁶⁴ Kaplan 105.

²⁶⁵ Kaplan 105.

²⁶⁶ Kaplan 105. It seems that there are differing views about whether gambling is an effective source of revenue for governments. Some researchers accept that gambling does have revenue generating

stopgap measures that lull the populace into a state of complacency while social and fiscal problems intensify”.²⁶⁷

Gambling can be criticised because it is often most popular and prevalent amongst those members of society who are less privileged and belong to lower classes.²⁶⁸ One could argue that those are in fact the persons that should not gamble, because they cannot afford it and often waste more money than they gain. They should be the ones that benefit from the proceeds of lotteries, instead of being victims who are drawn deeper into negative circumstances by the hope of making easy money.

Various other reasons exist for the prohibition or regulation of gambling. Critics often point to gambling’s potentially negative impact on persons, such as gambling disorder, financial hardship and family problems. Peter Collins calls this the “human costs argument”.²⁶⁹ In order to curb these negative consequences, governments have to put measures in place in order to control gambling and gambling operators and deal with problem gambling. Further costs are incurred in order to enforce gambling laws and to police crimes that relate to gambling.²⁷⁰ These measures create additional costs and provide the basis for the “social costs argument” against gambling.²⁷¹

Having said this, one should also bear in mind that some authors are in favour of the deregulation or liberalisation of gambling.²⁷² Some of them are of the view that the likelihood of harm caused by gambling is overemphasised.²⁷³ In particular, they reason that that the liberalisation of gambling will not necessarily lead to addiction or problem gambling.²⁷⁴ Instead, they suggest that liberalisation might have positive social or

potential and focus more on the manner in and model by which this should be regulated. Scott 19-23; Clotfelter and Cook 215-252.

²⁶⁷ Kaplan 105.

²⁶⁸ Frey JH “Gambling: A Sociological Review” in Frey JH & Eadington WR (eds) *Gambling: Views from the Social Sciences. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 107 (“Frey”) 111. See also Lighthelm *ea* 99-100, where the authors note that lottery participation is proportionally higher in less affluent segments of society.

²⁶⁹ P Collins 34-36.

²⁷⁰ P Collins 37.

²⁷¹ P Collins 36-39.

²⁷² In an article that stresses the social benefits of gambling, Basham and Luik concludes that “gambling adds significantly to the sum of human happiness; maybe that is reason enough for policy-makers to leave it alone”. (Basham & Luik 12) See also Littlewood M “Gambling and Regulation: Why there is Nothing to Fear from Liberalisation” March 2011 *Economic Affairs* 34-37 (“Littlewood”).

²⁷³ Littlewood 34; Basham & Luik 12.

²⁷⁴ Littlewood 36-37.

economic effects.²⁷⁵ Especially in the context of gaming and gambling activities that involve no consideration requirement, it appears that traditional arguments in favour of prohibition or regulation are losing strength.²⁷⁶ This is significant in the context of this thesis, because promotional competitions usually do not involve the payment of money. (In fact, laws usually prohibit promoters from requiring consideration.) It would therefore seem that there is a move to liberalise promotional competitions as well, although they may still need to be regulated in order to avoid abuse.

2.4.6 Law, vice and regulation

This work focuses on the regulation of promotional competitions. In order to consider the regulation of these activities, it will be beneficial to pause and consider the nature of crime and regulation in general. The study of the regulation and prohibition of crimes lies within the context of what Dixon describes as “the study of lawmaking in criminology and the sociology of law”.²⁷⁷ But, as Dixon remarks, “crime is not a fixed category of behaviour but rather a socially created designation”.²⁷⁸ He explains this by quoting Edwin Sutherland. The quotation elucidates the point well and is worth reproducing here:

An understanding of the nature of law is necessary in order to secure an understanding of the nature of crime. A complete explanation of the origin and enforcement of laws would be, also, an explanation of the violation of laws [...] Crime is a violation of law. If there were no laws, there would be no crimes. Whenever a law is passed and enforced, acts that were not crimes previously are made crimes. [...] In that sense, crime is the creation of the law.²⁷⁹

In other words, legislatures create laws in order to curb and prohibit crimes. One might say that something would not be a crime unless a law prohibited it.

²⁷⁵ Littlewood 37; Basham & Luik 9-12.

²⁷⁶ Owens MD “If it isn’t Gambling, How Far Should Gaming Regulation Go?: Quasi-gambling, ‘Freemium,’ and State Control” 2013 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 17:7 506-510 (“Owens 2013”) 509. Owens points out that, traditionally, gambling was criticised as being unproductive and that it had no “social utility”. However, he questions the validity of this argument and reasons that some of the relevant activities actually have social value because they offer the opportunity for “controlled simulation”. (Owens 2013 509)

²⁷⁷ Dixon D *From prohibition to regulation: bookmaking, anti-gambling, and the law* (“Dixon”) 17.

²⁷⁸ Dixon 17.

²⁷⁹ Sutherland EH *Criminology* 11, 18.

What then determines whether something should be a crime? Criminal laws are often created in response to vice and are often used as tools to control, curb or prohibit it.²⁸⁰ Laws have been passed and used to control vices such as prostitution, abortion, homosexuality, drug use, smoking, drinking, pornography, loitering, polygamy and gambling.²⁸¹ A basic dictionary definition of “vice” might explain it as “a moral fault or weakness in someone’s character” or “illegal and immoral activities, especially involving illegal sex, drugs, etc”.²⁸² Despite these relatively simple definitions, vice is a subjective concept with shifting meanings.²⁸³ Yet, vices display common elements. Leitzer identifies three main characteristics of vice: the activity is carried out in excess, it is habitual (as opposed to occasional) and it mostly affects the person that engages in the activity personally.²⁸⁴

²⁸⁰ Dombrink J “Gambling and the Legalisation of Vice: Social movements, public health and public policy in the United States” in McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* 43 (“Dombrink”); Green SP “Vice Crimes and Preventive Justice” 10 October 2013 *Criminal Law and Philosophy* (published online at <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11572-013-9260-7>, accessed on 5 March 2015) (“Green”) 1-2. The resultant laws, sometimes called “vice laws”, are criticised by some on the basis that they are “moralistic” (in other words, these laws only criminalise something because it is “wrong” or “sinful”) or “paternalistic”. (Green 1-2.) Skolnick notes that there is a difference between crime and vice, because vice “results from more ambivalence” and it “is continually subject to reevaluation”. Skolnick JH “The Social Transformation of Vice” 1988 *Law and Contemporary Problems* 51:1 9-29 (“Skolnick”) 9. [Leitzel J *Regulating Vice: Misguided Prohibitions and Realistic Controls* (“Leitzel”) 4 fn 3]

²⁸¹ Dombrink 43; P Collins 21; Green 1. Whitebread remarks that “prohibitory legislation most often occurs when a social majority objects to the specific conduct, value system, or culture of others and imposes regulation upon them. [Whitebread CH “‘Us’ and ‘Them’ and the Nature of Moral Regulation” *Southern California Law Review* 74 361-370 (“Whitebread”) 362, citing Hunt A *Governing Morals: A Social History of Moral Regulation* 1]

²⁸² Cambridge Dictionaries Online “Vice” (<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british/vice>, last accessed on 7 March 2015).

²⁸³ Burnham JC *Bad Habits: Drinking, Smoking, Taking Drugs, Gambling, Sexual Misbehavior, and Swearing in American History* (“Burnham”) 2; Leitzel 2-3. Leitzel remarks that society’s views regarding vices shift over time, even though it might seem as if people are agreed on which activities constitute vices. (Leitzel 3)

²⁸⁴ Leitzel 4. He notes that vice usually involves “pleasure and wickedness”, citing Skolnick JH “The Social Transformation of Vice” 1988 *Law and Contemporary Problems* 51:1 9-29 (“Skolnick”) 10. Skolnick refers to “pleasure and popularity, as well as wickedness”. Burnham remarks that vices “traditionally have been attractive, indeed, have been recreational and gratifying activities”, and he mentions that they also have “ritualistic aspects”. Accordingly, he labels them “bad habits”. (Burnham 1-2) Burnham also points to the connection between vice and deviance. People tend to decide what is acceptable to them, and categorise as deviant those people who do things that fall outside their classification of what is acceptable. (Burnham 14-15) Leggett observes that some vice activities (such as drug trafficking, prostitution and backroom gambling) often display a need to make money and that the policing of such activities require specific tactics. Leggett T *Rainbow Vice: The Drugs and Sex Industries in the New South Africa* 1.

It is often stated that the impact of vice is primarily on the person involved in the relevant conduct and that the behaviour could be regarded as “victimless”.²⁸⁵ However, it cannot be denied that third parties might be affected by the relevant person’s behaviour as well. When someone is involved in the relevant behaviour, there may very well be indirect victims such as relatives or friends.²⁸⁶ The law is therefore often used to protect perpetrators against harming themselves, those around them and the public in general.²⁸⁷ As such, and due to the criticism of the moralistic basis of so-called “vice crimes”, the basis of these crimes has in many cases shifted from morals to harm prevention.²⁸⁸

The law is often informed by public opinion or morality.²⁸⁹ However, challenges are created by the divergence in the public’s views.²⁹⁰ Morals are also not universal and what one person might regard as moral another might condemn as immoral.²⁹¹ Even

²⁸⁵ Leitzel 4-6; Geis G *Not the Law’s Business: An examination of homosexuality, abortion, prostitution, narcotics, and gambling in the United States* (“Geis”) 2. These crimes are often known as “victimless crimes”. Green remarks that, lately, these crimes fit the description of “preventive justice offenses”. He describes “preventive justice offenses” as follows: “Offenses that are said to be preventive (or anticipatory or prophylactic) are those for which the preventive (rather than retributive) rationale is the primary justification”. (Green 1) According to Ashworth and Zedner, the source of the term “preventive justice” is not clear, but can be traced back to William Blackstone in the 1700s. (Ashworth A & Zedner L *Preventive Justice* 28-29)

²⁸⁶ Geis 2-4.

²⁸⁷ Geis 4. However, the issue with some of the relevant laws lies in the difficulty to determine on an empirical basis the consequences of and harm caused by specific behaviour. (Geis 11)

²⁸⁸ Green 10. In Green’s view, it is difficult to argue that crimes were at a stage purely based on moral views, and that even extreme moralists would still have criminalised certain acts not purely on a moral basis but, even if only in part, also on account of the potential harm that can arise from those acts. Leitzel questions where the intention should be to reduce the occurrence of vice, or rather the harm that arises from vice. (Leitzel 13) The theory that government should intervene in a person’s activity if it could cause harm to others is known as the “harm principle”. Leitzel attributes the origin of this principle to John Stuart Mill. (Leitzel 19). Mill reasoned as follows:

“[...] the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilised community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not a sufficient warrant.”

(Mill JS *On Liberty* 22)

²⁸⁹ Various authors support this view. See, for example, Hart HLA *Law, Liberty, and Morality* 1-6; Fuller RC “Morals and Criminal Law” 1942 *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 32:6 624-630 624. Law and morals (and their relationship or separation) is a vast legal philosophical subject, which encompasses debates about natural law, legal positivism and related topics.

²⁹⁰ Geis 6-7; P Collins 3; Leitzel 3-5, 9; Skolnick 15-17. Whitehead captures the essence of morality’s relativity: “What is morality in any given time or place? It is what the majority then and there happen to like, and immorality is what they dislike.” (Whitehead AN *The Dialogues of Alfred North Whitehead*, quoted in Whitebread 1) On morality and its foundations in general see, for example, Burns RP “On the Foundations and Nature of Morality” 2008 *Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy* 31:1 7-21.

²⁹¹ Some laws are also created as result of negative trends, shocking incidents or due to “moral panic” (for example anti-terror legislation). These laws often have negative consequences, because they tend to generalise and target certain sections of society. (Green 13-14) (The concept “moral panic” has its origins in the 1960s and the New Deviancy Theory, and is attributed to Jock Young and Stanley Cohen.

in communities that share the same beliefs and morals one would find that the members of those communities do not necessarily share the exact same measure and interpretation of morality. There is often a discord between morality and the law, and even if one argues that moral laws protect society, one may find some societies that have fallen apart despite laws that were meant to enforce morality.²⁹²

When regulating vice, the law also needs to strike a balance between protecting society and limiting individual freedom.²⁹³ When developing laws, lawmakers need to consider to what extent a law may enforce subjective morality on individuals that participate in certain behaviour out of their own free will. Even if it is argued that the purpose of the law is to protect the relevant individuals against themselves, one must bear in mind that harm can be interpreted in different ways. What one person might consider harmful, another might regard as pleasurable. As such, Geis suggests that the law should allow individual freedoms within reasonable bounds so that individuals can exercise their own choices, but without harming society in general.²⁹⁴

These considerations are relevant for purposes of this study too. Promotional competitions are forms of gambling. Some people consider gambling to be a vice and argue that it should therefore be prohibited or regulated. Their arguments are often based on morality or subjective views and it is difficult to consider whether gambling needs to be prohibited or regulated on objective grounds. When it comes to promotional competitions, arguments in favour of prohibition are even more tenuous. Is participation in a promotional competition really a vice? Perhaps some people's participation in these competitions becomes excessive and habitual. Yet, even if this is true in exceptional cases, it is submitted that this should not be a reason for prohibiting the public from participating in promotional competitions

Young J "Moral Panic: Its Origins in Resistance, Ressentiment and the Translation of Fantasy into Reality" 2009 *British Journal of Criminology* 49 4-16. Krinsky C "Introduction: The Moral Panic Concept" in Krinsky C (ed) *The Ashgate Research Companion to Moral Panics* 1-5)

²⁹² Geis 7.

²⁹³ RA *The Gambling Debate* 26-31. In an American context, McGowan remarks: "This conflict between the societal good and the rights of individuals remains the basis for debating the ethical merits of public policy issues ranging from gun control to environmental protection." He notes that the tension is "between the common good and the individual's right to choose freely". (McGowan 26) Graglia's view is that "[g]overnment should prohibit conduct only to produce beneficial consequences sufficient to overcome the resulting loss of liberty". [Graglia LA "Government Promotion of Moral Issues: Gambling, Smoking, and Advertising" 2008 *Harvard Journal of Law and Policy* 31:1 69 ("Graglia") 70]

²⁹⁴ Geis 14.

in general. However, the potential for abuse might be cause for effective regulation instead.

2.4.7 Replacing prohibition with regulation

Gambling has been prohibited during various periods in history and in a variety of countries.²⁹⁵ However, governments often found that the prohibition of gambling merely led to underground gambling, mob activities and related crimes.²⁹⁶ They therefore started to consider legalising gambling in order to control it and curb the illegal activities spawned by underground gambling. Accordingly, many countries have shifted from prohibiting gambling to regulating it instead,²⁹⁷ and legalised gambling is spreading.²⁹⁸ Promotional competitions, as subspecies of gambling, have been part of this process all along. While promotional competitions were initially prohibited by virtue of the ban on gambling, the legalisation of gambling has also led to the emancipation of promotional competitions.

South Africa is part of the gambling legalisation wave. Gambling was prohibited in South Africa since the arrival of European settlers at the Cape, but was legalised at the end of the twentieth century. (This legalisation has also led to provisions that allow the lawful conducting of promotional competitions.) The approach to gambling has changed as well. Monnye puts it as follows: “Gambling has undergone a metamorphosis from being immoral, to becoming amoral, and from being a leisure

²⁹⁵ Dixon 6-7, 9. Governments often grapple with gambling since it is a controversial topic and opponents and proponents can often become emotional about the debate, often due to biased views or a lack of proper research and statistics.

²⁹⁶ P Collins 2. Cabot and Csoka mentioned that prohibition can only be effective if very onerous penalties are put in place to deter people from flouting the relevant law, if there is proper enforcement and if the public supports the prohibition. [Cabot AN & Csoka LV “The Games People Play: Is it Time for a New Legal Approach to Prize Games?” 2004 *Nevada Law Journal* 4:2 197-261 (“Cabot & Csoka”) 249]

²⁹⁷ Dixon gives a thorough examination of this shift in the United Kingdom. The title of his work aptly captures this shift: *From prohibition to regulation*. See Dixon D *From prohibition to regulation: bookmaking, anti-gambling, and the law*. See also Eadington WR “Ethical and Policy Considerations in the Spread of Commercial Gambling” in McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* 243 (“Eadington 1996”) 243.

²⁹⁸ Rose attributes this spread to factors such as the disappearance of moral arguments against gambling, government sanctioning of gambling, gradual change in gambling operations, the economic attraction of gambling, gamblers need for newer continuous improvement of gambling activities and aggressive development by gambling operators. (Rose IN “Gambling and the Law®: The Third Wave of Legal Gambling” 2010 *Villanova Sports & Entertainment Law Journal* 17:2 361 388-385; Rose IN “The Rise and Fall of the Third Wave: Gambling Will be Outlawed in Forty Years” in Eadington WR (ed) *Gambling and Public Policy: International Perspectives*)

activity, to becoming an income-generating recreational activity”.²⁹⁹ He points out that morality no longer dictates whether gambling should be regulated; instead, the generating of income and the promotion of tourism and recreation now drive the regulation of gambling.³⁰⁰

Globally, gambling is losing its vice categorisation. Dombrink remarks that gambling might not be regarded as a vice anymore (although some could still see it as a “special interest vice”) and that problem gamblers might not be as threatening as prostitutes and people addicted to drugs.³⁰¹ He notes that gambling may be controlled by way of so-called “sin taxes” and that it can therefore contribute to countries’ economies as well.³⁰² He identifies a shift in gambling studies – where critics of gambling used to focus on morality and gambling as a vice, they now evaluate gambling on its “actual societal contributions”.³⁰³ In a similar vein, Leitzer is of the view that “the increased satisfaction of consumers” is one of the most important benefits of gambling.³⁰⁴

The shift in views regarding gambling can also be related to changes in the communities that used to have strong views about gambling. At a stage, the church (or some parts of it) opposed gambling strongly. However, Eadington remarks that the church’s influence in society is decreasing and its views about gambling are changing.³⁰⁵ He points out that some churches in fact use gambling (such as bingo

²⁹⁹ Monnye S L “Gambling in South Africa: is online gambling not a component of gambling?” UNLV Gaming Law Journal Vol 3 (Fall 2012) (“Monnye”) 221. A study commissioned by the National Gambling Board echoed Monnye’s view and found that “gambling has become ‘normalised behaviour’ in South Africa”, although it did note that some members of the public were concerned about easy access to gambling venues and pointed out that attitudes might change as mobile and internet gambling develops. (National Gambling Board *The Social Impact of Gambling in South Africa: Qualitative Perspective 2013* 20-22, available online at <http://www.ngb.org.za/SiteResources/documents/Social%20impact%20of%20gambling%20qualitative%20perspective%202013.pdf>, accessed on 19 March 2015)

³⁰⁰ Monnye 221. Gambling and its regulation do not exist in a vacuum, but is also influenced by and may have an influence on politics, empowerment, the services industry and employment. [Sallaz J *The labor of luck: casino capitalism in the United States and South Africa* (“Sallaz”) 18-19]

³⁰¹ Dombrink 49. In respect of lotteries specifically, research shows that some people do not even regard lotteries as a form of gambling anymore. Instead, they view it as a pastime or recreational activity. (Ariyabuddhiphongs 17)

³⁰² Dombrink 58-59.

³⁰³ Dombrink 58. Rose also observes how gambling used to be regarded as a sin, but turned into a vice as society’s views changed. Eventually, gambling started to be viewed as entertainment and lately (problem) gambling can be regarded as a psychological condition. Rose IN “Compulsive Gambling and the Law: From Sin to Vice to Disease” 1988 *Journal of Gambling Behaviour* 4:4 240 240-242.

³⁰⁴ Leitzel 222. He remarks that people often miss this beneficial characteristic when they evaluate arguments in favour of or against gambling.

³⁰⁵ Eadington 1996 245.

and lotteries) to generate funds for charitable purposes.³⁰⁶ The public's view of gambling has changed too. James Smith remarks that where gambling may have been considered a sin and vice in the past, nowadays some people might even consider it "patriotic" to support a state run lottery.³⁰⁷

These developments have implications for promotional competitions as well. If gambling is losing its vice categorisation, then it is becoming even less likely that participation in promotional competitions will be regarded as a vice. Instead, as is the case with gambling, there might be a shift in focus to the constructive attributes of the activity, such as the marketing benefits for promoters and the entertainment value for participants.

2.4.8 Regulating gambling

Governments can follow various approaches and guidelines in regulating gambling and promotional competitions.³⁰⁸ They can prohibit those activities, allow them but

³⁰⁶ Eadington 1996 245. See also Rosecrance 6-7, who refers to the views of different churches and religious figures. The Howard Commission noted that some churches opposed gambling, while others acknowledged that they use raffles to generate funds. (Howard Report 18-23.) Carnelley and Schrage also point out, in a South African perspective, that negative attitudes about gambling are becoming less prevalent, perhaps because the church has a decreasing influence. (Carnelley & Schrage 269)

³⁰⁷ JF Smith 102. Despite this, public views about gambling seem to keep on changing. In Australia, for example, people generally seem to be critical of gambling and feel that the legalisation of gambling has reached its limits. (McAllister I "Public opinion towards gambling and gambling regulation in Australia" 2014 *International Gambling Studies* 14:1 146-160) People's views might also differ depending on the socio-demographic groups they form part of. (Rousseau GG & Venter DJL "Measuring Consumer Attitudes Towards Gambling" 2002 *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology* 28:2 87-92 92) One must also bear in mind that gambling – and casino gambling in particular - is still prohibited in a number of countries, such as Brazil, Israel and India. See Thompson WN "Why They Say 'No' (Casi-'No'): Countries that Reject Legalized Casino Gambling" 2012 *UNLV Gaming Law Journal* 16:3 195-230. Some researchers are also warning about the possible dangers of uncontrolled spreading of gambling and are calling for a debate about this. (See Orford J *An Unsafe Bet? The Dangerous Rise of Gambling and the Debate We Should Be Having* 222-235)

³⁰⁸ Various models of prohibition and regulation can be considered. In the context of online gambling, Snail discusses liberal, restrictive, prohibitive and protectionist models (and some permutations of those). Snail S "Online Gambling in South Africa" 2007 *Juta's Business Law* 15:3 114-121 ("Snail") 116-117. Kingma identifies three models, with reference to changing attitudes towards gambling over the course of time. The prohibition model is based on the premise that gambling is a sin and should be banned because it is "dysfunctional for social order". The alibi model involves perception of gambling as a vice, recognises its social value, and aims for legalisation. In terms of the risk model, gambling is viewed as entertainment and gambling laws are structured according to the economic importance of gambling. Kingma SF "The liberalization and (re)regulation of Dutch gambling markets: National consequences of the changing European context" 2008 *Regulation and Governance* 2 445-458 ("Kingma") 448. Kingma also notes that gambling models and policies are not necessarily implemented on their own, but often alongside each other. (Kingma 455) See also Kingma's discussion of gambling policy in the context of the risk society (with acknowledgment to Ulrich Beck). Kingma S "Gambling and the Risk Society: The Liberalisation and Legitimation Crisis of Gambling in the Netherlands" 2004 *International Gambling Studies* 4:1 47-67. Cabot and Csoka identify three models of regulation: the

regulate them at the same time, or they can allow people to engage in those activities freely and without any regulation.³⁰⁹ In the context of gambling and promotional competitions there is, as discussed above, a trend to move from the prohibition of gambling to the regulation thereof.³¹⁰ The concept of regulation and its application in relation to gambling and promotional competitions therefore requires consideration.

Regulation is a broad concept and various definitions can be given to the term. Dudley and Brito define the term within the narrow concept of “regulations”, being “specific standards or instructions concerning what individuals, businesses, and other organizations can or cannot do”.³¹¹ According to Orbach, the term can be explained as “government intervention in the private domain or a legal rule that implements such intervention”.³¹² In a “decentred” approach, Black proposes the following definition for regulation:

regulation is the sustained and focused attempt to alter the behaviour of others according to defined standards or purposes with the intention of producing a broadly identified outcome or outcomes, which may involve mechanisms of standard-setting, information-gathering and behaviour-modification.³¹³

Generally, one can also distinguish between “social regulations” and “economic regulations”.³¹⁴

player protection model (which protects the player), the government neutral model (in terms of which a government imposes very little regulation) and the government protection model (which “protects the economic interests of the state”). Cabot & Csoka 251-255, citing Cabot AN (ed) *Casino Gaming – Policy, Economics and Regulation* in general. In the context of casinos in particular, some states follow the so-called “Nevada model” which aims to regulate and stimulate a dynamic gambling industry by recognising gamblers’ need to gamble and giving casino operators space and freedom to run their operations. (Sallaz 235) In legalising gambling, South Africa sought to follow the Nevada model, but Sallaz points out that factors such as politics, employment regulation and management practices caused the model to be implemented in a manner which is different from the one followed in the state of Nevada. (Sallaz 19-23)

³⁰⁹ Cabot & Csoka 251-255.

³¹⁰ See section 2.3.7 above. Reith observes that the international trend is one of “proliferation and deregulation” and gambling has been expanding under governments’ watchful eyes. However, she argues that this has also led to a rise in problem gambling. (Reith 2008 167).

³¹¹ Dudley SE & Brito J *Regulation: A Primer* (“Dudley & Brito”) 1.

³¹² Orbach B “What is Regulation?” 2012 *Yale Journal on Regulation Online* 30:1, available online at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2143385 (“Orbach”) 6. Orbach points out that people often associate regulation with restriction, but regulation also involves facilitation and supply, such as the provision of roads, as well as health and education services. (Orbach 4)

³¹³ Black J “Critical Reflections on Regulation” 2002 *Australian Journal of Legal Philosophy* 27:1 1-35 (“Black 2002”) 26.

³¹⁴ Dudley & Brito 8. Gambling regulation would mostly constitute social regulation, although gambling authorities might also have an economic function. (See section 2.3.7.)

Why then would governments use their power to interfere in the lives of their citizens by regulating gambling and promotional competitions?³¹⁵ Often, they do so based on ideology or prevailing religious or moral views.³¹⁶ However, the regulation of gambling is also driven by attempts to curb problem gambling, crime and other negative consequences of gambling.³¹⁷ In regulating gambling, governments strive to achieve a balance. They need to create an opportunity for the public to channel their desire to participate in gambling,³¹⁸ while they have to curb related crimes, excess and abuse at the same time.³¹⁹ Gambling involves money in various forms too.³²⁰ Due to the risks of cheating, money laundering and the range of other crimes associated with money, gambling needs to be regulated.³²¹ Linked to this, governments also regulate gambling in order to control the allocation of gambling proceeds.³²² In addition, gambling is regulated to protect children and vulnerable people and even to avoid “public nuisances”.³²³ It seems, therefore, that there is some need to regulate gambling. Since promotional competitions are regarded as gambling activities, this regulation affects

³¹⁵ Gambling laws may be quite commonplace and gambling regulation might be accepted as a given, but Rose bemoans the fact that gambling is not better regulated and often neglected and ignored by legislatures. (Rose 589-590) As mentioned above (page 54), one must also bear in mind that some authors are in favour of deregulation or no regulation of gambling. They regard gambling as merely another form of human entertainment and activity, which does not need to be regulated. In fact, Basham and Luik argue that governments take away individuals’ opportunity to act responsibly by regulating gambling for them. (Basham & Luik 12)

³¹⁶ Geis 5-14; Spapens T “Regulating Illegal Gambling Markets: The Case of Illegal Casinos in the Netherlands” in Spapens T, Littler A and Fijnaut C (eds) *Crime, addiction, and the regulation of gambling* 93 (“Spapens”) 93. Religion plays an ambivalent role in gambling. In some religions, gambling forms part of religious activities (for example, divination and the casting of lots), while in other religions gambling is frowned upon or banned (such as in Islam). However, even within some religions there are divergent views in respect of gambling. In Christianity, for example, Roman Catholicism does not prohibit moderate gambling, while Puritan Christianity preaches against gambling. [Ferentzy P & Turner NE “The History of Gambling and Its Intersection with Technology, Religion, Medical Science, and Metaphors” in *The History of Problem Gambling: Temperance, Substance Abuse, Medicine, and Metaphors* (“Ferentzy & Turner”) 13-16; Binde P “Gambling and religion: Histories of concord and conflict” 2007 *Journal of Gambling Issues* 20 145-165]

³¹⁷ Spapens 93. Schalken TM *Casino en illegaliteit* (“Schalken”) 1.

³¹⁸ Schalken uses the Dutch term “menselijke speelzucht”. Schalken 1.

³¹⁹ Schalken 1. Spapens observes that governments often allow regulated legal gambling in an attempt to reduce illegal gambling by providing persons who participate in illegal gambling with another, regulated option. He reasons that people’s desire for gambling will not be quenched if gambling is prohibited. As such, legislatures allow gambling, but have to regulate it in order to deal with its negative consequences. Spapens 93-94.

³²⁰ Players stake money and often winnings are paid out in money.

³²¹ Rose IN “The Dangers of Under-Regulating Gambling” 2015 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 19:1 4-5. Rose warns against the risks of under-regulating gambling and discusses how under-regulation can lead to crime and corruption.

³²² Schalken 5. This is particularly relevant in the case of lottery proceeds and the allocation of funds to lottery grant recipients.

³²³ Leitzel 222.

the running of such competitions as well. However, it is submitted that promotional competitions do not involve all of the evils associated with regular gambling and that promotional competitions should therefore be regulated less strictly.

In South Africa, the legislature has acknowledged the requirement to protect society and the country's economy against the negative effects of gambling.³²⁴ In particular, the National Gambling Act, 2004 confirms the need to ensure that "gambling activities are effectively regulated, licenced, controlled and policed" and that "society and the economy are protected against over-stimulation of the latent demand for gambling".³²⁵ When it comes to gambling regulation, countries can follow a revenue, consumer or sumptuary model.³²⁶ In South Africa's case, the regulation follows the sumptuary model in respect of gambling, but the revenue model in the case of the National Lottery.³²⁷ These models allow lawful gambling and actually encourage it, in the case of the revenue model. Thus, it appears that gambling and lotteries are no longer regarded as evil and immoral in South Africa.

The role of government in dealing with gambling creates challenges when one considers the regulation of gambling.³²⁸ It is submitted that government has an ambiguous role in this regard. On the one hand, government is involved in the regulation and control of gambling. The purpose of this is to protect gamblers and the public. However, on the other hand, government has a duty to look after the finances

³²⁴ Preamble to the National Gambling Act, 2004.

³²⁵ Preamble to the National Gambling Act, 2004. S87(1)(f) also empowers the Minister of Trade and Industry to make regulations which set standards for gambling operations in order to avoid over-stimulation of gambling demand and to protect minors. The National Gambling Act, 1996 (the current Act's predecessor) recorded the guiding principles in the main part of the statute (s13), instead of the preamble. Carnelley notes that the Lotteries and Gambling Board also suggested that gambling policy should guard against the negative effects of excessive gambling and protect people's "work-ethic", but those principles were not incorporated in the National Gambling Act, 1996. (Carnelley *Obiter* 2000 198)

³²⁶ The revenue model entails maximisation of income, the consumer model aims to protect consumers (inter alia through the provision of information) and the sumptuary model seeks to satisfy gambling demand while discouraging excessive gambling. Clotfelter & Cook 242-248. (Scott 20-21; 2010 Gambling Review 30-31)

³²⁷ 2010 Gambling Review 9. The approach was suggested by the Lotteries and Gambling Board prior to the legalisation of gambling in South Africa and the Gambling Commission recommended that this approach be maintained. (2010 Gambling Review 17; LGB Main Report 63)

³²⁸ Where government also acts as a gambling or lottery operator one must evaluate government's role in actual gambling services as well. In New Zealand, for example, the National Lottery is operated by the New Zealand Lotteries Commission. (See Subpart 2 of New Zealand's Gambling Act 2003.) In South Africa the National Lottery is owned by government but operated by a private entity, while all other gambling is undertaken by the private sector. (2010 Gambling Review 68) The Lotteries and Gambling Board suggested this approach based on its research regarding the systems followed in other countries. (LGB Main Report 70, 77-80)

of the country as well. The issue is compounded if government has a direct interest in gambling, for example in countries where governments operate state lotteries.³²⁹ This places government in a precarious and arguably biased position. Government needs to monitor gambling and lotteries and to assess its impact on members of the public. However, in doing so, government would be aware of the revenue that is potentially created by the relevant activities. Government therefore needs to strike a balance between protecting the public and generating income for the state.³³⁰

When it comes to the actual regulation of gambling, one finds that it is focused on various aspects of gambling activity. The regulation covers matters such as gambling venues, the gamblers themselves, the gamblers' minimum age, the licensing of gambling operators, gambling advertising and problem gambling.³³¹ As such, there is a wide spectrum of activities that can fall within the scope of gambling legislation. However, when considering the regulation of gambling, as with other activities, it is submitted that governments should be careful of "over-criminalization".³³² One should also be mindful of the fact that close regulation, particularly when considered together with other forms of regulation, could at times have negative economic consequences.³³³ In this regard, Collins mentions how the ban on public smoking in South Africa can affect casinos profits.³³⁴ In the end, the legislation that is put in place should be effective and achieve its purposes.³³⁵ It is submitted that this should be kept

³²⁹ Scott discusses the role of government as a provider of lottery products. She remarks that the trend seems to be for governments to shift from being monopoly service providers and that this shift should perhaps also be reflected in the gambling industry. Scott 19, 24-26.

³³⁰ See Selby W "Social Evil or Social Good? Lotteries and state regulation in Australia and the United States" in McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* 65 ("Selby") 82-83. McGowan discusses this balancing act in the context of the gambling industry as well as the tobacco industry. In particular, he notes that the matter can be seen as a weighing-up of "the ethics of sacrifice" against the "ethics of tolerance". McGowan 26-31.

³³¹ Eadington WR "Understanding Gambling" in Eadington WR *Gambling: Public Policies and the Social Sciences* 8. P Collins 1. Miers D *Regulating Commercial Gambling: Past, Present, and Future* ("Miers") 350-351.

³³² Dixon 20-2, citing Geis and Rich RM *The Sociology of Criminal Law* 235-261). Furthermore, if gambling is allowed, gambling operators will want to stimulate demand in order to grow their businesses. However, as Scott warns, excessive advertising and promotion of gambling "could be severe in terms of a possible erosion to work incentives, to saving and investment behaviour, and to economic growth and productivity". Scott 19.

³³³ Cohen raises the point that people often overlook the economic role of gaming regulators, and that regulators should be mindful of the economic impact of their actions. Cohen P "Beyond the Obvious – The Economic Role of the Gambling Regulator" 2014 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 18:2 173-182.

³³⁴ P Collins 83, fn 6.

³³⁵ Dixon 21, citing Miers D & Page A *Legislation* vii; Tomasic R "The Sociology of Legislation" in Tomasic R (ed) *Legislation and Society in Australia* 19-26.

in mind in relation to the regulation of promotional competitions as well. Close regulation of those activities will not necessarily prevent such competitions from being conducted. Promotional competitions can serve a legitimate purpose in the marketing activities of businesses as well, and they should not be deprived of these marketing tools merely because they display some gambling characteristics.

Gambling legislation should also keep up with developments in technology, such as online and interactive gambling, although it often tends to trail behind such developments.³³⁶ Legislators will face challenges to keep up with new, hybrid forms of gambling that evolve as a result of new media, especially social networks.³³⁷ Due to the international nature of the internet, a country's legislation should be aligned with those of other countries and international best practice.³³⁸ This applies in the case of promotional competitions as well, particularly in view of the trend to conduct such competitions on social media platforms.

Further, one should bear in mind that legislation needs to be administered and enforced in order to serve its purpose.³³⁹ With gambling legislation comes the requirement for establishing regulators and authorities that can promote compliance with the legislation, oversee its effectiveness and enforce its provisions against those who breach the law.³⁴⁰ These authorities would also take steps if a promotional

³³⁶ Miller KC "How Should the Past Inform the Future? Reviewing Regulating Internet Gaming: Challenges and Opportunities" 2014 *UNLV Gaming Law Journal* 5:1 49-79 79. The regulation of interactive gambling is a developing topic in South Africa. Currently, unauthorised interactive gaming is unlawful in South Africa. (S11 of the National Gambling Act, 2004). However, when the National Gambling Amendment Act, 2008 enters into force it will regulate interactive gambling and provide for the issuing of interactive gambling licenses. For discussions of interactive gambling and the law in South Africa, see for example Carnelley M "Interactive Gambling: A South African Comparative Perspective Part I – Universal Legal Challenges" 2001 *Obiter* 273-299; Carnelley M "Interactive Gambling: A South African Comparative Perspective Part II – Regulatory Frameworks in Selected Jurisdictions" 2002 *Obiter* 23:2 1-26; Carnelley M "South African Interactive (Internet) Gambling Regulation – The 2006 Developments" 2007 *Speculum Juris* 2 258-265; Snail 114-121; Rodrigues C "The gaming spider spins its web: gaming law" 2008 *Without Prejudice* 8:9 24-25; Monnye 221-242. See also the overview, analysis and recommendations of the Gambling Review Commission (2010 Gambling Review 174-184).

³³⁷ Owens MD "If you can't tweet 'em, join 'em: The New Media, Hybrid Games, and Gambling Law" 2010 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 14:9 669-672.

³³⁸ Gainsbury S & Wood R "Internet gambling policy in critical comparative perspective: the effectiveness of existing regulatory frameworks" 2011 *International Gambling Studies* 11:3 309-323 320. For an overview of online gambling regulation in a number of countries, see Hutto J "What is Everybody Doing About it? A Foreign Jurisdictional Analysis of Internet Gaming Regulation" 2005 *Gaming Law Review* 9:1 26-34.

³³⁹ Miers 351.

³⁴⁰ In turn, gambling regulators and authorities also require oversight and review, for example when they issue gambling licences. See Carnelley *Obiter* 2011 74-78.

competition contravenes the relevant legislation and enters the realm of unlawful gambling. The compliance and enforcement activities of gambling regulators and authorities should be complemented by self-regulation of businesses that make gambling and lottery activities available to the public.³⁴¹ It is submitted that it would be more appropriate for self-regulatory authorities in the marketing and advertising industry to fulfil this role in the case of promotional competitions.

Ultimately, it is this author's view that legislatures should aim for balance. They should not lose sight of the fact that gambling can cause maladies in society. Yet, by prohibiting gambling, legislatures may not be able to eradicate gambling or problem gambling. It might actually force it to go "underground". As such, the situation may be addressed by legal, but properly regulated, gambling.

2.4.9 Promotional competitions and regulation

Promotional competitions are popular sales promotion tools.³⁴² However, they are forms of gambling and lotteries as well.³⁴³ Therefore, they share some of the negative characteristics of gambling. These competitions may be potential tools of harm and abuse, not only due to their gambling roots, but also because of unscrupulous marketers' misuse of these promotional tools. The risk factors associated with promotional competitions, considered below, may constitute cause for the regulation of promotional competitions.

As is the case with gambling, promotional competitions can, in certain instances, lead to financial exploitation.³⁴⁴ If competition organisers were allowed to charge consideration for entries, participants could end up spending significant sums of

³⁴¹ Miers 351.

³⁴² Refer to the more detailed discussions of promotional competitions as promotional tools in section 2.5 below. Unfortunately, it seems that statistics relating to the prevalence of promotional competitions in South Africa are not available. This differs from the position in other countries, for example Germany, where such information is recorded and accessible. (Becker 145-150)

³⁴³ Refer to the discussion above at page 16.

³⁴⁴ In an American context, Cabot and his colleagues point to the policy that financial harm should be the only grounds on which activities should be prohibited. They state that "public policy should not be concerned with the prospect that persons will become financially destitute buying hamburgers and soda simply to enter a game when they otherwise can receive free entries". (Cabot *ea* 37) It is submitted that this is too narrow a view. Even if entry to a competition is free, there could be various other harmful or abusive practices which may require regulation or prohibition.

money in an attempt to win attractive prizes.³⁴⁵ In such a situation, the competitions would constitute outright gambling or lottery activities. However, the laws of many countries prohibit organisers of promotional competitions from requiring consideration from entrants.³⁴⁶ Despite this, there is still the possibility that entrants could part with excessive amounts of money if they are required to purchase competition promoters' goods even though they might not need such goods.³⁴⁷ In order to prevent this from happening some countries prohibit promoters from requiring participants to purchase goods in order to enter competitions.³⁴⁸ However, the relevant laws often exclude the costs of submitting or transmitting entries from the aforesaid prohibition.³⁴⁹ Even so, there is still the risk that entrants might incur significant costs as a result of sending multiple entries.³⁵⁰

³⁴⁵ During 2008, Vodacom ran a competition in which the public could win BMW motor vehicles. In order to enter, participants had to send text messages that were charged at R10 each. The National Lotteries Board sent a cease and desist letter to Vodacom and the latter decided to bring the competition to an end. (Unknown "Vodacom switches from 'play' to 'pay'" 25 February 2008 IOL News <http://www.iol.co.za/news/south-africa/vodacom-switches-from-play-to-pay-1.390727#.VRHi3HkcRMs>, accessed on 25 March 2015) Griffiths discusses a similar situation in a British context, focussing specifically on television programmes that require participants to enter by phoning premium rated phone numbers. [Griffiths M "Interactive television quizzes as gambling: A cause for concern?" 2007 *Journal of Gambling Issues* Issue 20 ("Griffiths 2008") 269-276]

³⁴⁶ See, for example, s36(3)(a) of South Africa's CPA. The position is also similar in countries such as the United States (see *Cabot ea* 1-3). See also the discussion of New Zealand and Great Britain's laws in Chapter 4 below.

³⁴⁷ James JS "Regulating the Sweepstakes Industry: Are Consumers Close to Winning?" 2000 *Santa Clara Law Review* 41:2 581-618 ("James 582"); Unknown *Bank Night and Similar Devices as Illegal Lotteries* 1941 *Yale Law Journal* 50:5 941 946 (See *Cabot ea* 4-5 and fn 29); Griffiths M "Instant-win products and prize draws: Are these forms of gambling?" 2003 *Journal of Gambling Issues* 9 ("Griffiths 2003") (<http://jgi.camh.net/doi/full/10.4309/jgi.2003.9.5>, accessed on 21 March 2015). Cabot and his colleagues mention that there is no evidence of financial abuse which could be used to inform public policy in this regard. They state: "No reports exist to show that persons face financial devastation because they purchased truckloads of Dr. Pepper or other retail products simply to gain entry into promotional sweepstakes." (*Cabot ea* 30)

³⁴⁸ For example, Germany (Becker 144) and France (Béjot M & Bouvier C "France" in *International Promotion Marketing Law Book* (2nd ed) 99). In order to get around this prohibition, many promoters offer entrants an alternative, free method of entry, such as sending in a post card. This is sometimes described as "equal dignity sweepstakes" or flexible participation lotteries. See Cabot 18-23; FE Williams 1938 119-120; FE Williams 1958 132. Griffiths questions whether people actually use the alternative methods and mentions that he has not been able to obtain feedback from competition organisers in this regard. (Griffiths 2003 unpagged)

³⁴⁹ See, for example, s36(3)(a) of the CPA. The exception is also provided for in Germany. (Becker 144)

³⁵⁰ Becker 144. He mentions the example of a person who repeatedly phones a competition line. Actual examples of such scenarios can be found. Although in the context of a competition where participants had to vote for their favourite presenters and artists, *IOL News* reported of a person who won a car but spent R28 000 in sending text messages in doing so. (Khalianyane L "Woman spends big to win car" 30 October 2013 *IOL News* <http://www.iol.co.za/news/south-africa/eastern-cape/woman-spends-big-to-win-car-1.1599723>, accessed on 21 March 2015)

As another risk factor, some authors mention that promotional competitions can be regarded as “precursors” of gambling.³⁵¹ In other words, such competitions might introduce persons to gambling or serve as an entry-level form thereof.³⁵² Griffiths argues that prize draws “play on people’s something-for-nothing mentality, which contributes to the developing ‘instant-win’ culture”.³⁵³ As such, legislatures need to retain a measure of control over these competitions in order to limit the gambling element and avoid such competitions from becoming tools that lure people into more extensive gambling activities.

Some promotional competitions might be associated with deception and misleading of consumers. In general, this could be due to misleading wording used to market a promotional competition.³⁵⁴ However, the issue is also manifested in specific misleading practices. Certain competition organisers deceive consumers by notifying them that they have won prizes, while that is in fact not the case, or there might be additional requirements that they have to meet in order to become eligible for a prize.³⁵⁵ Organisers sometimes use deliberately vague marketing materials that hide onerous requirements in order to mislead persons to enter competitions.³⁵⁶ Consumers can be misled as to the true value of prizes as well.³⁵⁷ Furthermore, they could be lured into entering competitions while they fail to understand their chances of winning, and for this reason some foreign laws require that promoters must disclose

³⁵¹ Griffiths 2003 (unpaged).

³⁵² This theory is similar to the “gateway hypothesis” or “stepping stone theory” in studies of drug abuse, in terms of which it is argued that drug users start with “softer” drugs and then progress to “harder drugs”. (Vanyukov *ea* “Common liability to addiction and ‘gateway hypothesis’: Theoretical, empirical and evolutionary perspective” 2012 *Drug and alcohol dependence* 123 Supplement 1, S3-17, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3600369/>, accessed on 21 March 2015; Kandel D “Stages in Adolescent Involvement in Drug Use” 1975 *Science* 190:4217 912-914) In this context, some authors refer to “gateway drugs”. (Kandel DB “Examining the Gateway Hypothesis: Stages and Pathways of Drug Involvement” in Kandel DB (ed) *Stages and Pathways of Drug Involvement: Examining the Gateway Hypothesis* 3) Perhaps there is a possibility that promotional competitions could be regarded by some to be “gateway gambling games”.

³⁵³ Griffiths 2003 (unpaged).

³⁵⁴ James 596. Some American states prohibit the use of certain words in sweepstakes marketing.

³⁵⁵ James 582-588; Cushing C & Tierney J “Regulating the Sweepstakes Industry. Multistate Litigation” undated (“Cushing & Tierney”) (<http://web.law.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/microsites/career-services/Regulating%20the%20Sweepstakes%20Industry.pdf>, accessed on 27 March 2015) 1-2. S36(2) of the CPA appears to have been drafted in order to curb such deceptive or misleading practices.

³⁵⁶ Griffiths 2003 (unpaged).

³⁵⁷ For this reason, some states in the United States of America requires the average retail value of prizes to be disclosed. (James 595)

the odds of winning.³⁵⁸ Generally, consumers can be misled by complicated, confusing, deficient or inaccessible rules or terms and conditions.³⁵⁹

Various other abusive or questionable practices can be identified in the running of promotional competitions, such as failure to retract a competition's marketing material after the competition has closed,³⁶⁰ shifting of competition closing dates³⁶¹ and failure to award prizes. It could also happen that a promoter organises a competition even though it might not be in the position to award the prizes advertised in relation to the competition.³⁶² In general, some consumers could be subjected to inconvenience, confusion and abuse in competitions that are not organised properly or that run awry due to glitches in the competition process.³⁶³

As is the case with gambling in general, regulators need to take vulnerable persons into account and ensure that they are adequately protected. In particular, legislation should protect children³⁶⁴ and the elderly³⁶⁵ from competition promoters' abusive

³⁵⁸ For example the relevant statutes of Florida, Georgia and New York in the United States. (James 595-596)

³⁵⁹ Due to this, some laws require promoters to prepare rules before launching their competitions. See, for example, s36(3)(c) of the CPA. In some countries or states, such as New York, promoters are required to file their competition rules with the authorities. (Lord & Miller 5)

³⁶⁰ See, for example, the New Zealand case *Commerce Commission v Progressive Enterprises Ltd* [2010] NZCA 374 in which cereal boxes that contained marketing material for a competition were still displayed in stores after the competition had closed. (In that case, the Commerce Commission ultimately lost the battle against the competition organiser for failure to prove *mens rea*.)

³⁶¹ See the Australian case *Trade Practices Commission v Calderton Corp Pty Ltd* (1994) ATPR 41-306, in which the promoter shifted the closing date and added fake entries to the competition. (Miller *RV Miller's Australian Competition and Consumer Law Annotated* (35th ed) 1603.)

³⁶² To deal with this, some American states (such as Florida and New York) require competition promoters to provide security by way of a bond or guarantee or by establishing a trust account. (Lord & Miller 5)

³⁶³ Seligman TJ "Marketing through Online Promotions" April 2004 *The Computer and Internet Lawyer* 21:4 22-26 ("Seligman") 25. Seligman mentions the example of a competition run by the Kellogg Company where thousands of entrants were erroneously informed that they had won the grand prize.

³⁶⁴ Paxman K, Pelton T & Pelton FL "Should corporations be permitted to use promotional contests to manipulate the buying habits of children and youth?" in Pelton T, Reis G & Stewart S (eds) *Connections 2006* 65-76 ("Paxman ea"). The authors focus specifically on the potential danger of drawing children into gambling by exposing them to promotional contests. They also discuss health risks and obesity issues that could be caused by promotional competitions run by fast food restaurants – arguing that the lure of such competitions could affect children's eating habits. Griffiths also identifies how instant win and prize draw competitions may have an impact on children and could create so-called "chasing" behaviour. (Griffiths 2003, unpagged) See also Leitzel's discussion regarding vice and the protection of children in general. (Leitzel 21-26)

³⁶⁵ Cushing & Tierney 6-7; James 588-592. James examines elderly people's propensity for participating in sweepstakes and lists various reasons for this, including financial insecurity, reduced mental capabilities and boredom.

practices. Other classes of vulnerable persons, such as those who are unemployed or in financial distress, might be at risk as well.³⁶⁶

The internet and new media has caused a proliferation of competitions and contests.³⁶⁷ This technology has created privacy issues in the context of competitions – some promoters gather consumers' behavioural information, data, personal information or contact details in the course of conducting competitions.³⁶⁸ The information could be used to conduct direct marketing or could even be sold or provided to third parties. Consumer protection, privacy and data protection legislation may contain general provisions that are aimed at preventing this kind of abuse, but dedicated provisions could be more effective.³⁶⁹

Despite the risks and issues discussed above, promotional competitions can be run in such a way that the risk of potential harm and abuse is reduced or removed. As such, instead of prohibiting such competitions, it is submitted that they should be allowed, subject to proper and efficient regulation. Such regulation needs to be sufficient and must properly address the risks associated with promotional competitions.³⁷⁰ In Cabot and Csoka's view, this regulation should at least provide for sufficient disclosure to participants,³⁷¹ must ensure that advertising material is truthful and that the activities are conducted honestly, must prohibit conflicts of interest,³⁷² provide for effective dispute resolution, and regulate and protect participants' privacy and protect minors.³⁷³ One can also add that organisers should be required to implement internal procedures

³⁶⁶ Griffiths 2008 272. Griffiths also argues that some late night television competition shows prey on viewer's vulnerability because they are tired, less suspecting or perhaps intoxicated by that time.

³⁶⁷ Seligman 25; Cushing & Tierney 2; Cabot & Csoka 260-261.

³⁶⁸ Seligman 24-26.

³⁶⁹ For general provisions dealing with unsolicited communications and direct marketing in South African law, see the provisions of s45 of the Electronic Communications and Transactions Act, 2002, s11 of the CPA and s69 of the Protection of Personal Information Act, 2013.

³⁷⁰ Taylor and Kopp suggest that the regulation of prize contests should focus on preventing misleading and deception, and controlling the "gambling urge". In their view, participants are capable of evaluating their odds of winning and deciding whether they should enter, provided that the promoter of the competition does not mislead the public in order to lure them into entering the competition. (Taylor & Kopp 1991 202)

³⁷¹ Cabot & Csoka explain that disclosure must give the public the opportunity to make an informed decision as to whether they should participate in a specific prize game, but must also provide participants with contact details in order for people to get in touch with organisers. (Cabot & Csoka 256)

³⁷² For example, organisers' employees and family members should not be allowed to participate. (Cabot & Csoka 257)

³⁷³ Cabot & Csoka 256-257.

in order to prevent competitions from going awry.³⁷⁴ Minimum requirements should be set regarding the content and disclosure of competition rules as well.³⁷⁵ Perhaps promoters should also be required to provide proof that prizes were actually awarded, if requested to do so.

2.5 The Consumer Protection Perspective

Until the CPA came into effect, promotional competitions were regulated by gambling (lotteries) legislation.³⁷⁶ However, the promulgation of the CPA brought about a major shift in this regard. When the CPA entered into force, it repealed section 54 of the Lotteries Act, 1997. The latter still regulates lotteries in general and is the overarching legislation in this regard, but the particular regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa is now found in the CPA.

The shift in regulation from gambling legislation to consumer protection legislation is significant. As mentioned above, the Lotteries Act, 1997 remains the ultimate legislation which one must refer to in the first instance, in order to determine whether or not a lottery is lawful in South Africa. Section 56 of the Lotteries Act, 1997, in essence, provides that a lottery or competition will be unlawful unless it is authorised by the Lotteries Act, 1997 or other legislation. However, the Lotteries Act, 1997 no longer regulates promotional competitions in detail and the particular regulation is now found in the CPA.³⁷⁷ As such, there is a synergy between the Lotteries Act, 1997 and the CPA. But, it seems that the legislature now regards a promotional competition as a consumer protection issue and not as much a gambling or lotteries issue. It appears that the intention remains to protect the public against the possible evils created by promotional competitions (which are still types of lotteries), but the impression is

³⁷⁴ Taylor & Kopp 1991 209.

³⁷⁵ Taylor & Kopp 1991 209. Taylor and Kopp also provide additional recommendations, specifically in the context of United States regulation. These include that organisers should be required to register their competitions with authorities, lists of winners should be sent to the authorities and promoters should be required to obtain a bond or establish trust accounts to cover the value of prizes offered in the competition. They also suggest that promoters should display disclaimers prominently, and limit the number of entries to one per person. (Taylor & Kopp 1991 209-210)

³⁷⁶ S54 of the Lotteries Act, 1997, provided for the conducting of promotional competitions, subject to detailed requirements.

³⁷⁷ The Memorandum on the Objectives of the Consumer Protection Bill, 2008 does not contain any explanation for moving the regulation of promotional competitions from lotteries legislation to consumer protection legislation. The Draft Green Paper on the Consumer Policy Framework 09/04 ("Consumer Policy Green Paper") mentions promotional competitions merely in the context of false or misleading selling or advertising. (Consumer Policy Green Paper 26)

created that the consumer, in particular, is the vulnerable party who needs to be protected. Perhaps the reason for this lies in the fact that promotional competitions are tools used by suppliers to promote goods and services. Because the CPA governs the marketing and promotion of goods and services to consumers in South Africa, one can deduce that the legislature deemed it more appropriate to regulate promotional competitions through the CPA instead of the Lotteries Act, 1997 or other gambling legislation. Since the CPA now governs promotional competitions in South Africa, the nature of and need for consumer protection legislation warrants brief consideration.

Consumer protection law is an evolving and unique field of the law. De Stadler defines consumer law as “the area of law that regulates the private relationship between businesses and their customers”.³⁷⁸ However, as she cautions, this is an “oversimplification” of the term.³⁷⁹ Ramsay’s definition of “consumer law” is wider and he states that the term “could be understood as all laws and regulations affecting consumption and the structuring of consumer markets”.³⁸⁰

The concept “consumer law” can be defined from various angles. De Stadler touches on this relativity and the fact that the meaning depends on the definition of “consumer” in the relevant jurisdiction.³⁸¹ In South Africa, the CPA’s definition of “consumer” includes “a person to whom [...] goods or services are marketed in the ordinary course of the supplier’s business”, “a person who has entered into a transaction with a supplier in the ordinary course of the supplier’s business”, a user of goods, a recipient of services and also franchisees.³⁸² However, section 5 exempts the application of the

³⁷⁸ De Stadler E *Consumer Law Unlocked* (“De Stadler 2013”) 1.

³⁷⁹ De Stadler 2013 1.

³⁸⁰ Ramsay I *Consumer Law and Policy: Text and Materials on Regulating Consumer Markets* (3rd ed) (“Ramsay 2012”) 1.

³⁸¹ De Stadler, E “What is the Consumer Law Review” in Juta’s *Consumer Law Review* newsletter (February 2012) <http://jutalaw.co.za/newsletter/newsletter/consumer-law-review-january-2012-1/> (accessed on 11 January 2015) (“De Stadler 2012”).

³⁸² The full definition, in s1 of the CPA, is as follows:

“consumer”, in respect of any particular goods or services, means-

- (a) a person to whom those particular goods or services are marketed in the ordinary course of the supplier's business;
- (b) a person who has entered into a transaction with a supplier in the ordinary course of the supplier's business, unless the transaction is exempt from the application of this Act by section 5(2) or in terms of section 5(3);
- (c) if the context so requires or permits, a user of those particular goods or a recipient or beneficiary of those particular services, irrespective of whether that user, recipient or beneficiary was a party to a transaction concerning the supply of those particular goods or services; and

CPA to certain transactions, for example where a juristic person is a party to a consumer transaction and the juristic person's annual asset value or turnover in the previous financial year exceeds the threshold that is published from time to time.³⁸³ The CPA also does not apply to transactions where goods are sold or services are provided to the State.³⁸⁴ As such, the consumer protection law contained in the CPA does not necessarily apply to the relationship between businesses and customers in all instances.

Although the introduction of the CPA into South African law was a legal milestone in this country, consumer protection legislation was already in place in various countries at that stage.³⁸⁵ Consumer protection law is not new and, as Barnard remarks, "the CPA did not introduce the concept of consumer protection".³⁸⁶ In the same vein, Du Preez gives examples of consumer protection principles in Roman law and the *Magna Carta*.³⁸⁷ Furthermore, although the CPA is the first wide-ranging and comprehensive consumer protection statute in South Africa, consumer protection provisions can be found in various South African statutes that predate the CPA, although their provisions are piecemeal, limited and specific to particular subject matter.³⁸⁸

Consumer protection legislation has evolved in response to various factors, including imbalances and shortcomings in the law. Van Eeden points to developments during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries that drove the evolution of consumer protection

(d) a franchisee in terms of a franchise agreement, to the extent applicable in terms of section 5(6)(b) to (e)".

³⁸³ CPA, s5(2)(b).

³⁸⁴ CPA, 25(2)(a).

³⁸⁵ For example Argentina, Brazil, Canada, India, Uganda and the United Kingdom. Du Preez ML "The Consumer Protection Bill: A few preliminary comments" 2009 *South African Law Journal* 58 (Du Preez) 58 62.

³⁸⁶ Barnard J *The Influence of the Consumer Protection Act 68 of 2008 on the Common Law of Sale* ("Barnard") 23.

³⁸⁷ Du Preez 58.

³⁸⁸ See Woker T "Why the need for consumer protection legislation? A look at some of the reasons behind the promulgation of the National Credit Act and the Consumer Protection Act" 2010 *Obiter* 217-231 ("Woker 2010") 218-229, where Woker discusses the state of the law relating to consumer protection and credit prior to the introduction of the CPA. Refer to Du Preez 58, fn 7 for a list of statutes that contained consumer protection related provisions prior to the CPA coming into effect. See also the Memorandum to the Consumer Protection Bill [B19D-2008] ("CPB 2008") and the brief overview of consumer protection in South Africa prior to the CPA in Barnard 19-23, as well as Eiselen S & Naudé T "Introduction and Overview of the Consumer Protection Act" in Eiselen S & Naudé T (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* ("Eiselen & Naudé") 1. See also Louw E *The Plain Language Movement and Legal Reform in the South African Law of Contract* 131-135 for a discussion of the development of consumer protection law in South Africa, with specific reference to plain language.

law.³⁸⁹ In the second half of the twentieth century, jurists started to recognise that laws tend to favour businesses over consumers, even though those laws may seem just.³⁹⁰ Persons started to identify an imbalanced relationship between business and consumers. Van Eeden compares this to the relationship between employers and employees in which employers tend to have the upper hand.³⁹¹ In the consumer context, the balance of power most often lies with the supplier. For this reason, Du Preez remarks that “[t]he more vulnerable the consumer is, the more protection is required”.³⁹² However, she stresses that consumer protection law should not follow a “one size fits all” approach, but must be adapted to specific local needs and contexts.³⁹³

The CPA is the product of a lengthy process during which the consumer market in South Africa was investigated and the need for comprehensive consumer protection legislation was identified.³⁹⁴ The memorandum accompanying the final draft of the Consumer Protection Bill, in a succinct manner, lists the following factors which led to the development of the legislation: “discriminatory and unfair market practices; proliferation of low-quality and unsafe products; lack of awareness of rights; limited redress; inadequate protection for consumers; weak enforcement capacity”.³⁹⁵

The CPA’s aim is to address the issues highlighted in the paragraphs above. Section 3 sets out the CPA’s purposes with particular reference to the vulnerable consumer and unique consumer contexts.³⁹⁶ The preamble of the CPA contains the mission for the CPA. The legislation’s purposes include:

³⁸⁹ Van Eeden E *Consumer Protection Law in South Africa* (“Van Eeden 2013”) 1.

³⁹⁰ Van Eeden 2013 21-22. See also Ramsay 2012 1-40 and Eiselen & Naudé 6-13.

³⁹¹ Van Eeden 2013 1.

³⁹² Du Preez 63.

³⁹³ Du Preez 63.

³⁹⁴ For the history of this process, see for example the memorandum accompanying the CPB 2008 as well as Du Preez 59-60, Barnard 23-24, Van Eeden 2013 23, Stoop PN *The Concept ‘Fairness’ in the Regulation of Contracts under the Consumer Protection Act 68 of 2008* (“Stoop 2012”) 68-71 and Eiselen & Naudé 18-20.

³⁹⁵ CPB 2008. See Woker 2010 230-231, where she submits that regulation is necessary in order to protect consumers, particularly due to the proliferation of unfair practices, the uneven playing field which favours suppliers, the complicated nature of goods and challenges faced by consumers in seeking redress against suppliers.

³⁹⁶ Jacobs W, Stoop PN & Van Niekerk R “Fundamental Consumer Rights under the Consumer Protection Act 68 of 2008: A Critical Overview and Analysis” (2010) 13:3 *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal* 302 (“Jacobs *ea*”) 304.

[t]o promote a fair, accessible and sustainable marketplace for consumer products and services and for that purpose to establish national norms and standards relating to consumer protection, to provide for improved standards of consumer information, to prohibit certain unfair marketing and business practices, to promote responsible consumer behaviour, to promote a consistent legislative and enforcement framework relating to consumer transactions and agreements.³⁹⁷

The intention of the legislation seems to be clear, but it remains to be seen over the years to come whether the legislation will bring about the desired results.³⁹⁸ Having said this, it must be noted that the CPA has nevertheless filled a void and provides consumers with wide-ranging protection. In shifting the regulation of promotional competitions from the realm of gambling law to consumer protection law, the legislature has also increased the extent of the regulation. The CPA regulates promotional competitions in more detail than ever before. Accordingly, it is submitted that the regulation of promotional competitions from a consumer law perspective favours the consumer considerably. Of course, this increases the compliance burden on promoters at the same time.

2.6 The Marketing Context

2.6.1 Introduction

The focus of this thesis is on the regulation of promotional competitions specifically. One of the key characteristics of a promotional competition is that it serves to promote businesses, products and/or services. Indeed, for promotional competitions to be lawful in South Africa, they must in fact be conducted for promotional purposes.³⁹⁹ In the course of considering the regulation of promotional competitions, one should explore some marketing theory and seek to understand why businesses organise

³⁹⁷ Extract from preamble to the CPA.

³⁹⁸ Before the CPA came into force, Woker asked a similar question, hoping that it will mirror the arguable success of the National Credit Act, 2005. (Woker 2010 231) Despite the good intentions behind the CPA, the statute is not without its faults. See, for example, Govinden's comments on the CPA's product liability provisions. (Govinden K "One step forward, two steps back" December 2014 *Without Prejudice* 14:11 35-36) Eiselen and Naudé note that the CPA's first years have been marred by "teething problems". (Eiselen & Naudé 20-21)

³⁹⁹ See, for example, the definition of "promotional competition" in s36(1)(d) of the CPA. It requires that the competition must be conducted "for the purpose of promoting a producer, distributor, supplier, or association of any such persons, or the sale of any goods or services". The definition in the Lotteries Act, 1997 was more limited. It referred to "a lottery conducted for the purpose of promoting the sale or use of any goods or services". See also the definition of "sales promotion scheme" in New Zealand's Gambling Act, 2003. It refers to "gambling [...] used by a creator, distributor, or vendor of goods or services to promote the sale of those goods or services".

promotional competitions. Background knowledge regarding the running of prize promotions and some of the practices followed by promoters will assist one in considering whether and how promotional competitions should be regulated. In particular, this will cast some light on possible benefits of and the business case for running promotional competitions. Legal practitioners and other persons who draft terms and conditions for promotional competitions and review such promotions also need to be aware of the marketing context and the possible pitfalls of running promotional competitions. This will help them to ensure that they provide proper and informed services to their clients. Furthermore, an understanding of the client's perspective will create a better rapport with them.

2.6.2 Marketing and marketing tools

Any organisation needs to focus on activities that attract customers and clients and that maintain those relationships. The conducting of promotional competitions forms part of those activities. All of the activities fall within the broader category of marketing. The *Cambridge Business English Dictionary* describes “marketing” as “the business activity that involves finding out what customers want, using that information to design products and services, and selling them effectively”.⁴⁰⁰ *Merriam-Webster* explains the concept as “the activities that are involved in making people aware of a company's products, making sure that the products are available to be bought, etc”.⁴⁰¹ The American Association of Marketing (“AMA”)⁴⁰² defines “marketing” as “the activity, set of institutions, and processes for creating, communicating, delivering, and exchanging offerings that have value for customers, clients, partners, and society at large”.⁴⁰³ As

⁴⁰⁰ <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/business-english/marketing?q=marketing> (accessed on 20 April 2014).

⁴⁰¹ <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/marketing> (accessed on 20 April 2014).

⁴⁰² AMA “Definition of Marketing” <https://www.ama.org/AboutAMA/Pages/Definition-of-Marketing.aspx> (accessed on 20 April 2014). The AMA has adopted various formal definitions for “marketing” over the years. One could say that the changes to those definitions reflect changes in marketing practice and society. For discussions surrounding the AMA's 2004 definition, see Gundlach, GT “The American Marketing Association's 2004 definition of marketing: Perspectives on its implications for scholarship and the role and responsibility of marketing in society” *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* 26:2 243-250. Regarding the 2007 revision, see Gundlach, GT & Wilkie, WL “The American Marketing Association's new definition of marketing: Perspective and commentary on the 2007 revision” *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* 28:2, 259-264.

⁴⁰³ See Belch GE & Belch MA *Advertising and Promotion: An integrated marketing communications perspective* 7-8 (Belch & Belch). The authors of that work point out that “exchange” is a key element of “marketing” as a concept. The marketer and the customer each have something to “exchange” with the other – the marketer has products to sell and the customer can offer money in return. However, the meaning of “marketing” has become broader. The concept is no longer confined to merchants and their

such, the term “marketing” does not include only attracting customers’ attention, but studying their needs and fulfilling those needs as well.

In order to drive its marketing, a business can make use of a broad set of marketing tools. When referring to this set of tools, marketers often talk about the “marketing mix”.⁴⁰⁴ Some authors have refined the marketing mix in order to identify four main components. These are known as “the 4Ps”: product, place, price and promotion.⁴⁰⁵ Marketers focus on these key components in choosing and using the correct tools to market their products and services.

A marketer needs to get its message across to the public. This is done in the form of marketing communication.⁴⁰⁶ In the context of the 4Ps, Koekemoer points out that the fourth “P” (promotion) represents this communication element.⁴⁰⁷ There are various marketing communication tools that can be used in order to promote a business and its goods and services. These tools include, amongst others, advertising, direct marketing, personal selling, public relations, sponsorship and sales promotions.⁴⁰⁸

Advertising is probably one of the most obvious of the marketing communication tools. There are various ways in which one can define the term “advertising”. Since this thesis is based within the context of South African consumer law, one could start with the extensive definition of “advertisement” found in the Consumer Protection Act,

goods. Non-profit organisations can market themselves, even if members of the public cannot necessarily buy something from them. This is why the words “society at large” are found in the AMA’s definition of “marketing”.

⁴⁰⁴ It seems that the term “marketing mix” was coined by Neil Borden, who was inspired by a bulletin written by James Culliton. See Borden NH “The concept of the marketing mix” 1964 *Journal of Advertising Research* Vol 4 (June) 4-7.

⁴⁰⁵ The concept of the “4Ps” was developed by Edmund J McCarthy. See Silverman SN “An historical review and modern assessment of the marketing mix” in Rassuli KM *ea* (eds) “Proceedings of the 7th conference on historical research in marketing and marketing thought” 25-35. Various changes and updates to the 4Ps have been suggested. See for example the overview and suggestions in Fitzgerald J, Cavanaugh N & Bhiro R “CPR for the 4Ps: Breathing new life into the marketing mix” <http://alumni.keiseruniversity.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/CPR-for-the-4Ps-IABE.pdf> (accessed on 23 April 2014). Cummins & Mullin suggest using “6Cs” instead of “4Ps” (Cummins & Mullin 12-13, 15-16.)

⁴⁰⁶ See Koekemoer L *Advertising and sales promotion* (Koekemoer) 1. He explains that the “process of communicating with consumer and customers is called marketing communication.”

⁴⁰⁷ Koekemoer 4.

⁴⁰⁸ Koekemoer 4-11; Du Plessis F “Introduction to integrated marketing communication” in Du Plessis *ea Integrated marketing communication: A contemporary approach* (“Du Plessis”) 3-7; Semenik *ea Advertising and promotion: An integrated brand approach* (6th international ed) (Semenik *ea*) 13-14, 22-23; Shimp TA *Integrated marketing communication in advertising and promotion* (international ed) (“Shimp”) 7-8.

2008.⁴⁰⁹ One could also consider the definition contained in the Code of Advertising Practice of South Africa's Advertising Standards Authority.⁴¹⁰ However, since this particular discussion focuses on the marketing context of promotional competitions, it may be a good idea to find guidance from a source in the marketing discipline. Semenik and his co-authors describe advertising purely as "a paid, mass-mediated attempt to persuade".⁴¹¹ A marketer therefore pays to spread its messages through various forms of media in order to convince the public to buy its product or use its services.⁴¹²

Promotional competitions are forms of marketing and are usually supported by advertising. As such, it is important to understanding marketing and advertising as concepts from an industry perspective as well as in a legal framework. Marketing and advertising is regulated by self-regulatory codes and legislation, and one therefore needs an understanding of these concepts in order to interpret the applicable legislation.

2.6.3 Sales promotion in general

Another key marketing communication tool is sales promotion.⁴¹³ Various definitions exist for this concept.⁴¹⁴ Shimp describes it as follows:

⁴⁰⁹ S1 of the CPA defines "advertisement" as follows:

"any direct or indirect visual or oral communication transmitted by any medium, or any representation or reference written, inscribed, recorded, encoded upon or embedded within any medium, by means of which a person seeks to-

- (a) bring to the attention of all or part of the public-
 - (i) the existence or identity of a supplier; or
 - (ii) the existence, nature, availability, properties, advantages or uses of any goods or services that are available for supply, or the conditions on, or prices at, which any goods or services are available for supply;
- (b) promote the supply of any goods or services; or
- (c) promote any cause."

⁴¹⁰ Clause 4 of the Code of Advertising Practice contains the following definition:

"4.1 'advertisement' means any visual or aural communication, representation, reference or notification of any kind –

- 4.1.1 which is intended to promote the sale, leasing or use of any goods or services; or
- 4.1.2 which appeals for or promotes the support of any cause."

⁴¹¹ Semenik *ea* 11-13.

⁴¹² Semenik *ea* make the point that advertising always involves payment. If the marketer did not pay for the advertisement, it can be classified as publicity, public relations or some other form of marketing, but not as advertising. Semenik *ea* 11.

⁴¹³ Koekemoer uses the term "sales inducements". (Koekemoer 10.)

⁴¹⁴ See for example Brown C *The Sales Promotion Handbook* ("Brown") 13-14; Yeshin T *Sales Promotion* (Yeshin) 7-10; Semenik 536; Belch & Belch 516; Cook G "Sales Promotion" in Du Plessis *ea Integrated marketing communication: A contemporary approach* ("G Cook") 176. Yeshin evaluates

By definition, sales promotion (or simply promotion) refers to any incentive manufacturers, retailers, and even not-for-profit organizations use that serve to change a brand's perceived price or value temporarily.⁴¹⁵

When conducting sales promotions, marketers can employ various sales promotion activities and tools. These include promotional offers, discounts, rebates, vouchers (coupons), giveaways, sampling, loyalty schemes, contests and promotional competitions.⁴¹⁶

At its most basic level, sales promotion is a tool used by marketers to stimulate sales. However, Koekemoer points out that sales promotion does not include all activities that encourage sales.⁴¹⁷ He explains that “[s]ales promotions is any activity that offers incentives, such as a trial or continued purchase, for a limited time period to induce a desired response from a targeted population”.⁴¹⁸ Therefore, it seems that sales promotions are temporary in nature.

One must also distinguish sales promotion from advertising. According to Kotler, the difference is that “where advertising offers a reason to buy, sales promotion offers an incentive to buy”.⁴¹⁹ While sales promotion might be related to a limited time period, advertising can be an ongoing effort to build brand recognition and loyalty.

Sales promotions can be aimed at the marketer's own sales force, wholesalers, retailers and the consumer directly.⁴²⁰ According to Koekemoer, sales promotions can be based on the relevant product (for example “buy one get one free”), the price of the product (for example a discount) or value peripheral to the actual product (for example a competition).⁴²¹ Yeshin points out that a sales promotion draws customers' attention, incentivises them and makes sales happen quicker.⁴²² Sales promotion influences

various definitions and points out some deficiencies in them. For example, he criticizes the focus on the short-term nature of sales promotions and argues that sales promotions can build long term value for brands.

⁴¹⁵ Shimp 446 (emphasis contained in source).

⁴¹⁶ See Belch & Belch 518; G Cook 192-208; Jethwaney J & Jain S *Advertising management* (2nd ed) (Jethwaney & Jain) ch 12; Semenik 537-538; Yeshin 12.

⁴¹⁷ Koekemoer 6.

⁴¹⁸ Koekemoer 6.

⁴¹⁹ Kotler P *Marketing management* (10th ed) 597. See G Cook 176.

⁴²⁰ Belch & Belch 517; G Cook *ea* 176; Koekemoer 6; Yeshin 11.

⁴²¹ Koekemoer 10. See also Yeshin 11.

⁴²² Yeshin 10.

consumers, whether through economic benefits, the conveying of information about the marketer's offering or even the creation of an emotional experience for the consumer.⁴²³

Marketers' focus on sales promotions is increasing.⁴²⁴ Shimp attributes this growth to various causes, including marketers' attempt to win back customers' loyalty and catching consumers' attention in an environment where products are often very similar.⁴²⁵ Sales promotions have very specific benefits for marketers, such as driving sales, creating consumer faithfulness and stimulating consumer interest in products.⁴²⁶ However, marketers must plan sales promotions carefully and avoid the potential issues associated with them.⁴²⁷ Semenik and his colleagues warn that sales promotions can make customers too keen on the benefits offered by promotions – which might eventually devalue a brand due to the focus on aspects such as low pricing.⁴²⁸ If a sales promotion scheme is run on a regular basis, customers might become used to it and will become upset if changes are made to the scheme.⁴²⁹ Sales promotions require significant time, resources and effort.⁴³⁰ Marketers need to ensure that they manage them properly and ever increasing compliance and legal requirements impose a substantial burden on the persons involved.⁴³¹ As such, they should approach promotions strategically and conduct them at appropriate times and in a manner that benefits the brand.

Marketers should analyse and measure the impact and success of their promotions.⁴³² They might benefit from the existing research regarding the effectiveness of sales promotions. Marketing literature contains useful guidelines for running promotions too. For example, Raghubir and colleagues provide a handy list of “Do's and Don'ts of

⁴²³ Raghubir P, Inman JJ & Grande H “The three faces of consumer promotions” *California Management Review* (2004) 46:23-42.

⁴²⁴ G Cook 183-185; Shimp 448-452; Yeshin 3-7.

⁴²⁵ Shimp 450-451.

⁴²⁶ Cummins J & Mullin R *Sales Promotion: How to create, implement and integrate campaigns that really work* (3rd ed) (Cummins & Mullin) 33-44. G Cook 179-180.

⁴²⁷ G Cook 180-182; Semenik 554-555.

⁴²⁸ Semenik *ea* 554.

⁴²⁹ Semenik *ea* 555.

⁴³⁰ Semenik *ea* 555; Jethwaney & Jain 516.

⁴³¹ The CPA regulates various sales promotion tools, such as trade coupons and similar promotions (s34), loyalty programmes (s35), promotional competitions (s36) and referral selling (s38). The requirements of those sections can be somewhat exacting.

⁴³² See, for example, the advice provided by Brown 283-301; Cummins & Mullin 109-119; G Cook 210; Koekemoer 238-239; Yeshin 234-250.

Promotion Design”.⁴³³ Ultimately, marketers should evaluate the various sales promotion tools and decide on the most effective ones for their specific organisations.

2.6.4 Prize promotions

A promotion in which consumers can win prizes is known as a prize promotion. This forms a category of sales promotion on its own. Prize promotions can appear in various forms. Broadly, one can distinguish between two different types of arrangements.⁴³⁴ In some prize promotions, entrants need to display some form of skill, and winners are then judged based on the quality of their entries. These competitions are often called “skill contests”. Other competitions are structured in such a manner that the outcome is determined by chance. These are the “promotional competitions” that are regulated by section 36 of the CPA. In such competitions consumers normally have to enter a draw and the winner is then identified by the first entry drawn. In another form of promotional competitions, winners are identified instantly, for example by scratching a card or discovering a winning code or device inside product packaging. Marketers can consider the various forms of competitions and contests in order to decide which format will be most suitable for a specific campaign or project.

Prize promotions are unique sales promotions tools. Cummins and Mullin point out that a prize promotion is the only type of sales promotion in which the consumer is not assured that they will obtain a benefit - in a prize promotion everyone cannot be a winner (while in other sales promotions all consumers might be entitled to discounts or free gifts).⁴³⁵ The marketer can accurately calculate the cost of the promotion too, because the number of prizes and their value can be fixed, but with other sales

⁴³³ Raghbir *ea* 40-41.

⁴³⁴ Some authors distinguish between more types of prize promotions. Cummins and Mullin, for example, lists skill competitions, free draws, instant wins, games and lotteries. (Cummins & Mullin 204.) Some promoters also integrate advertising into interactive competitions, which is sometimes described as “advergaming”. (Cabot *ea* 16) Peattie and Peattie also point out that promoters can aim their competitions at their salesforce (“push competitions”), while other competitions can be aimed at attracting customers (“pull competitions”). [Peattie K & Peattie S “Sales Promotion – Playing to Win?” 1993 *Journal of Marketing Management* 9 255 (“Peattie & Peattie 1993a”) 255.] For purposes of this study, the author will categorise prize promotions based on the elements of skill or chance. This is because those elements play such a crucial role in determining whether or not a prize promotion is regulated by gambling, lotteries and/or consumer protection legislation.

⁴³⁵ Cummins & Mullin 203.

promotions the costs are often dependant on the extent of consumer participation.⁴³⁶ The marketer can give relatively big benefits (prizes) to a limited number of winners, because the marketer does not have to incur expenses in respect of all consumers that participate in the promotion.⁴³⁷ Prize promotions are also unique because they are regulated much more than other types of sales promotions.⁴³⁸

Prize promotions can be of great value to marketers.⁴³⁹ They create excitement amongst consumers, particularly because of the types of prizes that can be offered and the joy involved in discovering whether or not a participant is a winner.⁴⁴⁰ These promotions can lead to increased sales and draw attention to the specific products involved in the competition.⁴⁴¹ They can assist to stimulate demand in off-peak sales seasons.⁴⁴² Prize promotions can potentially let a brand stand out amongst the noise created by advertising in general, particularly since these promotions challenge consumers to do something in order to win a prize.⁴⁴³ Some marketers can also launch prize promotions to counteract promotions that are conducted by their competitors.⁴⁴⁴ Prize promotions afford marketers an opportunity to gain insight about consumers and

⁴³⁶ Cummins & Mullin 203. Also, as opposed to other types of sales promotions (such as temporary discounts), the promoter does not have to reduce the price of the relevant goods or services. (Peattie & Peattie 1993a 259)

⁴³⁷ Cummins & Mullin 203.

⁴³⁸ Cummins & Mullin 203;

⁴³⁹ Peattie K & Peattie S "Sales Promotion Competitions – A Survey" 1993 *Journal of Marketing Management* 9:3 271-286 ("Peattie & Peattie 1993b") 283-285.

⁴⁴⁰ Tillman R & Kirkpatrick CA *Promotion: Persuasive Communication in Marketing* 335. In their work which dates from the 1960s, Tillman & Kirkpatrick mentions exciting prizes such as "swimming pools ... or exotic items such as oil wells, islands, and race horses".⁴⁴⁰ Times might have changed since then. See also Yovovich BG "Sweeps and games take out new claims" *Advertising Age* 3 May 1982 ("Yovovich") M-7, M-30.

⁴⁴¹ G Cook 199; Tillman & Kirkpatrick 335; Peattie & Peattie 1993b 281. Ordinarily, one would expect prize promotions to be used by manufacturers, service providers, retailers and other profit driven businesses to promote their goods and services. However, Peattie points out that prize promotions can also be used to market non-profit organisations effectively. In this context, prize promotions still offer value to the public, while creating brand awareness for the non-profit promoter. These promotional tools also present an opportunity for non-profit marketers to collaborate with business that operate for profit. [Peattie S "Applying sales promotion competitions to nonprofit contexts" 2003 *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 8:4 349-362 ("Peattie 2003") 355-360] S36 of the CPA does not cover the running of promotional competitions by non-profit organisations in particular. The section seems to be aimed at competitions conducted to promote producers, distributors or suppliers, or goods or services. If a non-profit marketer wishes to conduct a chance based promotional competition, it would have to attempt to bring the competition within the ambit of s36 (perhaps by structuring the competition as a promotion of its goods or services), failing which it would have to comply with the more onerous requirements of the Lotteries Act, 1997.

⁴⁴² Peattie & Peattie 1993a 264; Peattie & Peattie 1993b 281.

⁴⁴³ Yovovich M-30.

⁴⁴⁴ Peattie & Peattie 1993b 281-281.

even build up databases of client information as well.⁴⁴⁵ By requiring entrants to answer questions regarding a product or brand, prize promotions can assist marketers to educate consumers about their products.⁴⁴⁶ They can also provide a platform for marketers to collaborate with and benefit from the reputation of other brands if products manufactured by prominent brands are offered as prizes.⁴⁴⁷ As such, if prize promotions are used properly they can be effective promotional tools for marketers.⁴⁴⁸

However, prize promotions do have some drawbacks. Overall, Brown is rather averse to prize promotions.⁴⁴⁹ He identifies a number of challenges, such as mistakes that happen with the implementation of prize promotions and unscrupulous marketers that give competitions a bad reputation.⁴⁵⁰ Cummins and Mullin describe prize promotions as “a minefield, but one that is worth getting through – just watch your step”.⁴⁵¹ Prize promotions also have a high barrier to entry because they often require consumers to purchase products in order to participate or to put in some kind of effort (such as sending in an entry or displaying skill or creativity) in order to enter. As such, they do not always attract consumers in great numbers.⁴⁵² Prize promotions are usually once-off activities that do not ensure consumer loyalty.⁴⁵³ There is often also a significant time period between entry and announcement of the winners, which makes these promotions less appealing for consumers.⁴⁵⁴ Some authors warn that prize promotions can detract from the brands and products being promoted, particularly if the consumer’s focus is more on the promotion than on the actual brand or if something goes wrong during the running of the promotion.⁴⁵⁵ In view of the drawbacks,

⁴⁴⁵ Tillman & Kirkpatrick 335.

⁴⁴⁶ Yovovich M-30.

⁴⁴⁷ Yeshin 168-170. See also G Cook 199.

⁴⁴⁸ In order to be effective, prize promotions need to be managed properly in order to avoid, for example, that customers start buying products only for the sake of participating in a promotion, with the result that some customer loyalty might be lost if the promotion comes to an end or is changed. (Peattie & Peattie 1993b 284-285; Peattie K, Peattie S & Emafo EB “Promotional Competitions as a Strategic Marketing Weapon” 1997 13:8 *Journal of Marketing Management* 13 777 787-788)

⁴⁴⁹ Brown 101-102. See also the challenges identified in Semenik *ea* 546-547 and Belch & Belch 542-543.

⁴⁵⁰ Brown 101. Due to the potential liability that could arise if a competition goes awry, some insurers offer sales promotion insurance. (Peattie & Peattie 1993a 266)

⁴⁵¹ Cummins & Mullin 204.

⁴⁵² Brown 102. The fact that many customers’ entries might not be successful, could also put the public off competitions because they associate them with losing. (Peattie & Peattie 1993a 266)

⁴⁵³ Brown 102.

⁴⁵⁴ Brown 102; Peattie & Peattie 1993a 266.

⁴⁵⁵ See, for example, Belch & Belch 543; Semenik *ea* 546.

organisations should employ prize promotions strategically in their marketing activities and not merely run them because their marketing agencies suggest them or because everyone else is running such promotions.⁴⁵⁶

Legal and regulatory requirements are some of the most significant challenges faced by organisers of prize promotions and promotional competitions in particular. However, these are obstacles that cannot be ignored. In some countries or states, promoters must register their promotional competitions, obtain approvals or file details regarding the competitions with local authorities.⁴⁵⁷ There might also be laws requiring organisers to post bonds or maintain funds in trust accounts as security for the awarding of prizes.⁴⁵⁸ From a United States perspective, Thomas divides the regulatory requirements for running prize promotions into three separate categories: “Fairness and disclosure requirements, restrictions on retail chance promotions and antigambling or lottery laws.”⁴⁵⁹ These legal requirements can be found, even if in different forms, in South Africa’s regulation of promotional competitions as well.⁴⁶⁰ As in many other countries, promoters running competitions in South Africa need to ensure that they familiarise themselves with the relevant legal provisions in order to avoid their competitions falling foul of the law.⁴⁶¹ This can often be a time consuming and costly exercise, but one that promoters need to undertake in order to avoid adverse consequences. As Frank Dierson remarks: “[...] it isn’t criminal intent, but rather inadvertencies that most often trip up companies running sweepstakes.”⁴⁶²

⁴⁵⁶ Peterson F & Kesselman-Turkel J “Through the looking glass” *Advertising Age* 3 May 1982 M-10. (Taylor & Kopp 1991 210)

⁴⁵⁷ For example, China, Russia and some states in the United States of America. Lehman E “China” in *International Promotion Marketing Law Book* (2nd ed) 57; Anyukhina I “Russia” in *International Promotion Marketing Law Book* (2nd ed) 228; Lord & Miller 5.

⁴⁵⁸ New York and Florida are examples of states that have such requirements. Lord & Miller 5.

⁴⁵⁹ Thomas R “The quirks of the law” *Advertising Age* 3 May 1982 M-11 – M-12 (“Thomas”). (Taylor & Kopp 1991 2015)

⁴⁶⁰ Currently, s36 of the Consumer Protection Act, 2008 (“CPA”) regulates promotional competitions. Previously, promotional competitions were governed by s54 of the Lotteries Act, 1997, together with the accompanying regulations. See the discussion in Chapter 5 below.

⁴⁶¹ Cook touches on legal issues in his discussion of competitions, contests and sweepstakes in a South African marketing communication context. (G Cook 199.) He states that “competitions or contests require some skill of participants, and not mere chance, in order for them to take part legally”. He mentions that games of chance require licences because they are lotteries. These statements are incorrect. Even though Cook’s comments were published in 2010 and might have been written before the CPA came into force, games of chance were already lawful at that stage, provided that they complied with the provisions of the Lotteries Act, 1997 and the relevant regulations.

⁴⁶² Frank Dierson quoted in Thomas at M-12.

Having identified various drawbacks, Brown states that a prize promotion can be successful if it creates sufficient excitement, entry is easy, the prize is significant or consumers feel that there is a good possibility of winning the prize.⁴⁶³ Although mentioning that participation levels in prize promotions are low, Shimp states that contests give consumers the opportunity to interact with a brand at a different level.⁴⁶⁴ In particular, he points out that prize promotions on the internet are becoming more important. Cummins and Mullin also view prize promotions as “powerful promotional techniques” with the potential to be very successful, but warn that their effect can wane quite quickly.⁴⁶⁵ In Tillman and Kirkpatrick’s view, these contests draw consumer attention because they give them the opportunity “to play, to compete, to win, to get something for nothing”.⁴⁶⁶

Since prizes play a crucial role in effective prize promotions, Brown suggests that promoters should opt for one substantial prize (or a limited number of big ones), instead of various insignificant prizes.⁴⁶⁷ Cummins and Mullin recommend one big first prize and many prizes for the rest of the winners.⁴⁶⁸ A prize should be relevant to the consumers that will enter.⁴⁶⁹ In Brown’s view, cash prizes are always best, followed by houses, cars and holidays.⁴⁷⁰

2.7 Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to examine the background and context of promotional competitions. At the outset, the key characteristics of gambling and lotteries were identified, chance being the most important of these. It was explained that promotional competitions are in fact forms of gambling, because they involve the allocation of prizes by way of lot or chance. In view of this, gambling was considered in further detail.

To start off with, gambling’s play element was identified. It was recognised that gambling has a purpose for its participants. Promotional competitions, as forms of

⁴⁶³ Brown 102. See also Jethwaney & Jain 515-516.

⁴⁶⁴ Shimp 522.

⁴⁶⁵ Cummins & Mullin 223.

⁴⁶⁶ Tillman & Kirkpatrick 336.

⁴⁶⁷ Brown 101.

⁴⁶⁸ Cummins & Mullin 208.

⁴⁶⁹ Brown 103.

⁴⁷⁰ Brown 103. See also Cummins & Mullin 204.

gambling, are therefore not without value. However, cognisance has to be taken of the gambling element and various views surrounding gambling were examined. It appears that people's views about gambling are considerably influenced by morality and that many people oppose gambling because it allows winners to gain something without working for it.

Even if the moral arguments are set aside, one cannot ignore the fact that gambling has some negative consequences, particularly in the shape of problem gambling. Due to the effects of this upon the gambler and those around him or her, it appears that some kind of regulation was necessary in order to protect participants against the ills that are sometimes associated with gambling. In view of the link to gambling, promotional competitions cannot escape regulation. If such an escape were to be allowed, persons would abuse promotional competitions as loopholes for conducting unlawful gambling.

When examining the legalities regarding promotional competitions, one should also keep in mind that they are principally sales promotion tools. Accordingly, the marketing context of promotional competitions was considered. It was explained that prize promotions are often designed and conducted mainly for purposes of attracting customers and generating sales, and not to serve as lotteries or disguised gambling activities. However, this does not mean that these competitions should not be regulated. For example, the marketing material surrounding promotional competitions could be misleading or deceptive, and competitions processes often go awry. This is where consumer protection law comes into play. Whilst gambling law regulates lawful gambling and prohibits unlawful gambling, consumer protection law regulates the actual running of promotional competitions in order to deal with the issues that might arise in the running of such competitions and the potential abuse of consumers that might be involved.

In conclusion, it is argued that society has moved past the point where activities such as promotional competitions can be regarded as a vice. Instead, they have merit in promoting sales and provide entertainment and diversion to consumers. Even though they share the same elements as regular gambling, it is suggested that far less harm

is associated with them. Accordingly, it is submitted that promotional competitions should be lawful and that the current regulatory approach in South Africa is appropriate.

CHAPTER 3

AN OVERVIEW OF THE HISTORY OF GAMBLING, LOTTERIES AND PROMOTIONAL COMPETITIONS

- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 A brief history from a global perspective
- 3.3 The South African historical context
- 3.4 Conclusion

3.1 Introduction

Societies and legislatures have been grappling with the regulation of gambling activities over the ages. As far back as the times of the ancient Romans, it was deemed necessary to promulgate laws relating to gambling. Even in the present day, legislatures continue to conduct gambling reviews and update the relevant laws. Gambling remains a controversial topic and it is expected that the debate around it will not be settled soon.

This chapter will provide an overview of the history of gambling, lotteries and promotional competitions in order to provide a historical background for this study. It will start with a discussion of gambling in ancient times and conclude with developments in the twenty first century. It will be shown how societies' attitudes towards these activities are ever-changing and how legislatures' approaches to these activities have developed over time. This background information is necessary to inform current considerations regarding the regulation of promotional competitions. The evolution of the marketing function of promotional competitions will be explained as well in order to show that these competitions are not merely gambling activities, but that they have been serving legitimate business purposes across generations. Various court decisions will also be discussed, in order to show the courts' reasoning regarding the essential elements of gambling, particularly lot or chance. Since the elements of lotteries and gambling have remained the same over centuries, it is submitted that these decisions can be used even in the present day to interpret legislation relating to lotteries and promotional competitions.

3.2 A brief history from a global perspective

3.2.1 Ancient times

Lotteries and gambling are not new. Historians and other authors tell us that the roots of those schemes and activities can be traced back to ancient civilisations.¹ However, there seems to be no certainty regarding the exact point in the history of humanity at which gambling was invented. In fact, some suggest that gambling might even predate humanity. Schwartz refers to studies and research that have shown that even animals seem to have an appetite for risk and gambling, and intimates that primates and other animals that predate humans might have discovered gambling before us.²

Lotteries, gambling and promotional competitions might not have existed in ancient times in the same form as today, but the concept of conducting an activity in which an outcome is determined by chance was present even in those societies.³ As remarked by the Lotteries and Gambling Board, gambling was not invented in the previous century, but has been with humanity for ages.⁴ In that report, the authors point out that the history of gambling is closely related to the history of “a basic characteristic of the human being: To play; to take a chance; to hazard; to risk; to game; to chance his luck”.⁵

¹ See, for example, Williams FE *Lotteries, Laws and Morals* (“Williams FE 1958”) 22-23; C l’Estrange Ewen *Lotteries and sweepstakes* 19-22; Curtin L & Bernardo K *The History of Sweepstakes* (“Curtin & Bernardo”) 11-22; Ashton J *A History of English Lotteries* (“Ashton”) 2-3; Ezell JS *Fortune’s Merry Wheel: The Lottery in America* (“Ezell”) 2; Kopp SW & Taylor CR “Games, Contests, Sweepstakes, and Lotteries: Prize Promotion and Public Policy” in Sheth JN (series ed) & Fullerton RA (ed) *Research in Marketing: Explorations in the History of Marketing* 151 (“Kopp & Taylor”) 152; Ottaway J *The UK National Lottery and Charitable Gambling* (“Ottaway”) 27-30; Murray HJR *A History of Board-Games other than Chess* 7-9 (“Murray”); Jones JP *Gambling Yesterday and Today* 13-21 (“Jones”); Wiehahn NE (chairman) *Main Report on Gambling in the Republic of South Africa* (RP 85/1995) (“LGB Main Report”) 258; Schwartz DG *Roll the Bones: The History of Gambling* (“Schwartz”) 6; Brenner R with Brenner GA *Gambling and Speculation: A Theory, a History, and a Future of Some Human Decisions* (“Brenner & Brenner”) 1-18.

² Schwartz 5. He refers to a study conducted by Duke University in which researchers found that macaque monkeys choose riskier opportunities over more predictable ones. In order to get more juice from a target, the monkeys would go for a riskier object, even though they knew that some of the other targets always gave them juice even though the amount of juice was less.

³ Ottaway 26-27.

⁴ LGB Main Report 25. The Board remarked: “The oldest ‘profession’ known to civilised society may very well be prostitution, but probably just as old as a leisure-time activity or as a more serious endeavour is the phenomenon of gambling.” (LGB Main Report 25)

⁵ LGB Main Report 25.

The role of lot and chance in life has been recognised by people since the dawn of civilisation. Yet, in those times, people did not only acknowledge its role, but lot was often actively used in practice to take decisions and for divination purposes. The ancient Hebrews threw lots to determine matters.⁶ The Old Testament of the Bible contains numerous accounts of instances where lots were used to determine divine will or the outcome of a situation. Lots were used, for example, to select scapegoats, to allocate land, to identify culprits and, in Jonah's case, to select the person that had to be thrown into the sea.⁷ In the New Testament, the soldiers used lots to divide up Jesus's clothes after his crucifixion and the disciples used lots to determine a new disciple after the death of Judas Iscariot.⁸

Lots were used in other societies and religions too, including those of ancient Egyptian, Indian and East Asian peoples.⁹ Egyptian mythology contains tales of the gods playing gambling games, but the walls of Egyptian tombs and ruins also depict gambling activities of ordinary people who lived in ancient times.¹⁰ Early Indian writings contain numerous accounts of divination and gambling and ancient hymns even contain songs about wives lost and lives ruined by gambling.¹¹ The Chinese used diviners too and some oracles gained recognition as great scholars, the *I Ching* perhaps being one of the most well-known examples of Chinese texts that relate to divination.¹²

As has been the case throughout history, people in early times also struggled with the unpredictable nature of life and tried to find guidance in tools of divination.¹³ Objects such as bones, nuts, pebbles, shaped sticks, shells, beans and slips of paper were used for divination and even to determine the outcome of legal trials.¹⁴

⁶ Jones 16.

⁷ Ewen 19-20; Ottaway 27-28; Williams FE 1958 22-23.

⁸ Matthew 27:35; Acts 1:26; Ottaway 27.

⁹ Ewen 20.

¹⁰ Jones 14; Schwartz 10-11;

¹¹ Schwartz 12-15. Schwartz quotes the thirty-fourth hymn in the tenth mandala of the *Rig Veda* completed between 1500 and 1200 BC), which ends with the following stanza: "My mother-in-law hates me; my wife pushes me away. In his defeat the gambler finds none to pity him. No one has use for a gambler, like an aged horse put up for sale". (Schwartz 14-15)

¹² Schwartz 15-17; Curtin & Bernardo 13-14.

¹³ LGB Main Report 26.

¹⁴ Ewen 20; Ezell 2; Murray 7-8; LGB Main Report 26.

Divination activities probably started off as “odds and evens” games, an activity that persists even in the present day.¹⁵ However, the tools used to predict the future evolved as time progressed. Divination practitioners started using hucklebones (*astragali*) to predict what the future might hold in store.¹⁶ In due course, the hucklebones were shaped into dice. At some stage, dice had more than the six sides that are found in common dice these days. The oldest six-sided dice was found in the north of Iraq (the location of historic Mesopotamia), while some credit the ancient Lydians for inventing the cubic dice.¹⁷

Although modern day lottery instruments are scientifically checked for accuracy and independent auditors supervise lottery draws, it might not have been the case in ancient times. Some people preferred using objects that did not produce absolutely random results. When using those objects, the diviner had to interpret the pattern in which objects such as bones or shells fell on the ground or even by inspecting excrement or the organs of animals.¹⁸ On the one hand, those practices allowed a margin for interpretation in order to give some flexibility and colour to the outcome.¹⁹ On the other, it allowed the diviner to steer the prediction to a sometimes more pleasing result or to appease the client.²⁰ This also led to another aspect of gambling that is encountered even today: cheating.²¹

Apart from the divinatory uses, lot and chance also fulfilled less serious functions in ancient times. Lot and chance have been incorporated in games and pastimes since early times and archaeologists have discovered evidence of rudimentary chance based games in societies as old as the San people.²² As such, tools that were initially used for divination and forecasting the future became instruments of pastime and play.²³

¹⁵ Schwartz 6. The Bible also refers to the use of the Urim and the Thummim which were used in Old Testament times to determine the will of God. (See, for example, Exodus 28:30 and Ezra 2:63)

¹⁶ Schwartz 6; Murray 8.

¹⁷ Schwartz 8; Murray 8.

¹⁸ Schwartz 6. Some diviners used more pleasant smelling tools, such as rose petals or tea leaves. (Schwartz 6)

¹⁹ Schwartz 6.

²⁰ LGB Main Report 26

²¹ Loaded dice were discovered in ancient Egyptian tombs (LGB Main Report 26) and early Indian records mention “clogged” dice (Jones 14).

²² Jones 13.

²³ LGB Main Report 26.

The objects used to cast lots also gave meaning to the word “lot”. It seems that the word “lot” developed from the Teutonic word “hleut”, which was used to describe objects used for divinatory purposes, for example pebbles or beans.²⁴ In due course, the terms *lotteria* (Italian) and *loterie* (French) were developed to indicate games of chance.²⁵ In later times, the word “lot” obtained a wider meaning too, referring also to a person’s fate and destiny in languages such as Dutch and English.²⁶

3.2.2 The ancient Greeks

Gambling was a part of the lives of the ancient Greeks, but to some authors it seems that the Greeks were less addicted to it than other ancient societies.²⁷ Jones argues that this was perhaps the result of strict laws and harsh sanctions and he refers to Aristotle’s critical views about gambling.²⁸ Yet, gambling featured prominently in various facets of ancient Greek society, whether sacred or secular. Greek mythology even ascribed the origin of the universe to a gambling game between the gods Hades, Poseidon and Zeus, while another god, Hermes, was the god of divination as well as gambling and luck.²⁹ The *Iliad* also contains an account relating to the casting of lots to determine who will fight in a particular battle and describes how the god Zeus used a divination device to determine who would win a battle and which hero would die.³⁰

Gambling formed a part of everyday life in ancient Greek times as well. Ancient Greek art depicts various forms of gambling and dice games, dice being used in both games as well as divination.³¹ It appears that they enjoyed chance based games like “odds and evens” and “heads or tails” as well, and cheating happened in some ancient Greek games as evidenced by altered dice discovered by archaeologists.³² The drawing of lots featured in their lives as well, and it appears that they often used a boy who had

²⁴ Ezell 2.

²⁵ Ezell 2; LGB Main Report 26.

²⁶ LGB Main Report 26; Ottaway 27-28; Ewen 24-25.

²⁷ Jones 16. Jones remarks that the Romans and Teutons, or the Oriental people, may have been much more involved in gambling.

²⁸ Jones 16. Jones notes that Aristotle placed gamblers in the same category as robbers and thieves.

²⁹ Schwartz 22; LGB Main Report 26.

³⁰ Curtin & Bernardo 14; Ewen 21; LGB Main Report 26.

³¹ Schwartz 24.

³² Schwartz 23, 25. Some dice with missing or duplicated numbers have been unearthed.

two living parents to draw a lot (a boy whose parent or parents have died being regarded as unlucky).³³ Lots were sometimes used to appoint public officials too.³⁴

However, gambling games were not the only popular games in those times. Games and contests of skill also featured prominently in ancient Greek society, being the origin of the present-day Olympic Games. These games were accompanied by gambling, with the public betting on matters such as the achievements of the athletes and the outcome of horse and chariot races.³⁵

3.2.3 The ancient Romans

The early Romans' lives were filled with superstition and playing with chance and fortune. They were greatly influenced by fortune and fate, and sought the advice of astrologers, fortune-tellers and other practitioners of divination.³⁶ The goddess Fortuna was a prominent figure in their belief system and the ancient Romans associated her with fate as well as prosperity.³⁷

With the rise of the Roman Empire gambling games flourished.³⁸ The ancient Romans became specialists at casting hucklebones (known as *tali*) and playing dice (known as *tesserae*).³⁹ Even children participated in various forms of chance based games.⁴⁰ The Romans were fond of games like "odds and evens" and activities in which a person had to guess in which closed hand an object was hidden, while they participated in formal gambling played at dedicated tables.⁴¹ At Pompeii, archaeologists also discovered manipulated dices used for cheating.⁴² The Romans are well-known for

³³ Curtin & Bernardo 14; Ewen 22.

³⁴ Curtin & Bernardo 17.

³⁵ Schwartz 25. Schwartz notes that games were not held only at Olympus, but also at Delphi, Corinth and Nemea.

³⁶ Schwartz 25.

³⁷ Curtin & Bernardo 15. Schwartz quotes Pliny the Elder, an ancient Roman philosopher who stated: "We are so much at the mercy of chance that Chance is our God." (Schwartz 25)

³⁸ Jones 19; Schwartz 25.

³⁹ Schwartz 26.

⁴⁰ Jones 19.

⁴¹ Jones 20. Evidence of gambling can also be seen in the ruins of Pompeii (the ancient city that was preserved when the nearby volcano erupted), for example writing on one wall welcoming gamblers, and gambling related graffiti and inscriptions about gambling winnings contained on other walls. [Schwartz 29; Jones 20; Drzazga J *Wheels of Fortune* ("Drzazga") 166] At Pompeii, archaeologists also discovered manipulated dices used for cheating. (Drzazga 166) Archaeologists have discovered evidence of gambling on numerous ancient flat surfaces in Rome, located in places such as the Forum and the Coliseum. [Lanciani R "Gambling and Cheating in Ancient Rome" 1892 *The North American Review* 155:428 97 ("Lanciani") 97-98]

⁴² Drzazga 166.

their gladiators and the public displays put on in arenas and amphitheatres. A lot of betting took place during these ancient shows and gamblers placed wagers on various aspects of these public spectacles.⁴³

The ancient Romans incorporated lots in various facets of their lives, but it seems that their lotteries constituted a form of entertainment or amusement, instead of the present day activity in which people purchase tickets with the hope of winning sizeable cash prizes.⁴⁴ Yet, the Romans are credited with developing the lottery in a basic form.⁴⁵ In their form of lottery they used rods or plates, called *sortes*, which contained inscriptions on them.⁴⁶ These lots were often used for divination and to predict the future, although the philosopher Cicero was highly critical of this and decried the practice as fraudulent.⁴⁷ Romans sometimes also used lots to allocate gifts to their guests when entertaining.⁴⁸ Lots played a part in the justice system as well and were used to select judges and, at times, to indicate who should be executed.⁴⁹ Some Roman officials were selected by way of lot too.⁵⁰

The Roman emperors seemed to be very fond of gambling.⁵¹ Augustus Caesar enjoyed gambling as a pastime and entertainment, although winning was not necessarily his objective.⁵² He also sponsored lottery prizes and organised a lottery to generate revenue for projects in the city of Rome.⁵³ Caligula, on the other hand, was a ruthless gambler and wanted to win, whatever it took.⁵⁴ Another emperor, Claudius, was a keen gambler as well, and even wrote a book about dice throwing.⁵⁵ Nero, who succeeded him, spent vast sums of money on gambling.⁵⁶ He also held lotteries in which slaves or gold could be won.⁵⁷ Gambling was a part of Julius Caesar's life too.

⁴³ Schwartz 29.

⁴⁴ Ezell 2; Ashton 3.

⁴⁵ Ewen 20.

⁴⁶ Ewen 20; Curtin & Bernardo 14.

⁴⁷ Ewen 20-21; Curtin & Bernard 14-15. In Cicero's view, the practice of divination encouraged superstition and error. (Ewen 21, quoting Cicero's *De Divinatione*)

⁴⁸ Ewen 21; Ashton 3.

⁴⁹ Curtin & Bernardo 17.

⁵⁰ Schwartz 26.

⁵¹ Some ancient Romans regarded the Caesars' palaces to be "gambling dens". (Lanciani 103-104)

⁵² Schwartz 27.

⁵³ Curtin & Bernardo 16.

⁵⁴ Schwartz 27-28.

⁵⁵ Schwartz 28.

⁵⁶ Schwartz 28.

⁵⁷ Ezell 2; Kopp & Taylor 152; Curtin & Bernardo 16.

Being inspired by a vision, he famously decided to cross the river Rubicon and conquer Rome with his army. Once he had resolved to do so, he declared: “*Alea iacta est.*” This can be translated as “the die is cast” or “the gambling is on” and shows that Julius Caesar relied on chance and fate in his destiny too.⁵⁸

Although it is quite clear that ancient Romans of all classes participated in gambling, commentators highlight a hypocrisy or dichotomy in this regard.⁵⁹ While gambling was prevalent, and even enjoyed by the emperors, gambling and games of chance were officially illegal under Roman laws (apart for some exceptions, such as betting on a few specific activities and gambling during the Saturnalia feast time).⁶⁰ Publicly, gambling was disapproved of and “gambler” was even a slightly disparaging term.⁶¹ Yet, the gambling carried on and laws were flouted. Some philosophers pointed out that the laws were ineffective, while many of those philosophers were also very critical of gambling and regarded it as a vice.⁶²

It seems that Roman laws against gambling were passed in order to protect society from the ills caused by gambling.⁶³ Initially, those laws might not have been very successful, perhaps because of the lack of proper enforcement.⁶⁴ However, the laws became stricter and offenders stood trial and faced more substantial penalties.⁶⁵ The laws developed further when Emperor Hadrian issued the Perpetual Edict.⁶⁶ Another important milestone in the development of Roman gambling law was reached when the *Corpus Iuris Civilis* was completed in the reign of Justinian.⁶⁷ His role as head of

⁵⁸ Schwartz 26. Carnelley M & Schrage E “Gambling Regulation: A comparison between the Roman and South African gambling laws” in Hoctor SV & Schwikkard PJ (eds) *The Exemplary Scholar: Essays in Honour of John Milton* (“Carnelley & Schrage”) 253 and fn 9. Schwartz, at 26, refers to a similar event in modern day history when, upon giving instructions to proceed with D Day and invade Normandy, General Eisenhower used another gambling related reference: “We’ve gone all in.”

⁵⁹ Carnelley & Schrage 254-255; Jones 20; Schwartz 28-29; Faris SB “Changing Public Policy and the Evolution of Roman Civil and Criminal Law on Gambling 2012 *UNLV Gaming Law Journal* 3:2 199 (“Faris”) 200.

⁶⁰ Carnelley & Schrage 254; Schwartz 28; Jones 20; Ewen 21. Some forms of gambling, like betting on sports, were however allowed. (Faris 199)

⁶¹ Carnelley & Schrage 254; Schwartz 28; Faris 200.

⁶² Carnelley & Schrage 254-255. Some philosophers regarded gamblers as criminals, greedy and regarded them the same as adulterers.

⁶³ Carnelley & Schrage 254.

⁶⁴ Carnelley & Schrage 255; Jones 20. Faris notes that gambling was regarded as a vice, but the Roman laws against gambling were not enforced consistently and across the board. (Faris 199)

⁶⁵ Carnelley & Schrage 256.

⁶⁶ Carnelley & Schrage 256.

⁶⁷ Faris notes that Justinian’s laws brought about a sea change in Roman gambling law, when dedicated edicts were passed in order to outlaw specific forms of gambling. (Faris 212)

the Roman Catholic Church might have shaped his attitude regarding gambling law.⁶⁸ While Justinian was emperor, the prohibitions against gambling became much stricter and he added civil remedies in an attempt to curb the evils he blamed on gambling.⁶⁹

While gambling might already have been very popular during the peak of Roman civilisation, it seems that it became even more widespread and prevalent during the decline of the Roman Empire. People became addicted to the activity and would be engrossed in gambling for days on end. Eventually, gambling became so rife that some authors identify it as one of the contributors to the ultimate fall of the Roman Empire.⁷⁰

3.2.4 The development of lotteries

The lottery, in its modern form, appears to have its roots in the early Renaissance. Some authors are of the view that the modern lottery originated in Italy during the 1500s.⁷¹ However, according to Ashton, the earliest account of a lottery he could find related to a lottery held in 1446 by the widow of Jan van Eyck, the Dutch painter who lived in Bruges.⁷² There are also records of various lotteries held in cities in the Low Countries, including Ghent, Utrecht and l'Écluse at around the same time.⁷³

It appears that early modern lotteries could have originated from schemes that might have been some of the earliest, rudimentary promotional competitions. Both Ashton and Ewen refer to lotteries held by Italian merchants (particularly in Genoa and Venice) in order to dispose of merchandise that did not sell well.⁷⁴ Ewen refers to another author, Johann Beckmann, who wrote about merchants who kept “urns of fortune”.⁷⁵ Apparently, the merchants wrote the names of items on lots that were kept in those

⁶⁸ Carnelley & Schrage 259. Faris remarks that Justinian's gambling related laws were driven by a desire to restore order to the Roman Empire and deal with the economic and social crises faced by it. (Faris 213)

⁶⁹ Carnelley & Schrage 260.

⁷⁰ Jones 20; Schwartz 29-30. Faris notes that Marcellinus, the Roman historian from the fourth century AD, wrote with disgust about the Romans' preoccupation with gambling and the activity's negative consequences on the Roman society. (Faris 203)

⁷¹ Ezell 2; Ashton 4. According to Brenner and Brenner, Western Europe's first private lottery was conducted in Florence in 1530. (Brenner & Brenner 9)

⁷² Ashton 4;

⁷³ Ewen 25-28.

⁷⁴ Ewen 23-24; Ashton 3-4. See also Van Niekerk JP *The Development of the Principles of Insurance Law in the Netherlands from 1500 to 1800* 104.

⁷⁵ Ewen refers to Beckmann J *History of Ancient Institutions*. Ewen 24. See also Curtin & Bernardo 47.

urns and customers were given the opportunity to draw lots and win the relevant items. Although both Ashton and Ewen do not dispute that the Italians conducted such promotions, they do not believe that those lotteries were the oldest modern lotteries.⁷⁶ Nonetheless, the merchants' lotteries show that there is a very old connection between lotteries and the promotion of sales.⁷⁷

From the time of the Renaissance lotteries became prevalent in Europe. The first cash prize lottery appears to have been organised in Florence in around 1530.⁷⁸ After that, lotteries spread to other Italian cities and the Italian National Lottery was born.⁷⁹ Lotteries also became popular in Spain and the German States.⁸⁰ In France, the lottery was identified as a useful means to increase the government's finances and lottery revenues were used for various projects.⁸¹

The lottery concept found its way to England too. Ewen points out that historians do not mention much about lotteries during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, but that lotteries must have been organised in England in those times because of their popularity in neighbouring Europe.⁸² The first prominent lottery in England was the Queen's Lottery held during the reign of Elizabeth I in order to raise funds to improve harbours and the inspiration for the lottery could have stemmed from the success of lotteries held in the Low Countries.⁸³ The Queen's Lottery promised great prizes in cash, plate ware, linen, tapestries and the like, and the intention was to return part of the entry fees to entrants.⁸⁴ Lottery fees were charged and entrants had to write a poem in order to enter.⁸⁵ As a means to encourage entries, the lottery's proclamation mentioned that if people travelled to certain cities to enter the lottery, they would not be prosecuted if they committed minor offences while they were there.⁸⁶ However, it

⁷⁶ Ewen 24; Ashton 3-4.

⁷⁷ Curtin & Bernardo, at 47, also refer to a merchant's lottery that was licensed in England during 1606. Apparently, there were complaints that the specific lottery became "a public nuisance".

⁷⁸ Curtin & Bernardo 43; Ewen 30.

⁷⁹ Curtin & Bernardo 43.

⁸⁰ Curtin & Bernardo 43-44; Ewen 30.

⁸¹ Ezell 3; Ewen 30.

⁸² Ewen 29.

⁸³ Dean D "Elizabeth's Lottery: Political Culture and State Formation in Early Modern England" 2011 *The Journal of British Studies* 587 (Dean) 591; Ewen 34-64; Ezell 3-4; Ashton 4-24; Curtin & Bernardo 44-46.

⁸⁴ Ashton 6-9.

⁸⁵ Curtin & Bernardo 44-45.

⁸⁶ Ashton 9-10.

seems that the indulgence was not applied in practice and Ashton mentions a record of a person who was imprisoned despite the proclamation's promise.⁸⁷

The Queen's Lottery was introduced in 1567, but the public was sceptic and hesitant to enter.⁸⁸ At the time, this was blamed on the incompetence of the people responsible for marketing the lottery as well as the fact that the lottery was a foreign concept to the public.⁸⁹ The mayor of London had to issue a proclamation to confirm the legitimacy of the Queen's Lottery and the date of the drawing (called a "reading" in those days) had to be postponed in January 1568 in order to attract more participation.⁹⁰ Yet, the rate of entries remained unsatisfactory. The Lords of the Council then sent out representatives to the towns to apply pressure on the people to enter the lottery.⁹¹ Only then did the process gain traction. The draw finally took place in 1569 and took a long time to complete – it started on 11 January and continued until 6 May 1569.⁹² In the end, the lottery was not very successful since only ten percent of the 400 000 lots had been purchased.⁹³

Perhaps due to the poor performance of the Queen's Lottery, the English government did not conduct another lottery for a number of years.⁹⁴ Despite this, private lotteries were licensed and it seems that they did quite well, generating profit for the individuals running those lotteries as well as providing funds for water supply projects.⁹⁵ During the same time, the merchant's lottery made its appearance in England as well. Records reflect that an Italian businessman obtained royal permission to hold a lottery in which some pieces of his merchandise were offered as prizes.⁹⁶ Some shopkeepers also promoted the sale of their goods by offering free private lottery tickets with every purchase.⁹⁷

⁸⁷ Ashton 10.

⁸⁸ Curtin & Bernardo 46.

⁸⁹ Dean 587.

⁹⁰ Ashton 20.

⁹¹ Ashton 21-22.

⁹² Ashton 24.

⁹³ Dean 587.

⁹⁴ Dean 611.

⁹⁵ Ashton 28-59.

⁹⁶ Curtin & Bernardo 47.

⁹⁷ Bender E *Tickets to Fortune* (Bender) 100.

The next milestone in English lottery history can be found in the early 1600s, when a series of prominent English lotteries were organised in order to generate funds for the building of the colony of Virginia in the New World (America).⁹⁸ These lotteries, known as the “Virginia Standing Lotteries”, were private lotteries and were initially quite successful, although they were eventually closed because of abuse and fraud.⁹⁹ The running of state and private lotteries in England continued during the next two centuries, although there were various attempts to regulate or ban them. However, in 1826, the English state lotteries were halted, even though some private lotteries were allowed to continue.¹⁰⁰ But, by 1845, anti-lottery legislation became very strict and even the promotion of lotteries in the press became illegal.¹⁰¹ Despite the success of some lotteries and their revenue potential, fraud, mismanagement and abuse of the public led to their demise in England.

The brief overview set out above relates mostly to lotteries in England. However, lotteries developed and flourished in various other countries at the same time. In North America, lotteries were operated from the early days of colonisation.¹⁰² They were in many instances held to raise funds for building and improvements, and contributed, for example, to building work at Yale and Harvard.¹⁰³ Lotteries also provided funding for the American Revolutionary War.¹⁰⁴ However, as was the case in England, lotteries developed a reputation for taking poor people’s money, abusing and misleading the public and general mismanagement.¹⁰⁵ Based on changes in the American’s society’s moral views, lotteries started to offend certain parts of society too.¹⁰⁶ This eventually led to the abolition of most lotteries in North America during the nineteenth century, the Louisiana Lottery being the last lottery to be banned in 1892.¹⁰⁷

⁹⁸ Curtin & Bernardo 47-48; Ashton 28-29.

⁹⁹ Curtin & Bernardo 51; Ezell 4-8.

¹⁰⁰ Curtin & Bernardo 61; Bender 104-105; Ashton 265-278; Raven J “The Abolition of the English State Lotteries” 1991 *The Historical Journal* 371-389.

¹⁰¹ Curtin & Bernardo 62; Ezell 9-11.

¹⁰² See Ezell 12-284 for an account of the lottery’s history in America.

¹⁰³ Ewen 31. Unknown “Lotteries” 1933 *Bulletin of the Business Historical Society* 7:4 1 (“Unknown 1933”) 1.

¹⁰⁴ Unknown 1933 1-3.

¹⁰⁵ Bender 126; Taylor CR & Kopp SW “Games, Contests, and Sweepstakes Run Afoul: A State of Legal Disorder” 1991 *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* 10:1 199-213 (“Taylor & Kopp 1991”) 203; Blanche EE “Lotteries Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow” 1950 *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* Vol 269 71 (“Blanche”) 73.

¹⁰⁶ Taylor & Kopp 1991 203.

¹⁰⁷ Bender 127; Jones 140; Unknown 1933 5.

Alongside lotteries, other forms of gambling continued to be popular around the world during and after the Renaissance. In America, gambling was participated in even before the arrival of the European settlers.¹⁰⁸ When the Europeans arrived in the New World, they brought their gambling activities with them as well.¹⁰⁹ One finds the history of gambling intertwined with major events such as North America's War of Independence and there are even accounts of some of the American presidents' fondness for gambling.¹¹⁰ The notorious Wild West also played an important part in America's gambling history.¹¹¹

In Britain, race betting and card games became increasingly popular.¹¹² Gambling remained ever-present, even though some anti-gambling laws were passed, for instance during the 1740s.¹¹³ Nevertheless, people continued to gamble, although the activity might have stayed out of public until regulated gambling was again legalised in 1961.¹¹⁴ Yet, horse race betting continued to be a popular, legal activity in Britain. The gambling scene remained present in other parts of the world as well, particularly in European colonies and the main continent, where gambling at spas, for instance, was quite popular.¹¹⁵ Well-known gambling hotspots such as Hong Kong and Macau were born during colonial days as well.¹¹⁶

3.2.5 The rise of contests, sweepstakes, games and similar schemes

In Britain and the United States of America, lotteries were banned during the nineteenth century. However, this inspired people to conduct lotteries in new forms, while trying to avoid anti-lottery legislation. A fondness for gambling, but also merchants' desire to promote sales, led to the development of competitions, games and sweepstakes that were often lotteries in disguise.¹¹⁷

¹⁰⁸ Schwartz 135-138.

¹⁰⁹ Schwartz 138-139.

¹¹⁰ Schwartz 138-157; Jones 23-24.

¹¹¹ Schwartz 214-268.

¹¹² Schwartz 158-180.

¹¹³ Jones 23; Schwartz 159.

¹¹⁴ Jones 23, 26.

¹¹⁵ Schwartz 182-241.

¹¹⁶ Schwartz 217-222.

¹¹⁷ Kopp & Taylor 156.

When following the history of these schemes, one must bear the elements of a lottery in mind, as well as the distinction between lotteries and contests.¹¹⁸ In a lottery, entrants pay consideration for the opportunity to win a prize, which is awarded by way of lot or chance. In a contest, success is determined by skill and not by lot, luck or chance. Whenever promotional schemes came before courts or authorities, these elements (or the lack thereof) were closely scrutinized in order to determine whether the schemes amounted to lotteries (in which case they were often declared to be illegal).¹¹⁹ However, these elements could be difficult to interpret. Due to the uncertainty of the outcome of court cases about lotteries, Ewen remarks that those cases, in themselves, became lotteries.¹²⁰

The gift enterprise is one of the first forms of the modern prize promotion and perhaps one of the parents of the promotional competition as we know it today. Gift enterprises date back to the eighteenth century and became particularly popular halfway through the nineteenth century.¹²¹ These enterprises entailed schemes by which businesses tried to attract custom and encourage sales by giving customers the opportunity to win a prize by way of chance.¹²² In these schemes, customers were often given state lottery tickets or tickets to lotteries organised by the shopkeepers themselves.¹²³ Ashton, whose work dates back to 1893, warned his readers against these enterprises, calling them “losing games”.¹²⁴ In the United States, the laws were changed in 1867 in order to ban them.¹²⁵

At this time, legislatures exempted art unions (organisations founded to promote the sale of art) from lottery legislation. These unions held lotteries in which works of art were distributed by way of lotteries.¹²⁶ The exemption from the legislation led to the growth of those unions as well as some abuse of the exemption.¹²⁷

¹¹⁸ Curtin & Bernardo 94; Kopp & Taylor 156-157.

¹¹⁹ See, for example, the American cases discussed by Curtin & Bernardo. (Curtin & Bernardo 92-93, 97-98, 100, 103-106, 113, 115-116, 118-199)

¹²⁰ Ewen 312.

¹²¹ Curtin & Bernardo 93.

¹²² Curtin & Bernardo 92; FE Williams *Flexible-Participation Lotteries* (“FE Williams 1938”).

¹²³ Curtin & Bernardo 93; Ewen 305-206; Ashton 293-296; FE Williams 1938 3.

¹²⁴ Ashton 292.

¹²⁵ Curtin & Bernardo 93.

¹²⁶ Ashton 331.

¹²⁷ Ewen 299-304.

During the second half of the nineteenth century, particularly in England, newspapers started various schemes to promote sales and generate revenue.¹²⁸ Ewen classifies these schemes as disguised lotteries (he calls them “newspaper lotteries”) and regards them as attempts to flout anti-lottery legislation.¹²⁹ These newspaper lotteries took on many forms. Missing word competitions were popular.¹³⁰ In these competitions, newspapers would omit a word from a sentence. A reader, on paying an entry fee, stood a chance to win a prize if they correctly guessed the missing word. The newspapers did not keep the entry fees for themselves, but distributed the fees amongst the winners. The missing word competitions eventually ended up in court and were declared to be unlawful lotteries.¹³¹

Limerick competitions were similar to the missing word competitions, except that entrants had to come up with the last line for a limerick.¹³² Initially it appeared that skill determined success in these competitions and that they were therefore not lotteries.¹³³ However, it became apparent that the entries were not actually judged, that all entries were not even read and that sub-standard entries sometimes won in those competitions.¹³⁴ The authorities concluded that luck in fact determined who would be the winner and accordingly banned the competitions on account of being lotteries.¹³⁵

In the United States, merchants and businessmen recognised competitions’ potential to promote business and sales as well. However, prize promotions only become truly popular and prevalent in that country during the twentieth century.¹³⁶ Curtin and Bernardo suggest that legal lotteries were still satisfying the public’s appetite for games of chance during the nineteenth century.¹³⁷ However, one of the most

¹²⁸ Miers D *Regulating Commercial Gambling* (“Miers 2004”) 176-184.

¹²⁹ Ewen 307.

¹³⁰ Ashton 339-346; Bender 142-145; Ewen 307-308.

¹³¹ Bender 144-145; Ewen 308. For example, in the English case of *Barclay v Pearson* [1893] 2 Ch 154 the court decided that a missing word competition was a lottery, because the outcome depended on whether the winner’s entry matched the organiser’s entry, and not on the skill displayed by the participant. (Miers 2004 178)

¹³² Bender 146; Ewen 309-311.

¹³³ Bender 145.

¹³⁴ Bender 145; Ewen 310.

¹³⁵ Bender 145; Ewen 310. Miers notes that the British government initially did not regard the limerick competitions as illegal, but the Joint Select Committee on Lotteries and Indecent Advertisements was of the view that missing word competitions and limerick contests were “surrounded by similar evils”. (Miers 2004 178-179)

¹³⁶ Curtin & Bernardo 107-123; Kopp & Taylor 158-164.

¹³⁷ Curtin & Bernardo 91-92

prominent prize promotions organised in America during the 1800s was in fact not a lottery, but a skill contest.¹³⁸ PT Barnum (a concert promoter) decided to bring Jenny Lind (a famous opera singer) to the United States.¹³⁹ In order to promote the concerts and ticket sales, he organised a contest in which members of the public could write lyrics for a song.¹⁴⁰ Entries were to be judged and the winning entry to be sung by Lind during the concerts.¹⁴¹ The competition generated enormous attention and ticket sales were boosted because people wanted to hear the famous singer performing the winning song, thus demonstrating the marketing power of a competition.¹⁴²

At the end of the nineteenth century and into the first half of the twentieth century, Americans started to exploit prize promotions in earnest.¹⁴³ Promoters devised various schemes to promote sales, in some instances to make money from entry fees as well. Often, these schemes had to be tested in the courts. The question was usually whether a competition required consideration from entrants in order for them to participate. A couple of court cases centred on this, but in some of those the courts found that the competitions were not unlawful. *Yellowstone Kit v State*¹⁴⁴ was one of those cases.¹⁴⁵ In that matter, Yellowstone Kit was a travelling medicine man who sold various medicines and lotions. He held shows in the evening in order to promote his goods. He gave the public free lottery tickets and held a draw on the final night of his stay in town. In order to stand a chance to win, ticket holders had to be present at the draw. Yellowstone Kit charged entry fees for the final night's show, but made it clear that ticket holders could attend the draw for free. The court acquitted the salesman on the basis that entrants did not have to pay anything in order to participate in the prize draw. Some further judgements followed in which the courts held that the relevant

¹³⁸ Curtin & Bernardo 90-91.

¹³⁹ Lind's visit to the United States is also regarded as a watermark in the development of live music in America and mass culture in general. [Waksman S "Selling the Nightingale: P.T. Barnum, Jenny Lind, and the management of the American crowd" 2011 *Arts Marketing: An International Journal* 1:2 108 ("Waksman") 108-109]

¹⁴⁰ Waksman 112.

¹⁴¹ The winning entry was "Greeting to America", with lyrics by Bayard Taylor and music by Jules Benedict. (Waksman 117)

¹⁴² Curtin & Bernardo 91; Waksman 112.

¹⁴³ Various forms of contests became quite popular, including contests that required entrants to formulate lists of things that products could be used for as well as letter writing contests. (Kopp & Taylor 158-19)

¹⁴⁴ 88 Ala. 196, 7 So. 338 (1890).

¹⁴⁵ Curtin & Bernardo 95-98; FE Williams 1958 95-104; Kopp & Taylor 157.

competitions were not unlawful lotteries, because consideration was not a requirement for entry into those competitions.¹⁴⁶

However, the American courts became stricter in due course. In one case, for example, the court concluded that a newspaper conducted an illegal lottery because winners had to go to the newspaper's offices to claim their prizes, even though no entry fees were involved.¹⁴⁷ The courts and authorities reasoned that if a promoter required any kind of effort or exertion from an entrant, that requirement would amount to consideration and would render the competition an illegal lottery.¹⁴⁸ The laws also required post offices to confiscate illegal lottery materials.¹⁴⁹ The post offices applied a stringent policy in this regard and organisers steered away from chance based competitions, opting for skill based contests instead.¹⁵⁰ As such, contests became very popular during the first half of the twentieth century and involved challenges such as word guessing, jingle writing or letter writing contests in which entrants had to explain why they liked their favourite products.¹⁵¹

During the 1930s, the Irish Hospitals Sweepstakes was launched, setting the scene for promotional sweepstakes that would become extremely popular in the United States later in that century.¹⁵² The Irish Hospitals Sweepstakes was a lottery run by a private trust for the benefit of Irish hospitals.¹⁵³ Lotteries were not generally lawful in Ireland at that time, but the Irish Hospitals Sweepstakes received a special dispensation.¹⁵⁴ The Irish Hospitals Sweepstakes generated substantial revenue, and attracted more entries from the United States than from Ireland itself, even during the

¹⁴⁶ Curtin & Bernardo 98-99; Kopp & Taylor

¹⁴⁷ *Edward F. Sweet v Washington Hesing* (case no. 23241, US Circuit Court for the Northern District of Illinois); FE Williams 1958 106-109; Curtin & Bernardo 100-101; Kopp & Taylor 157.

¹⁴⁸ Curtin & Bernardo 101; FE Williams 1958 108-109.

¹⁴⁹ FE Williams 1958 105; Curtin & Bernardo 100.

¹⁵⁰ FE Williams 1958 105-106; Curtin & Bernardo 101-102; Kopp & Taylor 157-158. During this period, post offices used the book *Lotteries, Frauds and Obscenity in the Mails* (JL Thomas) to guide them. Thomas was Assistant Attorney-General for the Post Office Department and later a judge of the Supreme Court of Missouri.

¹⁵¹ Curtin & Bernardo 102-105; Kopp & Taylor 158-162.

¹⁵² Curtin & Bernardo 120-123; Bender 158-166.

¹⁵³ Encyclopaedia Britannica "Irish Sweepstakes"

<http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/294177/Irish-Sweepstakes> (accessed on 24 January 2015) ("Britannica, Irish Sweepstakes").

¹⁵⁴ Dowrick, FE "The Irish Sweep and Irish Law" 1953 *The American Journal of Comparative Law* 2:4 505 ("Dowrick") 505-506.

period that lotteries were illegal in America.¹⁵⁵ Under Irish law, this created some questions relating to conflict of laws, particularly since many entrants were from countries outside Ireland and disputes could arise about transactions relating to the sweepstakes.¹⁵⁶ The Irish Hospitals Sweepstakes also attracted considerable participation from the United Kingdom, from which the Republic of Ireland had recently become independent.¹⁵⁷ This increased the existing strain between the two countries, particularly since lotteries were initially still unlawful in the United Kingdom.¹⁵⁸ The Irish Hospitals Sweepstakes operated for 57 years until it was replaced by a state lottery.¹⁵⁹ Despite the success and popularity of the sweepstakes, investigations revealed that abuse and greed was rife, with only a fraction of the lottery's income actually going to hospitals.¹⁶⁰

The term "sweepstakes" was not used for the first time in the 1930s though. The word dates back to at least Elizabethan times, the term appearing in Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (although spelt "swoopstake").¹⁶¹ In those times, "sweepstakes" referred to a game in which the victor was entitled to all the stakes.¹⁶² In the 1700s and beyond, the term was used in relation to horse racing and later on in respect of pool betting.¹⁶³ In the twentieth century, it featured prominently in the name of the Irish Hospitals Sweepstakes, as discussed above. From the 1950s, sweepstakes became very popular in the United States.¹⁶⁴ However, the term was now used for a prize promotion which did not require entry fees or consideration from participants.¹⁶⁵ Winners were determined by chance, and by the 1960s promoters preferred to run these competitions instead of skill based competitions.¹⁶⁶ The laws started to change too,

¹⁵⁵ Britannica, Irish Sweepstakes.

¹⁵⁶ Dowrick 505-506.

¹⁵⁷ Ewen 352. Coleman M "A Terrible Danger to the Morals of the Country: The Irish Hospitals' Sweepstake in Great Britain 1930-87" 2005 *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy. Section C: Archaeology, Celtic Studies, History, Linguistics, Literature* 105c:5 197 ("Coleman") 198-205.

¹⁵⁸ Coleman 213-214.

¹⁵⁹ Britannica, Irish Sweepstakes.

¹⁶⁰ Dodd S "Irish Sweepstake scandal remains a lesson to us all" *Independent.ie* (7 December 2003) <http://www.independent.ie/opinion/analysis/irish-sweepstake-scandal-remains-a-lesson-to-us-all-26237690.html> (accessed on 24 January 2015).

¹⁶¹ Shakespeare W *Hamlet* (Act IV, Scene V, Line 143). Curtin & Bernardo 4; Bender 159.

¹⁶² Curtin & Bernardo 4.

¹⁶³ Curtin & Bernardo 5; Bender 159-160.

¹⁶⁴ Curtin & Bernardo 7.

¹⁶⁵ Curtin & Bernardo 7.

¹⁶⁶ Kopp & Taylor 163; Taylor & Kopp 1991 204.

with state lotteries being established in some American states.¹⁶⁷ The courts also relaxed strict interpretations and rejected arguments that some competitions were unlawful.¹⁶⁸ In subsequent years, the Federal Trade Commission increased regulation of these competitions in the United States, although prize competitions continued to remain popular promotional tools for marketers.¹⁶⁹

3.3 The South African historical context

3.3.1 Early history

South African gambling legislation dates back to 1658 – merely six years after arrival of the Dutch at the Cape.¹⁷⁰ The legislation prohibited gambling and games.¹⁷¹ It appears that the gambling habits and losses of visiting sailors and soldiers gave rise to the creation of this law.¹⁷² A couple of subsequent laws, called “plakaten”, were issued in the Cape during the rest of the 1600s and in the subsequent century, banning lotteries and prohibiting the playing of cards and dice in homes.¹⁷³ In those times, gambling was a problem amongst slaves, but was rife in canteens too and even a Dutch clergyman was dismissed on account of his gambling habit.¹⁷⁴

The 1800s saw the promulgation of separate, dedicated gambling legislation for each of the former South African colonies.¹⁷⁵ In the Orange Free State, all gambling and

¹⁶⁷ Taylor & Kopp 1991 204.

¹⁶⁸ See for example *Federal Communications Commission v. American Broadcasting Co., Inc* (1954) 347 U.S. 284, in which the court found that neither the promotional value of the competition nor the requirement that entrants had to listen to the radio constituted consideration. Taylor & Kopp 1991 204.

¹⁶⁹ Kopp & Taylor 163-164.

¹⁷⁰ Carnelley M “Offences relating to gambling and lotteries” in Milton JRL, Cowling MG and Hctor SV *South African Criminal Law and Procedure Vol III: Statutory Offences 2nd ed*, service number 21, (“Carnelley 2011”) 2.

¹⁷¹ 1 *Kaapse Plakaatboek* 46; Carnelley 2011 2 and 3, fn 1.

¹⁷² Lötter 191, citing Speight WL “Gambling in South Africa” 1958 *Commercial Law Reporter* 229 (“Speight”). In the LGB Main Report, the authors assumed that “the indigenous people of South Africa” must also have played gambling games before the arrival of European settlers. (LGB Main Report 30.)

¹⁷³ Carnelley 2011 2; Lötter 192; Van Wyk I “‘Tata Ma Chance’: On Contingency and the Lottery in Post-Apartheid South Africa” 2012 *Africa* 82:1 41 (“Van Wyk”) 42.

¹⁷⁴ Ruwardus Cloppenburg used to be in the service of the Dutch East India Company, but was “[o]ne of the most notorious gamblers of the early eighteenth century”. (Speight 230-231)

¹⁷⁵ Carnelley 2011 2-3; Lötter 192.

games of chance were forbidden.¹⁷⁶ Natal and the Transvaal followed suit and passed their own legislation against betting, gambling and games of chance.¹⁷⁷

In the Cape of Good Hope, the Act for the Prohibition of Lotteries entered into force on 30 September 1889.¹⁷⁸ It repealed previous legislation of the same kind, apart from any art union legislation. As was the case in England and other countries, art unions were exempted from lotteries legislation and, as such, these organisations could hold lotteries in which works of art could be won.¹⁷⁹ The Cape Act prohibited matters such as the operation of lotteries, their advertisement in newspapers and the distribution of materials that contained information relating to any lotteries.

The Orange Free State passed anti-lottery legislation which was similar to the Cape Act.¹⁸⁰ The *Wet over Loterijen en Sweepstakes*¹⁸¹ (Act on Lotteries and Sweepstakes) declared illegal all lotteries in the Orange Free State. It dealt with typical lottery concepts such as prizes, subscription and consideration. Although it did not define the term “sweepstakes”, it referred to that term as an example of a lottery.¹⁸² Similar anti-lottery legislation was also in place in Natal and the Transvaal.¹⁸³

A Commission of Enquiry was appointed in 1909 to investigate matters relating to race meetings, betting and the like in the Transvaal.¹⁸⁴ The Commission’s report is relevant because it contains specific recommendations relating to “competitions which, though they contain an element of skill (and are therefore not illegal under the present law), are really lotteries”.¹⁸⁵ The report mentions examples such as limerick and guessing competitions.¹⁸⁶ The Commission recommended a change in the law in order for the

¹⁷⁶ Carnelley 2011 2.

¹⁷⁷ For example the Transvaal’s *Wet Tegen Hazardspelen*, 6 of 1889 (Act against Games of Chance). Carnelley 2011 2; LGB Main Report 31.

¹⁷⁸ Act 9 of 1889 (the “Cape Act”).

¹⁷⁹ The art unions were exempted in order to stimulate the development of the fine arts and the raising of funds for that purpose. (LGB Main Report 30.)

¹⁸⁰ Carnelley 2011 2.

¹⁸¹ Chapter CXLIII of the Orange Free State’s “*Wetboek*” (Law Book).

¹⁸² S2(1) of the OFS Act.

¹⁸³ Law 25 of 1878 in Natal and, in the Transvaal, the Law against Holding of Lotteries 7 of 1890. Carnelley 2011 3.

¹⁸⁴ Jordan HH (chairman) *Report of the Race Meetings, Betting, etc., Commission* (“Jordan Report”).

¹⁸⁵ Jordan Report 5.

¹⁸⁶ Jordan Report 5.

definition of “lottery” to cover “[...] all kinds of competitions [...] in which the element of chance predominates over the element of skill”.¹⁸⁷

In 1910, the Union of South Africa was created. The separate gambling and lottery laws of the former colonies remained in force in the Cape, Orange, Free State, Natal and Transvaal.¹⁸⁸ The next major event in South African gambling legislation would only occur in the 1960s with the promulgation of the Gambling Act, 1965. In the interim, ancillary legislation was adopted to deal with specific gambling matters such as gambling clubs and sports pools.¹⁸⁹ Two Gambling Amendment Acts were also promulgated to strengthen the current legislation and to deal with lotteries played by means of pin-table machines.¹⁹⁰ An attempt to curb the distribution of materials to lottery organisers can be found in section 35 of the Post Office Act, 1958 as well.

3.3.2 Prize promotion judgements in the first half of the twentieth century

During the first half of the 1900s, the courts were called upon in a number of cases to determine whether competitions and other schemes constituted lotteries. The various provincial laws were still in place, and lotteries were unlawful. In many of those cases, arguments centred on the presence of the consideration element. In some cases, the courts also had to decide whether the outcome of those competitions or schemes was determined by skill or by chance. Some of the judgements are discussed below.

In *R v Lew Hoi*,¹⁹¹ a case that involved a Chinese numbers game, the court carefully analysed the definition of “lottery”. The court discussed the subscription element and pointed out that in ordinary sweepstakes the contributions (subscriptions) of the entrants made up the prize and the scheme remained a lottery even if part of the subscription funds was paid out to someone.¹⁹² It confirmed that the scheme was a lottery even if the prize was not predetermined and it did not matter that the scheme involved some variations that were not necessarily common to other lotteries.¹⁹³ The

¹⁸⁷ Jordan Report 5.

¹⁸⁸ Carnelley 2011 3; Lötter 192; Carnelley M “Gambling, Gaming and Lotteries” *The Law of South Africa* 10:2 (“Carnelley 2005”), par 216 and fn 3.

¹⁸⁹ Carnelley 3; LGB Main Report 32.

¹⁹⁰ LGB Main Report 32.

¹⁹¹ 1937 AD 215.

¹⁹² 220-221.

¹⁹³ 220-221.

court stressed the importance of giving effect to the legislature's intention to prohibit gambling and concluded as follows:

[...] the Court should be slow to hold that a scheme is not a lottery which contains the gambling element of an adventure of a stake by a number of competitors in the hope of winning a prize on some issue determined by chance, even if it contains other features which do not affect these essential characteristics.¹⁹⁴

A prize promotion was the subject of the matter in *R v Cotterill*.¹⁹⁵ In that case, Ackermans Limited ran the "Jumble Word Competition" in *The Cape Argus*. Entrants had to unscramble words and send their answers to the promoter, with no entry fees charged.¹⁹⁶ Mr Ackermann acknowledged that the competition was run in order to promote his store's sales. On account of this, the court found that at least some of the entrants must have made a contribution by purchasing items from the store. In the court's view this fulfilled the subscription element.¹⁹⁷ Further, the court found that winners were selected by way of chance even though they had to display skill in unscrambling the words.¹⁹⁸ This was because there were numerous entries and only a fraction of them were actually verified to check whether the answers in them were correct.¹⁹⁹ The organisers merely awarded the prizes to the first 78 entries that were opened. Since the winners received prizes, the third element of a lottery was present as well. As a result, the court declared the competition to be an unlawful lottery.²⁰⁰

The consideration element in a prize promotion came under the spotlight again in *R v Ellis Brown Limited*.²⁰¹ In that case, the defendant sold coffee and tea.²⁰² The defendant concealed prize vouchers in some of the product tins. If a person bought one of those tins, they became entitled to a cash prize.²⁰³ The court had to examine whether participants had to pay something in order to stand a chance to win a prize. The court referred to this payment requirement as the so-called "gambling element".²⁰⁴

¹⁹⁴ 222.

¹⁹⁵ 1927 CPD 48.

¹⁹⁶ 49.

¹⁹⁷ 53.

¹⁹⁸ 53-54.

¹⁹⁹ 53.

²⁰⁰ 78. The court decided that "[c]hance was the determining factor".

²⁰¹ 1938 AD 98.

²⁰² 100.

²⁰³ 100.

²⁰⁴ 100.

It decided that participants did in fact pay to participate in the competition, because they could not get hold of the winning vouchers without purchasing the tins of coffee or tea.²⁰⁵ In the court's view, entrants paid to participate when they paid for the products they purchased.²⁰⁶ In conclusion, the court stated that it had to apply the law and that it could not venture into a debate regarding whether the relevant legislation was in fact intended to prohibit something which was essentially a promotional tool to market a promoter's business.²⁰⁷

The definition of "lottery" in the Transvaal's Law against the Holding of Lotteries was also considered in *R v Morrison*.²⁰⁸ The appellant in that matter was a businessman who wished to increase his sales by giving customers the opportunity to receive a coupon if they purchased goods to a value of five shillings.²⁰⁹ The coupons would be entered into a draw and the winner would receive a house and land. The court noted that subscription is a crucial element of a lottery.²¹⁰ It held that customers were "induced to risk money in order to have a chance of gaining a valuable prize".²¹¹ The court decided that the price paid by entrants for the goods purchased from the appellant included the subscription for entry into the prize draw.²¹² Consequently, the court found that the scheme was a lottery.

In some judgements, the courts found that the relevant schemes did not constitute lotteries. In *R v Livingstone*,²¹³ for example, entrants had to predict which horses would win in a race.²¹⁴ The court found that the competition was not a lottery because success in the competition depended on skill instead of chance.²¹⁵ The court's reasoning was that it took some skill to select the horses and that chance was not the determining factor in the competition.²¹⁶

²⁰⁵ 101.

²⁰⁶ 101.

²⁰⁷ 101. As such, the court recognised the function of a promotional competition. However, not being the legislature, it was not in a position to make provision for the lawful running of such competitions.

²⁰⁸ 1914 TPD 329.

²⁰⁹ Carnelley classifies this competition as a "gift scheme". Carnelley 2011 66 and fn 14.

²¹⁰ 332-333.

²¹¹ 334-335.

²¹² 332.

²¹³ 1924 TPD 45.

²¹⁴ 48.

²¹⁵ 48-49.

²¹⁶ 48.

In *Silberman v Hodkinson*,²¹⁷ the court had to consider another prize promotion that involved prediction. In this case, a cigarette manufacturer invited entrants to vote for popular girls' names by sorting twelve specific girls' names in order of popularity, amongst other entry requirements.²¹⁸ The organisers would then, using the lists of names received from entrants as votes, determine the order of the twelve names based on the popularity displayed in the entries.²¹⁹ The winner would be the person who had the most names in the correct order. The court found that this was not a lottery, because the outcome depended on skill.²²⁰ The court referred to the reasoning in *R v Livingstone*, where the one judge was of the view that the outcome of a lottery had to depend entirely on chance in order for the competition to be a lottery, while the other judge stated that chance had to be the "determining factor" instead of the "only element" or "only factor".²²¹ While in the *Silberman* case the judge agreed with the test that chance had to be the only factor, he was satisfied in the case under consideration that chance was not "the determining factor".²²²

Skill was also the determining factor in *R v Bertram Davis*.²²³ In that matter, the South African Toilet Requisite Co. placed advertisements in the *Sunday Times*.²²⁴ The advertisements contained pictures and entrants had to create captions for those.²²⁵ Entry fees were payable and the winner would be the person whose caption is chosen by one of the newspaper's employees.²²⁶ The court found that this was not a lottery, because participants had to use their skill to create a caption that would be selected by the newspaper employee.²²⁷

The above cases are merely examples of the numerous cases that turned on whether or not a competition or other scheme involved a lottery.²²⁸ The cases from those times remain instructive because they can be used to give guidance when one must interpret

²¹⁷ 1927 TPD 562.

²¹⁸ 563.

²¹⁹ 563.

²²⁰ 568.

²²¹ 568.

²²² 568.

²²³ 1915 TPD 155.

²²⁴ 157.

²²⁵ 157.

²²⁶ 157.

²²⁷ 164-165.

²²⁸ See, for example, the various lotteries listed by Carnelley (Carnelley 2011 66) and the applicable footnotes.

the provisions of the current Lotteries Act, 1997.²²⁹ As such, some of these cases will be referred to below in the discussions around section 54 of the Lotteries Act, 1997 and section 36 of the CPA.²³⁰

3.3.3 The times of the Gambling Act, 1965

During the 1960s, the government decided to combine the various provincial gambling laws into one statute on the basis that the current position was confusing and that clarity had to be achieved.²³¹ The government chose to maintain the prohibition on gambling (except for betting on horseracing).²³² The Minister of Justice was in fact strongly opposed to gambling and saw the need to “stamp out lotteries” and “eradicate this evil root and branch”.²³³ Lötter points out how the government also provided sweeping powers to the Minister, giving him the authority to expand the definition of “lotteries and games of chance” to include activities that were not already mentioned in the statute.²³⁴

Despite arguments from the opposition, the Gambling Act, 1965 entered into effect on 1 July 1969 without any changes.²³⁵ Numerous court cases found their basis in the 1965 Act, commencing with a number of battles regarding the Minister of Justice’s attempts to prohibit “any pin-table, machine, or contrivance”.²³⁶ Some of the cases came about as a result of uncertainty regarding the Act’s wording. Carnelley remarks that it was “an enactment distinguished, as was its pre-Union predecessors, by extraordinary inept draftsmanship”.²³⁷

The provincial laws did not make provisions for the running of promotional competitions. The situation did not change under the Gambling Act, 1965 either. However, promoters still tried to run them. As such, these competitions ended up in our courts on occasion and led to judgements such as *Minister of Mineral and Energy Affairs v Lucky Horseshoe (Pty) Ltd.*²³⁸ In that case, the respondent issued lottery

²²⁹ For example, some of the cases were referred to in *FirstRand Bank v National Lotteries Board* [2008] 3 All SA 121 (SCA).

²³⁰ See Chapter 5 below.

²³¹ Lötter 192; Carnelley 2011 3; Carnelley 2005 164; LGB Main Report 33.

²³² Carnelley 2005 164 fn 4.

²³³ Lötter 192, where that author refers to the texts of the various Assembly Debates.

²³⁴ Lötter 193

²³⁵ Lötter 193; LGB Main Report 33.

²³⁶ Lötter 193.

²³⁷ Carnelley 2011 and fn 21.

²³⁸ 1994 (2) SA 46 (A).

tickets to various retailers, including filling stations. The retailers bought the tickets from the respondent, but they were made available to members of the public at no cost. Initially, the respondent required the retailers to provide a member of the public with a ticket only if they purchased something from the retailer. However, the respondent changed its instructions and informed retailers that tickets had to be given to everyone, even if they did not purchase something. Despite this, the court found that the scheme was a lottery because most members of the public would only have received tickets if they bought something from a retailer.²³⁹ In the court's judgement, this meant that those members of the public paid consideration in order to enter the competition and that the subscription element was therefore present.²⁴⁰

In yet another case surrounding the subscription element, the court in *S v Pepsi-Cola (Pty) Ltd*²⁴¹ had to examine a promotion in which every tenth bottle of Pepsi contained a liner which entitled the purchaser of that bottle to another free Pepsi. The court found that the scheme was not a lottery since members of the public did not pay an increased amount for the relevant bottles of Pepsi and that there was therefore no subscription.²⁴² In the court's view, members of the public were not paying for the right to win another Pepsi.²⁴³ The court regarded the scheme as a promotional tool, instead of a lottery, and was of the view that the legislature did not intend for such schemes to be covered by the prohibitions of the Gambling Act, 1965.²⁴⁴ The court also expressed its surprise that a policeman's time was wasted to investigate the matter which led to the case, particularly while so many serious crimes were being committed.²⁴⁵ Dendy queries the argument of the court in the *Pepsi-Cola* case.²⁴⁶ For instance, he criticises the court's decision that the scheme was not a lottery since participants would not enter the competition for a future right to stand a chance to win a prize.²⁴⁷ He indicates that the court overlooked the legislation's definition of "prize" in concluding that the

²³⁹ 55.

²⁴⁰ 59.

²⁴¹ 1985 (3) SA 141 (C).

²⁴² 144.

²⁴³ 144.

²⁴⁴ 144.

²⁴⁵ 142.

²⁴⁶ Dendy III 104.

²⁴⁷ Dendy III 104.

free cool drinks did not qualify as prizes, pointing out that any movable or immovable property could constitute a prize.²⁴⁸

In *Boardman v Minister van Finansies*²⁴⁹ the court was called upon to decide whether the Government's defence bond scheme amounted to an illegal lottery. The public could buy defence bonds and stood a chance to win prizes in a monthly draw.²⁵⁰ The court argued that participants in the scheme were not at risk to lose anything and found that the scheme was not a lottery, because there was no subscription involved.²⁵¹ Furthermore, the court held that the Government was in any event not bound by the provisions of the Gambling Act, 1965.²⁵² As such, even if the scheme was a lottery, the outcome would have remained the same.²⁵³ The *Boardman* decision has been criticised for deviating from earlier decisions and creating the implication that an entrant must risk losing something in order for the subscription element of a lottery to be present.²⁵⁴ Dendy also argues that the court misinterpreted the definition of "lottery" by finding that a scheme had to be a lottery in the general sense in order to be an illegal lottery.²⁵⁵

Apart from the Gambling Act, 1965, competition organisers also had to take note of other legislation that could have an impact on their competitions. The Trade Practices Act, 1976, which contained provisions relating to trade coupons, was one of these statutes.²⁵⁶ This Act regulated the situation where trade coupons were provided to someone, *inter alia* for them to be able to participate in a competition,

²⁴⁸ Dendy II 78 and fn 9 on that page.

²⁴⁹ 1984 (1) SA 259 (T).

²⁵⁰ 261-262.

²⁵¹ 266-267.

²⁵² 267.

²⁵³ 267.

²⁵⁴ Dendy M "Pitfalls of Advertising – II. Lotteries." 1988 *Businessman's Law* 17 77 ("Dendy II") 77 fn 4; Dendy M "Pitfalls of Advertising – III. More about lotteries." 1988 *Businessman's Law* 17 101 ("Dendy III") 104; Dendy M "Pitfalls of Advertising – IV. Competitions." 1988 *Businessman's Law* 17 157 ("Dendy IV") 160; Lane W, Hoffe D, Dison D & Tatham C *Kelsey Stuart's The Newspaperman's Guide to the Law* (4th ed) ("Lane ea") 187.

²⁵⁵ Dendy I fn 4, where Dendy also points out that the court in *S v Mbonani* 1986(3) SA 839 (N) clearly rejected the argument of the court in the *Boardman* case. However, in *S v Pepsi-Cola* 1985 (3) SA 141 (C), the court seems to have followed the argument in the *Boardman* case. (Dendy III 104.) Bell, Dewar & Hall *Kelsey Stuart's The Newspaperman's Guide to the Law* (5th ed) ("Bell Dewar") 207.

²⁵⁶ Stuart KM *The Newspaperman's Guide to the Law* (3rd ed) ("Stuart") 231-235. The Trade Practices Act, 1976 replaced the Trade Coupons Act, 1935, which also contained strict prohibitions relating to trade coupons.

and prohibited certain practices in relation to such trade coupons.²⁵⁷ Those provisions were relaxed by way of amendments that came into effect in 1984.²⁵⁸ Apart from the legislation relating to coupons, competition organisers further had to ensure that they did not fall foul of the Newspaper Press Union of South Africa's general by-laws, which prohibited the publication of skill competitions that had no purpose other than money making and not the promotion of business, unless certain exceptions applied.²⁵⁹

Although gambling was prohibited in South Africa under the Gambling Act, 1965, this was not the case in the so-called "homelands" (Transkei, Bophuthatswana, Venda and Ciskei) that were established during the 1970s.²⁶⁰ Those states passed legislation which provided for the issuing of gambling licenses and several casinos operated in those states.²⁶¹

Despite the prohibitions of the Gambling Act, 1965, and initial cases such as *Boardman*, *Pepsi-Cola* and *Lucky Horseshoe*, it seems that the authorities often ignored minor lotteries, such as fundraising lotteries conducted by churches and schools.²⁶² In due course, larger and more prominent fundraising lotteries started to appear, for example ITHUBA, Operation Hunger, the Community Chest and Natal Lotto.²⁶³ It is not clear why action was not taken against those lotteries, particularly since they blatantly contravened the Gambling Act, 1965.²⁶⁴ Carnelley suggests that the operators might have argued that those schemes were based on skill instead of chance, while the Report of the Commission of Inquiry into Lotteries, Sports Pools, Fundraising Activities and Certain Matters relating to Gambling ("Howard Report") notes that chance was still the dominant element of these lotteries.²⁶⁵ Perhaps as a result of promoters' attempts to hide their lotteries behind feigned skill requirements,

²⁵⁷ Section 10.

²⁵⁸ Lane *ea* 191-192.

²⁵⁹ Lane *ea* 227.

²⁶⁰ Carnelley 2005 164; Carnelley 2011 3; Lötter 194; LGB Main Report 34; Van Wyk 42.

²⁶¹ Carnelley 2005 3. Wiehahn P "To be or not to be: the legality of gambling in South Africa" *Codicillus* XXXVII 2 39 ("P Wiehahn") 39.

²⁶² Lötter 194.

²⁶³ Lötter 194; LGB Main Report 33; Carnelley 2011 3; P Wiehahn 40; Commission of Inquiry into Lotteries, Sports Pools, Fundraising Activities and Certain Matters relating to Gambling (RP 80/1993) (the "Howard Report") 15. In the Howard Report, the authors remarked how operation of the ITHUBA scratch cards actually generated revenue for the operator of that scheme, to the detriment of the charities that were supposed to benefit from it. (Howard Report 56-57.)

²⁶⁴ Howard Report 42-43.

²⁶⁵ Carnelley 2011 3; Howard Report 15; Lötter 194.

the Gambling Act, 1965 was amended to prohibit skill based gambling games as well.²⁶⁶

3.3.4 Gambling reform at the end of the twentieth century

Even though the Gambling Act, 1965 was amended to ban skill based gambling, the South African government must have realised that the public had a need for gambling and, perhaps, that times were changing. The Howard Commission was therefore created, with Mr Justice JA Howard as chairman. As is clear from the Howard Commission's name, its purpose was to investigate whether lotteries and various forms of gambling were desirable and, if so, how they should be regulated and who should profit from them.²⁶⁷

The Howard Commission's inquiry found that gambling was a well-liked and lucrative activity in South Africa.²⁶⁸ In view of this, it concluded that the public's desire for gambling should be recognised and that gambling should therefore be legalised.²⁶⁹ However, the Howard Commission recommended tight regulation in order to guard against the ills that can often be caused by gambling.²⁷⁰ In respect of lotteries specifically, the Howard Commission concluded that they are less damaging than other forms of gambling, perhaps since lotteries are conducted over longer periods and because there is less instant gratification due to the draws only taking place at the end of the lottery periods.²⁷¹ As such, a single National Lottery was suggested for South Africa.²⁷² The Howard Report also deals with small lotteries (such as those operated by schools and churches) as well as private lotteries (office and club lotteries).²⁷³ The Howard Commission concluded that these lotteries are less

²⁶⁶ Carnelley 2011 3; Lötter 194-195; LGB Main Report 33.

²⁶⁷ Carnelley 2011 3-4; Howard Report 1-4. The Howard Commission's terms of reference were initially limited to lotteries, sports pools and scratch-card games, but in due course extended to gambling games. (Howard Report 1.)

²⁶⁸ Howard Report 16.

²⁶⁹ Howard Report 22-23. In the Commission's view, gambling prohibition would not eliminate all gambling activity. Instead, it remarked: "Laws which are designed to lead men away from vice and sin, particularly those vices and sins that injure only the sinner, are notoriously difficult to enforce".

²⁷⁰ Howard Report 23.

²⁷¹ Howard Report 33-34.

²⁷² Howard Report 35-40. The Commission was of the view that one could not object "to the State promoting or even conducting a national lottery which is popular, socially harmless and designed to raise money for welfare, health, education and other social purposes". (Howard Report 35)

²⁷³ Howard Report 45-49.

problematic and that they should be allowed, subject to limitations and restrictions.²⁷⁴ However, the Howard Commission did not deal with promotional competitions conducted by merchants and businesses at all, and was of the view that no other lotteries should be allowed.²⁷⁵

As a result of the Howard Commission's work, the Lotteries and Gambling Board Act, 1993 was promulgated. This happened in times of historic change in South Africa, including Nelson Mandela's release from imprisonment and the country's first democratic elections. In Carnelley's view, these events "overtook" the Howard Report, but the process was in fact taken forward again with the establishment of the Lotteries and Gambling Board.²⁷⁶ The Board conducted its own enquiry into lotteries and gambling, under chairmanship of Prof NE Wiehahn, and delivered an Interim Report during October 1994.²⁷⁷ It submitted its *Main Report on Gambling in the Republic of South Africa* in March 1995.²⁷⁸

Despite challenges such as time pressure, a lack of reference sources and a complicated practical and legislative landscape in the country, the Lotteries and Gambling Board completed its work in quite a short period of time.²⁷⁹ The LGB Main Report covers wide territory, ranging from the history of gambling in South Africa and other countries to the socio-economic impact of gambling, the economic effects of gambling and problem gambling.²⁸⁰ The Board recognised that gambling had become a leisure activity in South Africa and that the time had arrived to introduce legal, regulated gambling in South Africa, despite that fact that some people were still

²⁷⁴ Howard Report 45-49.

²⁷⁵ Howard Report 49-50.

²⁷⁶ Carnelley M "Betting on Dog Racing. The Next Legalised Gambling Opportunity in South Africa? A Cautionary Note from the Regulation of Greyhound Racing in Britain" 2010 *UNLV Gaming Law Journal* 1:1 73 at 78 and fn 41 on that page.

²⁷⁷ LGB Main Report 1. Sallaz notes that Wiehahn was appointed in post-apartheid South Africa and was seen as a good choice because he was regarded as a "*veligte* (enlightened) Afrikaner" (sic), having previously recommended the legalisation of trade unions. Sallaz JJ *The Labor of Luck: Casino Capitalism in the United States and South Africa* ("Sallaz") 189.

²⁷⁸ The Board's Report was met with mixed reaction and with quite a measure of opposition from urban casinos and some large corporate entities. (Sallaz 194-195)

²⁷⁹ NE Wiehahn 1995 2-3. The Board relied on submission from various role-players, many of whom were in favour of legalised, regulated gambling. Civic organisations also provided submissions and only one political party was in favour of banning gambling. (Sallaz 189-190)

²⁸⁰ NE Wiehahn 1995 5-8.

opposed to the activity.²⁸¹ The Board was not convinced that gambling would have an adverse effect on people's work ethic and was of the view that it would not have a significant on society, although it recommended that the government should conduct ongoing research relating to the socio-economic impact of gambling.²⁸² Problem gambling was also covered by the Board and it took note of the fact that some people in South Africa did struggle with this.²⁸³

In its Report, the Board formulated twelve principles for "the design, structure and operation of South Africa's gambling system".²⁸⁴ These principles included control and regulation, interaction between national and local government and the protection of gamblers and society.²⁸⁵ The Board proposed that legalised gambling "should be strictly controlled, well-regulated and effectively policed".²⁸⁶ In order to protect society, it was in favour of an approach in terms of which gambling would be allowed but not stimulated, and suggested that government's policies should balance the operation of a legal gambling industry against the protection of society.²⁸⁷ Particular emphasis was placed on "transparency, honesty and integrity" in the gambling industry.²⁸⁸ The Board produced recommendations on the operation of a National Lottery and the regulation of private, society and small lotteries as well as the licensing of casinos and the regulation of sport betting.²⁸⁹ However, the LGB Main Report does not deal with promotional competitions.

Ultimately, the LGB Main Report laid the foundations for legalised gambling in South Africa and led to the enactment of the National Gambling Act, 1996.²⁹⁰ The new legislation allowed for the licensing of casinos and the regulation of gambling and wagering and dealt with matters such as the creation of the National Gambling

²⁸¹ LGB Main Report 53-54. In the Board's view, "gambling is a reality in that it is natural for man to take a chance or a risk". (LGB Main Report 54)

²⁸² LGB Main Report 54-55.

²⁸³ LGB Main Report 55-58. The Board also proposed that the gambling industry should contribute towards the establishment of problem gambling treatment centres.

²⁸⁴ NE Wiehahn 1995 9.

²⁸⁵ NE Wiehahn 9-12; LGB Main Report 63-73.

²⁸⁶ LGB Main Report 63. The Board also suggested that the relevant gambling legislation should be comprehensive, properly drafted and unambiguous.

²⁸⁷ LGB Main Report 65.

²⁸⁸ LGB Main Report 69. The Board was concerned about the fact that the gambling industry was often associated with crime and negative elements and was of the view that transparency would prevent such perceptions from being formed.

²⁸⁹ LGB Main Report 75-139.

²⁹⁰ Carnelley 2011 4.

Board.²⁹¹ As a result, South Africa evolved into “[o]ne of the newest legal gambling ‘havens’ in the world”.²⁹²

The National Gambling Act, 1996 was eventually replaced by the National Gambling Act, 2004.²⁹³ The 2004 Act contains principles that are similar to its predecessor and deals with the same matters in general.²⁹⁴ However, according to Carnelley, “the structure of regulation of the industry on a national level has been revisited, broadened and clarified”.²⁹⁵ The National Gambling Act, 2004 is the statute that currently regulates gambling in South Africa on a national level, while each of the nine provinces has its own provincial gambling legislation as well.²⁹⁶

3.3.5 The Lotteries Act, 1997 and promotional competitions

While the National Gambling Act, 1996 legalised regulated gambling in South Africa, the Lotteries Act, 1997 led to the establishment of South Africa’s first National Lottery. The Lotteries Act, 1997 commenced on 1 March 2000 and is still in force, although it has been amended on occasion and certain sections have been repealed.²⁹⁷ It provides for the operation of the National Lotteries Commission and National Lottery²⁹⁸ and deals with the allocation of lottery proceeds.²⁹⁹ The Act also regulates sports pools³⁰⁰ and various other forms of lotteries, such as society lotteries,³⁰¹ private lotteries³⁰² and lotteries that are incidental to exempt entertainment.³⁰³

The Lotteries Act, 1997 introduced the first provisions for the lawful conducting of promotional competitions in South Africa. Section 54 of the Lotteries Act, 1997 was dedicated to this form of competition.³⁰⁴ The section was not in the draft versions of

²⁹¹ Carnelley 2011 4.

²⁹² Carnelley M “A Précis of the South African Gambling Industry” 2001 *Gaming Law Review* 5:1 3.

²⁹³ Carnelley 2011 4.

²⁹⁴ Carnelley 2011 6.

²⁹⁵ Carnelley M “Gambling Law Developments in South Africa: The Summer of 2004/2005” 2005 *Gaming Law Review* 9:4 318.

²⁹⁶ Carnelley 2005 164.

²⁹⁷ The Lotteries Act, 1997 has been amended by the Lotteries Amendment Act 10 of 2000, Lotteries Amendment Act 46 of 2001, Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act 12 of 2004, Public Service Amendment Act 30 of 2007, the CPA and the Lotteries Amendment Act 32 of 2013.

²⁹⁸ Ss 2 to 20.

²⁹⁹ Ss 21 to 35.

³⁰⁰ S55.

³⁰¹ S38.

³⁰² S37.

³⁰³ S36.

³⁰⁴ S 54 has been repealed and promotional competitions are now regulated by s36 of the CPA.

the Act, but marketers fought hard for the inclusion of the provisions in the Lotteries Act, 1997, next to the other lotteries regulated by the legislation.³⁰⁵ They wanted to avoid a repetition of the position under the Gambling Act, 1965, which in effect prohibited promotional competitions.³⁰⁶ Under section 54, promoters could still not require entrants to pay consideration in order to participate in promotional competitions.³⁰⁷ As such, the situation under the Gambling Act, 1965 did not change. However, section 54 made it clear that promoters were allowed to run promotional competitions in which entrants were required to pay for goods or services in order to participate in competitions. This therefore clarified the uncertainty under previous legislation in this regard. Provision was also made for the lawful conducting of competitions that would otherwise have contravened the prohibitions on certain competitions found in section 56 of the Lotteries Act.

Although the legislature recognised the need for the legalisation of promotional competitions, it also issued extremely onerous draft regulations relating to promotional competitions during the course of 1999.³⁰⁸ These regulations were met with fierce criticism and 140 submissions were received when the public was invited to comment on the draft.³⁰⁹ The Lotteries Board appointed consultants to investigate the position and the UNISA Bureau for Market Research compiled a report which found that “current business practises regarding promotional competitions differ substantially from the stipulations contained in the Draft Regulations”.³¹⁰ As a result of the report and industry submissions, the draft regulations were abandoned and less restrictive regulations were eventually put in place in the form of the Promotional Competition Regulations, 2001 (“PC Regulations”).³¹¹

³⁰⁵ Parliamentary Monitoring Group “Presentation on the Lotteries Amendment Bill, 2001” <http://pmg-assets.s3-website-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/docs/2001/appendices/011017Lottery.htm> (accessed on 31 January 2015) (“Amendment Bill Presentation”); Parliamentary Monitoring Group, Minutes of Trade and Industry Portfolio Committee, 17 October 2001 (<https://pmg.org.za/committee-meeting/916/>) (accessed on 31 January 2015); MacKenzie 12.

³⁰⁶ S 12.

³⁰⁷ S54(1)(b) and s54(1)(j).

³⁰⁸ MacKenzie 12.

³⁰⁹ Amendment Bill Presentation.

³¹⁰ Amendment Bill Presentation; MacKenzie 12.

³¹¹ Amendment Bill Presentation; MacKenzie 12.

The Lotteries Act, 1997 defined a “promotional competition” as “a lottery conducted for the purpose of promoting the sale or use of any goods or services”.³¹² This definition had to be read with the definition of “lottery” which was described as including “any game, scheme, arrangement, system, plan, promotional competition or device for distributing prizes by lot or chance and any game, scheme, arrangement, system, plan, competition or device, which the Minister may by notice in the Gazette declare to be a lottery”.³¹³

Section 54(1) of the Lotteries Act and the PC Regulations contained comprehensive and complex requirements that had to be met in order for promotional competitions to be lawful.³¹⁴ If a competition did not meet all of the requirements contained in section 54, it would be unlawful in terms of the provision of sections 56 and 57 of the Lotteries Act, 1997.³¹⁵ The requirements in section 54(1) and the PC Regulations covered a wide range of matters. For example, the price charged for the goods or services to which the competition related had to be the price ordinarily or usually charged for the goods or services, it could not be increased due to the competition and the promoter was not allowed to charge any other consideration.³¹⁶ The competition had to relate to goods or services that were ordinarily dealt in by the promoter.³¹⁷ The competition and its prizes were also not allowed to be similar to a competition, game or sports pool conducted by or on behalf of the National Lottery or the prizes awarded in any such competition, game or sports pool.³¹⁸ MacKenzie pointed out that the last-mentioned requirements protected the National Lottery’s monopoly and in effect made most promotional competitions unlawful because they often employed mechanisms and prizes that were similar to those of the National Lottery.³¹⁹ For various reasons, MacKenzie argued that the PC Regulations were *ultra vires*.³²⁰

³¹² S1.

³¹³ S1.

³¹⁴ See Abdurahman Z “Everybody’s done it” 2006 (December) *Without Prejudice* 37-38 (“Abdurahman”); Aguiar A “It can be dangerous to take a bet on the Lotteries Act” 2008 (February) *Without Prejudice* 44-45; Carnelley 2005 269-272; Carnelley 2011 69; MacKenzie J “Wave good-bye to those lekker competitions” 2003 (3:1) *Without Prejudice* 12-13 (“MacKenzie”);

³¹⁵ Carnelley 2011 69-70; *FirstRand Bank v National Lotteries Board* [2008] 3 All SA 121 (SCA) 124 para 11; *National Lotteries Board v Bruss NO and others* [2009] 2 All SA 164 (SCA) 167 para 16.

³¹⁶ S54(1)(b).

³¹⁷ S54(1)(g).

³¹⁸ S54(1)(i) and reg 3(1)(b) of the PC Regulations.

³¹⁹ MacKenzie 12-13.

³²⁰ MacKenzie 13.

The consideration or subscription element in promotional competitions formed the basis of two noteworthy judgments of the Supreme Court of Appeal: *FirstRand Bank v National Lotteries Board*³²¹ and *National Lotteries Board v Bruss NO.*³²² In the *FirstRand Bank* case, the bank ran a competition in which entrants stood the chance to win randomly drawn cash prizes if they deposited money for a 32 day period in a “Million-a-Month” call account. The bank relied on section 63 of the Lotteries Act, 1997, and argued that the Act did not apply to the competition because entrants were not required to tender any form of subscription. The court disagreed and declared the competition to be unlawful. It found that entrants staked something on a chance of winning when they were deprived of the possession of their money for a fixed period (even if the entrants could withdraw all of their money after the deposit period).

The *Bruss* matter involved the *Winikhaya* competition conducted by a charitable trust. Entrants stood the chance to win various prizes by sending entries by way of premium rated text messages or post cards to the organisers. The prizes were awarded by way of random draws. The court held that the competition was an illegal lottery and not a promotional competition, because it involved subscription and the trust operated the competition in order to raise funds for charities instead of promoting goods or services.

3.3.6 The shift from lotteries legislation to consumer protection

The beginning of the twenty first century saw the arrival of South Africa’s first comprehensive and dedicated consumer protection legislation.³²³ The Consumer Protection Act (“CPA”) was signed into law on 24 April 2009. Certain of its provisions took effect a year after that, with almost all other provisions entering into force on 31 March 2011.³²⁴

The CPA repealed section 54 of the Lotteries Act, 1997, and now regulates promotional competitions in detail by way of section 36 and the related provisions found in the Consumer Protection Act Regulations. The focus may have shifted from

³²¹ [2008] 3 All SA 121 (SCA). See Carnelley M “Gambling law” (Recent Cases) 2010 3 *South African Journal of Criminal Justice* 439-453 (“Carnelley 2010”) 450-451 and the criticism in Louw J “Distortion of the law: A comment on the SCA judgment in *FirstRand Bank Ltd v National Lotteries Board* 2008 (4) SA 548 (SCA)” 2012 (August) *De Rebus* 59-60.

³²² [2009] 2 All SA 164 (SCA). See Carnelley 2010 451-452.

³²³ See page 75 above.

³²⁴ Some provisions are still in abeyance as at the date hereof, for example those relating to the registration of business names and the pre-emptive blocking of direct marketing.

lotteries regulation to consumer protection legislation, but promotional competitions are still strictly regulated. And promotional competitions remain as popular as ever, if not more prevalent due to the social media wave. As such, even though the courts have not yet had the opportunity to interpret the provisions of section 36, it is probably just a matter of time before that will happen.

3.4 Conclusion

Gambling, in all of its forms (including lotteries, sweepstakes and prize draws), is part of society and has been present in people's lives from time immemorial. People have made fortunes out of it, but lives have also been ruined. As one can see from the very brief overview above, legislatures have been grappling with gambling for a very long time.³²⁵ Even the ancient Roman lawyers struggled to hold a consistent view about gambling. They passed laws that banned it while, at the same time, they continued with the activity in private. At times, gambling was used to generate revenue for governments and noble causes. Yet, throughout history, governments have also endeavoured to ban gambling or regulate it in a strict manner. It seems that history moves in circles and that gambling may be legal during one era, while it will be banned in the next.³²⁶ However, the arguments for and against gambling and legislative approaches towards it remain useful to inform current debates around the topic. It is also important to bear the historical background in mind when considering the way in which gambling and promotional competitions should be regulated in the present day.

Around the globe, courts have played a key role in the development of the law relating to promotional competitions. Their decisions are especially useful to understand the elements of prize promotions, especially the presence or absence of the chance element. This is the case in respect of South Africa as well. In the discussions above, it was shown that this country's courts released some particularly instructive judgements during the beginning of the twentieth century. At the end of that century,

³²⁵ Lötter refers to gambling as a "selective vice" and highlights this dichotomy, pointing out how some forms of gambling can be completely legal, while others are, at the same time, strongly regulated or forbidden. Lötter S "The odds against gambling" 1994 *South African Journal of Criminal Justice* (7) 189 ("Lötter") 189.

³²⁶ Rose writes about the "gambling waves" and "recurring cycles" of gambling regulation that come and go. (Rose IN *Gambling and the Law* ("Rose 1986") 13.) Blanche points out how "European countries have alternatively abolished the lotteries, re-established them, re-abolished them, and so on". (Blanche 72) See also Wiehahn NE *Gambling in South Africa – A New Challenge* 5.

the Supreme Court of Appeal also added some very important judgements to the existing body of case law.

At present, gambling is legal in many countries, although it is often regulated comprehensively. Sweepstakes, prize promotions, contests and the like are popular promotional tools too (while they constitute gambling at the same time). Legislation is currently quite permissive in relation to these forms of gambling, although they are regulated in order to protect the public. Yet, as is the case with gambling in general, history shows that promotional schemes often lead to abuse. In the end, it remains to be seen whether the current trend of legalisation of promotional competitions will continue, or whether the tide will turn against them again at some point in the future.

CHAPTER 4

THE REGULATION OF PROMOTIONAL COMPETITIONS IN NEW ZEALAND AND GREAT BRITAIN

- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 New Zealand
- 4.3 Great Britain
- 4.4 Conclusion

4.1 Introduction

South Africa's regulation of promotional competitions is not unique and did not develop independently. Some provisions of the applicable legislation have their roots in English law or have been copied from English statutes, and South African courts have quoted English cases in their judgements on lotteries and promotional competitions. Overall, English law has had an important influence on the development of South African law. Consequently, one cannot consider the current regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa without examining the past and present legal position in Great Britain. Such an examination will provide reasons for some provisions in South African legislation and related English judgements can be used to interpret the legislative provisions in this country. Furthermore, it will be instructive to compare South Africa's current regulation of promotional competitions with the situation in Great Britain in order to determine whether any lessons can be learnt from its legislation.

In addition, the relevant laws of New Zealand will be considered. This will be done because Great Britain's current legislation relating to prize competitions followed the New Zealand model in part. New Zealand's legislation is also quite modern and it will be useful to benchmark South Africa's legislation against the position in that country. Accordingly, this chapter will focus on the regulation of promotional competitions (also known as prize competitions or sales promotion schemes) in Great Britain and New Zealand, while some comparative comments will be provided from a South African perspective.

4.2 New Zealand

4.2.1 Background

New Zealand is a country located in the South Pacific Ocean, with an estimated population of just over 4.4 million people.¹ The Polynesian Maori originally settled there before the first European discovered it in 1642, and the British started to colonise it from 1769 when Captain Cook arrived in New Zealand.² The country became an independent dominion in 1907, but it remains part of the British Commonwealth and Queen Elizabeth II is still the official head of state.³

Before the arrival of the Europeans, the Maori did not gamble.⁴ However, they practised forms of divination and used lots, for example to determine someone's guilt.⁵ Gambling only started to spread in New Zealand after Europeans settled in the country and introduced raffles as well as betting on cards and horses.⁶ Although Queen Victoria gave instructions that there should be no lotteries in New Zealand and recreational lotteries were thus prohibited, people in colonial times still participated in other forms of lotteries, such as lotteries in which people disposed of unwanted goods.⁷ Small lotteries were also held by churches, schools and the like.⁸ Eventually, the 1881 Gaming and Lotteries Act banned lotteries, subject to some exceptions.⁹ However, soon art union lotteries were allowed and the New Zealand government founded its own Art Union.¹⁰ In 1907, amendments to the laws banned "street betting"

¹ Central Intelligence Agency *The World* "New Zealand" 20 June 2014 (<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/nz.html>) ("CIA Factbook NZ") (accessed on 31 January 2015). New Zealand has a relatively small population, when compared to South Africa's estimated population of approximately 54 million people. (Statistics South Africa "Mid-year population estimates: 2014" <http://beta2.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0302/P03022014.pdf>.)

² Wilson J "History" *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand* (30 April 2014) <http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/history> (accessed on 31 January 2015).

³ CIA Factbook NZ. New Zealand and South Africa have somewhat similar colonial histories and both countries are still members of the British Commonwealth at present.

⁴ Adams P "The history of gambling in New Zealand" 2004 *Journal of Gambling Studies* Issue 12 (available online at <http://jgi.camh.net/doi/full/10.4309/jgi.2004.12.2>) ("Adams").

⁵ Grant D *On a Roll: A History of Gambling and Lotteries in New Zealand* ("Grant") 151-152.

⁶ Adams.

⁷ Grant 155.

⁸ Grant 156.

⁹ Grant 160. Some specific raffles, for example, were still allowed.

¹⁰ Australasian Gambling Council "Chapter 16: A Brief History of Gambling in New Zealand" 1 (available online at https://www.austgamingcouncil.org.au/system/files/AGCPublications/AGC_DB_2013-14_CHP_16.pdf) ("AGC Ch 16") (accessed 31 January 2015); Grant 158-159.

and basically restricted legal gambling to the racecourse.¹¹ During the First World War, funds were raised by way of lotteries and raffles, even though some were legal and others were not.¹² In 1949, raffles and some other forms of gambling were legalised under the Gaming Amendment Act 1949 (which amended the Gaming Act, 1908).¹³

During the 1970s, the New Zealand society's views on gambling changed and restrictions eased.¹⁴ As a result, a new gambling statute, the Gaming and Lotteries Act 1977, came into force on 1 April 1978. It regulated various matters relating to lotteries and gambling and specifically contained an exemption for competitions that qualified as "sales promotions".¹⁵ If a scheme qualified as such, it would not be prohibited or regulated by the Act's provisions relating to prize competitions and it could therefore be conducted lawfully. The concept "sales promotion" was defined as follows:

any prize competition -

- (a) promoted by the manufacturer or a retailer of any goods or services for the purpose (which shall be a question of fact) of promoting the sale of those goods or services; and
- (b) in respect of which the right to enter is dependent on the purchase, at a price not exceeding the usual retail price, of any such goods or services, or any specified quantity or value of such goods or services, within a specified period; and
- (c) in respect of which no other direct or indirect consideration is paid to participate.¹⁶

The 1977 Act therefore allowed promoters to conduct competitions in order to promote sales of their goods or services, as long as the relevant price remained the usual one and no other consideration was payable.

During the 1980s, two lotteries ("Lotto" and "Instant Kiwi") were launched and gaming machines were introduced.¹⁷ After that, the Casino Control Act 1990 paved the way

¹¹ Report of the Royal Commission to Inquire into and Report upon Gaming and Racing Matters in New Zealand (H-23) 1948.

¹² Grant 174-175.

¹³ AGC Ch 16 1; Grant 213. In general, gambling was still prohibited and raffles had to comply with the legislation's requirements in order to be lawful.

¹⁴ Grant 287.

¹⁵ S18.

¹⁶ S2.

¹⁷ AGC Ch 16 1. These lotteries are conducted in New Zealand to this day.

for licensed casinos to be set up.¹⁸ The first casino was in due course established in Christchurch.¹⁹

Two reviews of gambling in New Zealand were conducted during the 1990s.²⁰ As part of one of those reviews, a public attitude survey conducted by the Department of Internal Affairs in 1995 revealed that there was “majority support [...] for sales promotions”.²¹ In 2000, a full review of gambling in New Zealand was announced.²² The government was of the view that an overhaul of the country’s gambling legislation was necessary and a discussion document was released in order to invite the public’s submissions on the reform of gaming in that country.²³ The discussion document touched on a wide range of issues, such as the role of gaming, its risks (including problem gambling), how lottery revenues should be distributed and the manner in which gaming should be managed.²⁴

This gambling review led to the drafting of the Responsible Gambling Bill (later renamed the Gambling Bill), which went through some changes and was eventually assented to on 18 September 2003.²⁵ The Gambling Act 2003 (the “NZ Gambling Act”) repealed and took the place of the Gaming and Lotteries Act 1977 as well as the Casino Control Act 1990.²⁶

4.2.2 Gambling regulation and the NZ Gambling Act in general

The NZ Gambling Act is the principal legislation which regulates lotteries and gambling in New Zealand. However, the Racing Act 2003 also regulates some gambling

¹⁸ AGC Ch 16 1.

¹⁹ AGC Ch 16 2. At present, there are only about five casinos in New Zealand and no new casino venue licenses will be issued. Gambling Act 2003, s10. (Department of Internal Affairs “Gambling Fact Sheet #28: Casinos”, [http://www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.nsf/Files/GamblingFactSheets-Feb2013/\\$file/FactSheet28-Feb2013.pdf](http://www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.nsf/Files/GamblingFactSheets-Feb2013/$file/FactSheet28-Feb2013.pdf), accessed on 21 February 2015.)

²⁰ Department of Internal Affairs (2001) *Gaming Reform in New Zealand: Towards a new legislative framework* (“NZ Gaming Reform Paper”) 7.

²¹ Department of Internal Affairs Policy Unit *Gaming – A New Direction for New Zealand: Department of Internal Affairs Policy Proposals* 19.

²² NZ Gaming Reform Paper: preface and 7; Department of Internal Affairs “Gaming Act Review” (https://www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.nsf/wpg_URL/Legislative-Reviews-Gaming-Act-Review-Index?OpenDocument) (accessed on 1 February 2015).

²³ NZ Gaming Review Paper 7.

²⁴ NZ Gaming Review Paper 19-23, 29-30, 65-74, 75-77.

²⁵ Department of Internal Affairs. “Gambling Act 2003” https://www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.NSF/wpg_URL/Services-Casino-and-Non-Casino-Gaming-Gambling-Act-2003?OpenDocument) (accessed on 1 February 2015) (“DIA Gambling Act”).

²⁶ DIA Gambling Act.

matters, although it focuses on the regulation of horseracing, greyhound racing and sports betting in particular. The purposes of the NZ Gambling Act include controlling of the growth in gambling, legalising some forms of gambling (while prohibiting others), promoting responsible gambling, guarding against the risks associated with gambling and crimes related to gambling and ensuring that proceeds from gambling are distributed appropriately.²⁷

There are three main authorities that oversee or play a part in the regulation of gambling in New Zealand. The Department of Internal Affairs is tasked with the controlling of gambling and also issues licenses for gambling that takes place outside casinos.²⁸ The Gambling Commission's main function is the licensing of casinos.²⁹ The New Zealand Lotteries Commission operates lotteries in New Zealand, including Lotto and Instant Kiwi.³⁰ Until recently, the position in New Zealand in this regard differed from the one in South Africa, where the National Lottery was conducted by a licensed operator under supervision of the National Lotteries Board. However, the Lotteries Amendment Act, 2013 came into force in South Africa on 14 April 2015 and changed the National Lotteries Board's name to the National Lotteries Commission. The powers of South Africa's National Lotteries Commission were extended too and the National Lottery can now be conducted by a licensed operator or an organ of state. (Previously, organs of state could not be licensed to operate the National Lottery.)³¹ The third main authority on New Zealand's gambling scene is the Ministry of Health, which plays a role in gambling regulation, particularly in the area of problem gambling services.³² In South Africa, it seems that problem gambling is mostly the responsibility of the National Responsible Gambling Programme and the South African Responsible Gambling Foundation – and not South Africa's Department of Health.³³

²⁷ S3.

²⁸ Department of Internal Affairs "Gambling Fact Sheet #1: Gambling Regulation in New Zealand" ("Fact Sheet 1") 2. The unit is known as "Gambling Compliance". It also fulfils other functions, such as providing Government with policy input, educating the public and setting certain gambling related rules and standards.

²⁹ Fact Sheet 1 2. The Gambling Commission also hears appeals against decisions of the Department of Internal Affairs and can function as a commission of enquiry.

³⁰ Fact Sheet 1 2.

³¹ See, inter alia, sections 1(a), 3, 4 and 13 of the Lotteries Amendment Act, 2013 and the Memorandum on the Objects of the Lotteries Amendment Bill, 2013.

³² Fact Sheet 1 2.

³³ National Responsible Gambling Programme "History, Structure and Function of the NGRP" <http://www.responsiblegambling.co.za/content/?37> (accessed on 21 February 2015); Collins P ea

As a general departure point, gambling is prohibited in New Zealand unless it is authorised by the NZ Gambling Act, the Racing Act 2003 or constitutes private gambling.³⁴ “Private Gambling” is defined as “gambling by persons at a private residence”, but it must comply with a number of requirements in order to be lawful.³⁵ The requirements include, *inter alia*, that all stakes placed must be distributed as rewards, the gambling must mainly be a form of social event or entertainment, the person conducting the gambling must not make money out of it and there must be no admission fees.³⁶ The NZ Gambling Act expressly prohibits bookmaking and remote interactive gambling,³⁷ and does not allow the authorisation of any of those activities.³⁸

The NZ Gambling Act provides for six different classes of authorised gambling.³⁹ No licence is required for the first two classes.⁴⁰ Gambling must meet a variety of criteria in order to be categorised as class 1 or 2 gambling. These criteria relate to, *inter alia*, the purposes for which the gambling proceeds will be applied, the total value of prizes, the potential turnover of the gambling and the frequency of the gambling.⁴¹ In order to conduct gambling that falls within classes 3 and 4 an operator must obtain a licence.⁴²

“Addressing Problem Gambling: South Africa’s National Responsible Gambling Programme” 2011 *South African Medical Journal* 101:10 722-723.

³⁴ NZ Gambling Act, s9(1). Fact Sheet 1 1.

³⁵ S4.

³⁶ See the definition of “private gambling” in s4.

³⁷ According to s4(1):

“remote interactive gambling—

(a) includes—

- (i) gambling by a person at a distance by interaction through a communication device; or
- (ii) the conduct of gambling described in subparagraph (i) by a person; but

(b) does not include—

- (i) gambling conducted by the Lotteries Commission; or
- (ii) gambling authorised under the Racing Act 2003; or
- (iii) gambling by a person in New Zealand conducted by a gambling operator located outside New Zealand; or
- (iv) a sales promotion scheme that is in the form of a lottery and is conducted in New Zealand.”

³⁸ S9(2)(b).

³⁹ S20(1).

⁴⁰ S23 and 26.

⁴¹ See s22 for the criteria that apply to class 1 gambling and s24 for those that relate to class 2 gambling. S25 also contains a list of requirements that apply to class 2 gambling specifically. Those requirements have to be met in relation to gambling that meets the criteria in s24 and relate to matters such as the publication of point of sale information, the announcement of results, a prohibition on the incurring of costs relating to the claiming of prizes as well as requirements that relate to unclaimed prizes.

⁴² S28(1) and 31. See s27 for the criteria that relate to class 3 gambling and s30 for the criteria that apply in respect of class 4 gambling.

The remaining two classes encompass casino gambling and lotteries conducted by the Lotteries Commission.

Apart from dealing with the various classes of authorised gambling, the NZ Gambling Act also deals with matters such as application for and renewal and suspension of gambling licences.⁴³ Part 3 of the NZ Gambling Act provides for the establishment of the Gambling Commission and matters related to the operation of the Commission.⁴⁴ A large portion of the statute is dedicated to the New Zealand Lotteries Commission and the operation of lotteries.⁴⁵ The distribution of lottery proceeds is regulated as well and the NZ Gambling Act provides for the establishment of the New Zealand Lottery Grants Board in this regard.⁴⁶

In order to deal with the issue of problem gambling, the NZ Gambling Act contains various provisions that deal with “harm prevention and minimisation”.⁴⁷ Subpart 1 imposes age restrictions on specific types of gambling. In terms of section 301, it is an offence for a person under the age of 18 years to purchase a ticket for an instant game and certain other lotteries. Persons under that age are prohibited from participating in class 4 gambling and casino gambling too.⁴⁸ Subpart 2 regulates admission to gambling venues and makes provision for the issuing of exclusion orders in order to prevent problem gamblers from entering gambling venues. The NZ Gambling Act also provides for the development and implementation of an “integrated problem gambling strategy” in order to curb problem gambling.⁴⁹ In order to fund the problem gambling strategy, a levy can be imposed on gambling operators.⁵⁰

The NZ Gambling Act deals with various miscellaneous matters as well, such as the enforceability of gambling contracts,⁵¹ and prohibits the provision of credit for gambling

⁴³ See, for example, subpart 3 (licensing of class 3 gambling), subpart 4 (licensing of class 4 gambling) and subpart 5 (casino gambling) in Part 2 of the NZ Gambling Act.

⁴⁴ See s220 to 235.

⁴⁵ See subpart 2 of part 3 of the NZ Gambling Act.

⁴⁶ See subpart 3 of the NZ Gambling Act.

⁴⁷ See part 4 of the NZ Gambling Act. The provisions are aimed at protecting consumers and the public in general.

⁴⁸ See s302 and 303.

⁴⁹ S317 and 318.

⁵⁰ S319 to 323.

⁵¹ In terms of s14(1), a contract will be illegal if it relates to illegal gambling, but will be enforceable under s14(2) if it is authorised by or under the NZ Gambling Act.

purposes.⁵² It is also an offence to advertise overseas gambling in New Zealand.⁵³ In this regard, the NZ Gambling Act creates an anomalous position when it comes to the internet and gambling. It is illegal for a person in New Zealand to participate in remote interactive gambling⁵⁴ (online gambling) and to advertise overseas online gambling in New Zealand. However, a person in New Zealand may participate in online gambling which is conducted by an operator based outside New Zealand.⁵⁵

Online gambling was the subject matter of *Department of Internal Affairs v TV Works Ltd*,⁵⁶ in which the accused were charged with advertising overseas gambling in New Zealand.⁵⁷ The District Court confirmed the anomalous position, noting that New Zealand courts do not have jurisdiction over matters outside New Zealand and mentioning that the NZ Gambling Act did not prohibit someone in New Zealand from participating in online gambling offered by an operator outside that country.⁵⁸ The court dismissed the charges on the basis that the relevant activity did not constitute gambling. However, the decision on that basis was overturned on appeal to the High Court,⁵⁹ and on further appeal the High Court's decision was confirmed by the Court of Appeal.⁶⁰ It appears that under New Zealand's previous gambling statute, the Gaming and Lotteries Act 1977, the position was similar in that the Department of Internal Affairs acknowledged that persons in New Zealand could participate in online gambling conducted by operators outside New Zealand, although such activity may

⁵² S15. However, the holder of a casino operator's licence may offer or provide credit with the approval of the Casino Control Authority or the Gambling Commission. (S15(3))

⁵³ S16(1). See CCH 28-29.

⁵⁴ See the definition in fn 37 above and the prohibition on remote interactive gambling in s9(1)(2)(b).

⁵⁵ The District Court judgement also drew attention due to its recognition of the digital era. The judgement was in digital form and contained embedded videos. See for example Shera R "Judge Harvey Goes Web 2.0" (<http://www.lojo.co.nz/updates-article/Judge-Harvey-Goes-Web-20>, accessed on 23 February 2015).

⁵⁶ CR 08004505568-620 (District Court, Auckland, 23 June 2010).

⁵⁷ Paras 25-33 of the judgement.

⁵⁸ Paras 109-110 of the judgement.

⁵⁹ *Department of Internal Affairs v TV Works Ltd* CRI 2010-404-256 [2010] NZHC 2024 (17 November 2010).

⁶⁰ *TV Works Ltd v Department of Internal Affairs* [2012] NZCA 160; NZAR 534 (26 April 2012). *The New Zealand Herald* "Judge calls bluff on online gambling site" 10 July 2010 (http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10657874, accessed on 23 February 2015); *The New Zealand Herald* "Court settles wrangle over definition of gambling" 26 April 2012 (http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10801678, accessed on 23 February 2015); Nightingale S ea "Internet gambling – But not as you know it" (<http://www.buddlefindlay.com/legal-update-on-ICT-aug-2011>, accessed on 23 February 2015).

have constituted illegal gambling in the strict sense.⁶¹ A similar matter can also be found in South African case law. In *Casino Enterprises (Pty) Ltd v Gauteng Gambling Board and Others*,⁶² a casino was located in Swaziland but the Supreme Court of Appeal found that the gambling took place in South Africa if persons in South Africa gambled on the casino's website, and that it was unlawful to advertise the casino in South Africa.⁶³

Provision is made in the NZ Gambling Act for the authorisation of specific forms of gambling. In this regard, section 18 specifically provides that sales promotion schemes will be lawful (if they comply with the relevant criteria). The Governor-General is also allowed to declare an act, behaviour or transaction not to be gambling.⁶⁴ Pursuant to this, the Gambling (Non-gambling Activities) Regulations 2013 have been issued in relation to spot prizes. Section 18 and the aforesaid Regulations have an important bearing on promotional competitions and will be analysed below.⁶⁵

4.2.3 Sales promotion schemes under the NZ Gambling Act

A typical promotional competition involves a scheme in which participants submit entries in order to stand a chance to win a prize which is awarded by way of lot or chance. If one considers the definitions of "gambling"⁶⁶ and "lottery"⁶⁷ in the NZ

⁶¹ Simpson Grierson "Online Gambling – Can You or Can't You" April 2001 (<http://www.findlaw.com/12international/countries/nz/articles/440.html>, accessed on 23 February 2015).

⁶² 2011 (6) SA 614 (SCA).

⁶³ See paras 35, 36 and 40 of the judgement.

⁶⁴ S368(a).

⁶⁵ The Gambling (Prohibited Property) Regulations 2005 prohibits certain items from being offered as prizes. As such, these Regulations need to be considered in the context of sales promotion schemes as well.

⁶⁶ "The term is defined in s4 as follows:

"gambling—

- (a) means paying or staking consideration, directly or indirectly, on the outcome of something seeking to win money when the outcome depends wholly or partly on chance; and
- (b) includes a sales promotion scheme; and
- (c) includes bookmaking; and
- (d) includes betting, paying, or staking consideration on the outcome of a sporting event; but
- (e) does not include an act, behaviour, or transaction that is declared not to be gambling by regulations made under section 368."

⁶⁷ The term is defined in s4 as follows:

"lottery—

- (a) means a scheme or device involving multiple participants for which—
 - (i) a person pays consideration to participate, directly or indirectly; and
 - (ii) prizes of money are distributed according to a draw that takes place after all participants have entered; and
- (b) includes lotto, raffles, and sweepstakes".

Gambling Act, it becomes clear that such a competition could fall within the ambit of the Act, potentially rendering such a competition illegal.⁶⁸ In some circumstances, a promotional competition could be classified as “gambling” if participants submit entries (which might be regarded as consideration⁶⁹ if one follows a broad interpretation of the term) with the hope of winning money in a competition where the outcome is determined wholly or partly by chance (such as in the event of a random draw). A promotional competition could also be categorised as a “lottery” if one considers that some promotional competitions involve indirect payment by participants who stand a chance to win money prizes in a draw that takes place at the conclusion of the competition.

In view of the abovementioned issues, organisers of promotional competitions in New Zealand run the risk of falling foul of the NZ Gambling Act’s provisions and should therefore take care to prevent their competitions from being illegal. However, the New Zealand legislature must have recognised the need to allow lawful operation of such competitions, because provision has been made for the conducting of such competitions in the NZ Gambling Act. Sales promotion schemes are regulated by way of section 18 of the NZ Gambling Act. As such, the regulation of these competitions form part of gambling legislation, in contrast with the position in South Africa where promotional competitions are now regulated as part of consumer protection legislation – specifically section 36 of the Consumer Protection Act, 2008. It is interesting to note that some organisations in New Zealand advocate for the regulation of sales promotion schemes to be shifted to consumer protection legislation (i.e. the Fair Trading Act), while a similar shift has already happened in South African legislation.⁷⁰

The NZ Gambling Act deals in a very succinct manner with promotional competitions (referred to as “sales promotion schemes” in New Zealand).⁷¹ Section 18 explicitly

⁶⁸ Bachman E, Knox L and Peacock R “New Zealand” in *International Promotion Marketing Law Book* (“Bachman”) 192.

⁶⁹ The NZ Gambling Act does not define the term “consideration”.

⁷⁰ (See the submission by the Marketing Association of New Zealand in respect of the Ministry of Consumer Affairs’ Consumer Law Reform Discussion Paper, http://www.consumeraffairs.govt.nz/pdf-library/consumer-law-reform-submissions-pdfs/nz-marketing-association.pdf/at_download/file, accessed on 28 March 2015).

⁷¹ In this chapter, the terms “sales promotion scheme” and “prize competition” are used in most cases in order to refer to promotional competitions, because those terms are the ones that appear in the relevant New Zealand and British legislation.

states: “A sales promotion scheme is authorised by this Act”. A sales promotion scheme would automatically be authorised if it complies with the NZ Gambling Act and no further licence would be required.⁷² The scheme would therefore be regarded as lawful gambling and, as such, sales promotion schemes are listed in the NZ Gambling Act’s definition of “gambling”.⁷³ In order to understand what is meant by the term “sales promotion scheme”, one must refer to the relevant definition in section 4:

sales promotion scheme means gambling that does not involve a gaming machine nor a prize restricted or prohibited under section 17, used by a creator, distributor, or vendor of goods or services to promote the sale of those goods or services if—

- (a) participation in the gambling requires a person to purchase the goods or services promoted for a price not exceeding the usual retail price; and
- (b) the date or period on or over which the outcome of the gambling will be determined is clear to the participant at the time and place of sale; and
- (c) the person is not required to pay direct or indirect consideration other than to purchase the goods or services promoted (except the cost, at the standard rate, incurred in submitting an entry into the promotion, for example, the cost of postage at the standard rate or sending a telecommunication by mobile telephone at the standard rate); and
- (d) the outcome is determined—
 - (i) randomly or wholly by chance; or
 - (ii) partly by chance (whether chance plays the greater or lesser part) and partly by the application of some knowledge or skill.

In order for an organiser to run a promotional competition in New Zealand,⁷⁴ without contravening the NZ Gambling Act’s provisions, the organiser would have to ensure that the competition meets all of the criteria contained in the definition of “sales promotion scheme” reproduced above.⁷⁵ When determining whether the NZ Gambling Act applies, some authors suggest that the first step should be to enquire whether participants are required to purchase goods or services in order to enter the competition.⁷⁶ However, although the NZ Gambling Act’s sales promotion scheme

⁷² Department of Internal Affairs “Gambling Fact Sheet #9: Sales Promotion Schemes” (“Fact Sheet 9”) 1.

⁷³ See fn 66 above.

⁷⁴ The Department of Internal Affairs is of the view that a sales promotion conducted from overseas might not be legal either. Fact Sheet 9 1.

⁷⁵ Hurley M & Smedley R “Win! Win! Win!” 10 March 2010 (“Hurley & Smedley”) <http://www.anthoniharper.co.nz/cms/uploads/FJP-N-410-1%20Win%20Win%20Win%20-%20Newsletter.pdf>, accessed on 23 February 2015. (No longer available online, but copy on file with the author hereof.)

⁷⁶ Hurley & Smedley.

provisions are tailored for competitions that have purchase requirements, it is submitted that the NZ Gambling Act will not be relevant in such circumstances only. In competitions with no purchase requirement, participants might still be required to tender consideration – in which event the competition could still be classified as gambling. Alternatively, in order to remove the competition from the NZ Gambling Act's scope, the organiser would have to structure the competition in such a way that it does not contain all of the elements of “gambling” or a “lottery”.⁷⁷ This could be done by eliminating one of the traditional elements of gambling or a lottery, such as making the competition purely skill based (thereby removing the chance element).⁷⁸ The organiser could also attempt to remove the consideration element by making entry into the competition absolutely free.⁷⁹

Turning to the four criteria contained in the definition of “sales promotion scheme”, one sees that two of those relate to the consideration element. Subsection (a) presupposes that an organiser of a sales promotion scheme would require participants to purchase goods or services in order to enter the competition, and states that such consideration may not exceed the usual retail price of the goods. The NZ Gambling Act does not explain how one would determine if a price is the “usual retail price”. Presumably, this is the price normally charged. In other words, the price that would be payable if no competition was running. It would thus be lawful for an organiser to require entrants to purchase goods or services.⁸⁰ However, if an organiser wishes for its scheme to comply with the requirements for a sales promotion scheme, the organiser would have to require participants to purchase goods or services in order to enter the competition.⁸¹ Of course, if participants are not required to purchase goods or services, and there is no other form of consideration payable, the NZ Gambling Act would not

⁷⁷ CCH *Sales and Marketing Law in New Zealand* (“CCH”) 23-24. The authors suggest that organisers should first check whether the competition contains an element of gambling. If it does not, the competition will not be affected by the NZ Gambling Act. However, if a gambling element is present, the competition needs to comply with all of the requirements contained in the definition of “sales promotion scheme” in order to be legal.

⁷⁸ CCH 25. The authors provide the example of “a giveaway where the first 10 people get a prize”. However, it is questionable whether there will be no element of chance in such a competition, since it might be argued that chance will determine who the first ten people will be.

⁷⁹ CCH 25.

⁸⁰ In some countries, such as France, it is not lawful for organisers to require entrants to purchase goods or services in order to enter a competition. (Béjot M “France” in *International Promotion Marketing Law Book* 99) In South Africa, the position regarding this issue is unclear. See the discussion at pages 226-228 below.

⁸¹ This is due to the provisions in s4(a).

apply because the competition would not constitute gambling. But, if there is such a purchase requirement, all of the criteria would have to be met in order for the competition to be lawful.

Subsection (c) also makes it clear that no direct or indirect consideration (other than the usual retail price of the goods) must be payable by entrants in a sales promotion scheme.⁸² Initially, some authors were of the view that this meant that organisers had to avoid situations where entrants have to incur any indirect costs, such as postage fees or costs relating to text messages, although a competition might still qualify as a sales promotion scheme even if such standard costs are incurred.⁸³ However, others argued that entrants could be expected to bear the costs of entry, such as postage and text message fees, as long as those are standard fees and the fees are not increased.⁸⁴ This uncertainty was resolved when the Gambling Amendment Act 2015 amended the definition of “sales promotion scheme” in order to provide for an exception relating to standard telecommunication and postage fees. As such, entry expenses (such as postage or text messages at standard rates) are allowed to be incurred.⁸⁵ The Act explains that standard rates refer to rates that are determined by service providers (who are not connected to the competition) and which relate only to communication costs.⁸⁶ In other words, the telecommunication or postage costs may not include a margin which is payable in consideration for the right to enter the competition.

The definition of “sales promotion scheme” also requires the organiser of such a scheme to inform entrants of the “date or period on or over which the outcome of the gambling will be determined”.⁸⁷ This must be done at the point of sale (for example, at the store’s cash register counter) and at the time when the sale is concluded.⁸⁸ According to the Department of Internal Affairs, this requirement also means that a

⁸² Hurley & Smedley (unpaged).

⁸³ Baldwin Son & Carey “Beyond advertising – keeping your sales promotion within the law” 23 April 2010 (“Baldwin”) (<http://baldwins.com/beyond-advertising-keeping-your-sales-promotion-within-the-law/>, accessed on 24 February 2015).

⁸⁴ CCH 26; Bachman 192.

⁸⁵ See paragraph (c) of the definition of “sales promotion scheme”.

⁸⁶ S4(2A).

⁸⁷ Fact Sheet 9 2.

⁸⁸ See paragraph (b) of the definition of “sales promotion scheme”.

sales promotion scheme “must be run within a specified period of time” and that the relevant information should be included in material that promotes the competition.

The last requirement in the definition centres on the chance element. It is clear from that requirement that a competition would be classified as a sales promotion scheme if it involves chance in one way or another. This requirement is cast in broad terms and would affect any competition which contains an element of chance. However, whereas a competition organiser would usually scrutinize the chance related portions of definitions such as these in order to attempt to avoid their competition from falling within the scope of same, the situation is the other way around when it comes to the NZ Gambling Act. When that Act is considered, organisers of competitions (in which there is a purchase requirement) will endeavour to ensure that they can structure their competitions in such a way that they will actually fall within the ambit of the definition of “sales promotion scheme”.

Apart from the four requirements contained in the “sales promotion scheme” definition, organisers of such schemes must also ensure that the prizes awarded in such a scheme are not prohibited prizes in terms of the provisions of section 17.⁸⁹ That section empowers the making of regulations that specify prohibited prizes and confirms that gambling will be regarded as illegal if prohibited property is offered or used as prizes.⁹⁰ The Gambling (Prohibited Property) Regulations 2005 have been issued in this regard and prohibits items such as liquor, firearms and tobacco products from being awarded as prizes. A promoter may also not offer vouchers or entitlements to any prohibited property. The nature of a prize is required to be disclosed comprehensively too.⁹¹

The Gambling Amendment Act⁹² introduced a new section 17A which relates to the retail value of prizes. It requires that someone who conducts gambling must inform entrants of the “retail value and characteristics of any non-cash prize offered or used as a prize for the gambling”.⁹³ Although the NZ Gambling Act does not state this clearly, it is arguable that organisers of sales promotion schemes will have to comply

⁸⁹ The introductory text of the “sales promotion scheme” definition makes it clear that such a scheme may not involve a prohibited prize.

⁹⁰ S17(2).

⁹¹ Fact Sheet 9 2.

⁹² 2015 (No 3).

⁹³ S17A(1).

with this new requirement, since those schemes constitute gambling under the Act. It is submitted that this requirement was introduced in order to assist the public to make informed decisions before they enter competitions or participate in gambling.

The NZ Gambling Act's prohibition on remote interactive gambling creates challenges for promoters who wish to run promotional competitions online.⁹⁴ As mentioned before, remote interactive gambling takes place when a person gambles at a distance by interacting through a communication device.⁹⁵ As such, if a promotional competition involves a scheme in which entrants interact with the promoter via a communication device (such as a cell phone or computer), the competition may constitute remote interactive gambling. This would be the case if the relevant competition contains the typical elements of gambling, such as the staking of consideration on an uncertain event in the hope of winning a prize. However, there is an exception for remote interactive competitions that are run as sales promotion schemes specifically. The definition of "remote interactive gambling" provides that such gambling does not include "a sales promotion scheme that is in the form of a lottery and is conducted in New Zealand".⁹⁶ It seems, therefore, that a gambling type promotional competition conducted via the internet, a cell phone or similar means will be lawful only if the competition is structured as a lottery.

The use of the term "lottery" in the exception that relates to remotely conducted sales promotion schemes creates some confusion. The NZ Gambling Act's definition of "lottery"⁹⁷ contemplates a scheme in which persons pay consideration in order to stand the chance to win a money prize in a draw. If one had to use this definition, it could create a situation where a promoter would have to require participants to pay consideration in order to enter the competition and the promoter would have to award money prizes specifically. If one considers that promoters may in fact not charge consideration in respect of a sales promotion scheme use of the NZ Gambling Act's definition of "lottery" would be nonsensical. It does need to be pointed out that the definition of "lottery" includes a lotto, raffle and sweepstakes. Those terms are,

⁹⁴ Bachman 194; Wilson V "The Legality of Text Competitions under the Gambling Act" 29 September 2004 ("Wilson"), <http://www.internationallawoffice.com/newsletters/detail.aspx?g=b540e029-0910-4d1c-bfca-0ff183aadcc6&redir=1> (accessed on 25 February 2015).

⁹⁵ S4(1). See fn 37 above.

⁹⁶ Paragraph (b)(iv) of the definition of "remote interactive gambling". See CCH 27-28.

⁹⁷ See fn 67 above.

however, not defined. Still, some promotional competitions are conducted in the form of raffles and, as such, one might be able to bring such competitions within the scope of the “lottery” definition. Accordingly, it is submitted that the legislature had random draws in mind when it used the term “lottery” in the exception relating to sales promotion schemes. In order to be able to benefit from the sales promotion scheme exception to remote interactive gambling, a promoter would therefore have to structure its competition in such a manner that a group of participants enter the competition and the outcome needs to be determined by way of a random draw at the end of the competition. Any other form of gambling based promotional competition would fall foul of the prohibition on remote interactive gambling.

An “instant win game” would be an example of a competition which would be regarded as remote interactive gambling if participants have to access the internet in order to play such game.⁹⁸ The reason for this would be that a single participant will have an instant, isolated opportunity to determine whether or not they have won a prize and the competition will not involve a type of lottery where all entrants are entered into a single competition with a draw at the end. In order to avoid a competition from being classified as remote interactive gambling, an organiser would have to remove the remote interactive element. In other words, participation would have to take place by means other than the internet, a mobile phone or something similar.⁹⁹

One must also note that the sales promotion exception to remote interactive gambling requires that the sales promotion must be conducted in New Zealand.¹⁰⁰ This would mean that a remote interactive sales promotion scheme would not fall within the scope of the exception if it is operated from outside New Zealand, but is marketed to and open for participation by persons in New Zealand. In order to be lawful, an overseas promoter would have to ensure that its sales promotion scheme is actually organised and run in New Zealand.¹⁰¹ It is submitted that the legislature inserted these provisions in order to protect consumers against potential abusive schemes that are not regulated by New Zealand’s legislature and cannot be policed by the authorities in that country.

⁹⁸ CCH 28.

⁹⁹ Wilson (unpaged). Wilson, quoting the Department of Internal Affairs, also mentions that a text competition would be unlawful if no goods or services are actually promoted

¹⁰⁰ Fact Sheet 9 1; Baldwin.

¹⁰¹ Baldwin (unpaged).

4.2.4 Prize competitions and spot prizes

In addition to sales promotions schemes, the NZ Gambling Act also regulates other forms of competitions that might be related to promotional competitions. In particular, the Gambling Act (Prize Competition) Game Rules 2004 contain provisions in respect of prize competitions. Chance plays a role in these competitions, but entrants have to exercise a measure of knowledge or skill as well.¹⁰² To qualify under this category, direct or indirect consideration must be paid by entrants and prizes must be in the form of money.¹⁰³ The Department of Internal Affairs mention tagged fishing competitions and sporting competitions which involve random draws as examples of prize competitions.¹⁰⁴ In view of the consideration requirement, these competitions are lotteries and not sales promotion schemes, and operators of such competitions must comply with onerous and restrictive requirements.¹⁰⁵

Specific regulations have been issued under the NZ Gambling Act in order to declare that spot prize competitions will not be regarded as gambling if they meet the criteria in those regulations.¹⁰⁶ In essence, a spot prize competition is a scheme in which prizes are awarded by way of a draw which is held in relation to a specific event (for example a sport tournament). If a spot prize competition complies with the relevant

¹⁰² The Gambling Act (Prize Competition) Game Rules 2004 define “prize competition” as follows:

“**prize competition** means a scheme or a competition -

- (a) for which direct or indirect consideration is paid to participate; and
- (b) that distributes prizes of money or in which participants seek to win money; and
- (c) for which the result is determined partly by chance and partly by the performance by the participant of an activity of a kind that may be performed more readily by a participant possessing or exercising some knowledge or skill, whether or not it may also be performed successfully by chance.”

¹⁰³ See paragraphs (a) and (b) of the definition of “prize competition”.

¹⁰⁴ Department of Internal Affairs “Prize Competition Game Rules” (http://www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.nsf/wpg_URL/Services-Casino-and-Non-Casino-Gaming-Prize-Competition-Game-Rules, accessed on 28 March 2015)

¹⁰⁵ Game rules 4 to 10 contain stringent requirements, relating to matters such as competition tickets, prizes, record keeping and auditing.

¹⁰⁶ The Gambling (Non-gambling Activities) Regulations 2013. Regulation 3(1) defines a spot prize competition as follows:

a lottery having the following characteristics:

- (a) it forms part of, or is conducted together with, during, or within 7 days after the completion of, a competition or event;
- (b) it is subsidiary to the competition or event;
- (c) the consideration paid (directly or indirectly) to participate in it is the consideration paid to participate in or attend the competition or event, and no additional consideration (direct or indirect) is required.

requirements, the competition would be lawful and the operator would not require a gambling licence.¹⁰⁷

4.2.5 Other requirements relating to promotional competitions

When running promotional competitions in New Zealand promoters do not have to be mindful of gambling legislation only. They also need to ensure that their competitions do not fall foul of the provisions contained in related legislation and self-regulatory industry codes.¹⁰⁸

For promoters, the Fair Trading Act 1986 (“FTA”) is the most important legislation to consider, apart from the NZ Gambling Act. The FTA’s purposes include the prevention of conduct that is harmful to consumers and ensuring that consumers receive truthful information.¹⁰⁹ It is aimed at protecting consumers’ interests and confidence too.¹¹⁰

Regarding the FTA’s purpose, Judge Callander remarked as follows:

The trick, it seems, is to sort the genuine from the bogus, the legitimate from the misleading and deceptive. One reason for the Fair Trading Act 1986 was to ban misleading conduct and deceptive practices used by predatory con artists.”¹¹¹

In the case of promotional competitions and sales promotion schemes, the FTA’s provisions would mostly be relevant in relation to the marketing and promoting of those

¹⁰⁷ Department of Internal Affairs “Gambling Fact Sheet #40: Spot Prize Competitions” (“Fact Sheet 40”) ([http://www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.nsf/Files/Gambling-Fact-Sheets/\\$file/Gambling-Fact-Sheet-40-Spot-Prize-Competitions-9-July-2014.pdf](http://www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.nsf/Files/Gambling-Fact-Sheets/$file/Gambling-Fact-Sheet-40-Spot-Prize-Competitions-9-July-2014.pdf), accessed on 24 February 2015). Regulation 4 lists the following requirements that have to be met in order for a spot prize competition to be regarded as a non-gambling activity:

- (a) the determination of its outcome does not involve any gaming machine; and
- (b) no prize is property of a class specified by regulations under section 17 of the principal Act as property that must not be offered as a reward for gambling or used to reward a winner of gambling; and
- (c) the main event—
 - (i) is not itself an act, behaviour, or transaction that is gambling; and
 - (ii) benefits the community in which it is held (or some wider community of which it forms part).”

South Africa’s Lotteries Act, 1997 contains a similar exemption relating to lotteries that are conducted in relation to exempt entertainment, although the requirements are more onerous than those of the relevant New Zealand regulations that relate to spot prize competitions. (See s36 of the Lotteries Act, 1997.)

¹⁰⁸ CCH 29-30, 67-68; Bachman 190; Baldwin; Hurley & Smedley.

¹⁰⁹ FTA, s1A. Commerce Commission New Zealand “What is the Fair Trading Act ... and how does it affect me?” (<http://www.comcom.govt.nz/fair-trading/fair-trading-act-fact-sheets/what-is-the-fair-trading-act/>, accessed on 25 February 2015).

¹¹⁰ S1A(1).

¹¹¹ *Commerce Commission v Probitas Ltd and Ewan Malcolm Campbell* District Court, Tauranga, 26 March 2007 page 2, paragraphs 3 and 4).

competitions and schemes.¹¹² In particular, promoters need to ensure that they do not contravene the provisions of section 17, which deals with the offering of gifts and prizes.

In short, section 17 prohibits a person from offering gifts and prizes if they have no intention to in fact provide those gifts or prizes, or if those prizes or gifts will not be provided in accordance with the offer.¹¹³ In order to ensure that their competition offers comply with the provisions of section 17, promoters need to ensure that their offers are as clear and accurate as possible and that the relevant terms and conditions contain all crucial details.¹¹⁴ The terms and conditions should, in particular, specify the time period during which the competition will run.¹¹⁵ Promoters need to make sure that prizes are described without any ambiguity or untruth and that entrants will not be deceived or misinformed when it comes to the prizes or the odds of winning.¹¹⁶ For example, if a supplier offers the opportunity to win a specified sum of money, the offer would breach section 17's provisions if the winner will in fact receive a gift voucher to purchase the supplier's products, instead of the cash sum.¹¹⁷ A promoter would also breach those provisions if it offers a prize, but the offer does not disclose that there is a condition attached to the prize.¹¹⁸

The provisions of section 17 have formed the basis of a judgement of New Zealand's Court of Appeal. In *Commerce Commission v Progressive Enterprises Ltd*,¹¹⁹ a large supermarket chain was taken to task by the Commerce Commission in a matter that

¹¹² Bachman 190, 193; Baldwin; Hurley & Smedley. When devising marketing and promotional materials and campaigns surrounding promotional competitions, promoters need to take note of the provisions of Part 1 of the FTA in particular.

¹¹³ The full text of s17 reads as follows:

“No person shall,—

(a) in connection with the supply or possible supply of goods or services or with the promotion by any means of the supply or use of goods or services; or

(b) in connection with the sale or grant or the possible sale or grant of an interest in land or with the promotion by any means of the sale or grant of an interest in land,—

offer gifts, prizes, or other free items with the intention of not providing them or of not providing them as offered.”

¹¹⁴ Commerce Commission New Zealand “Special offers and competitions” August 2010 (“FTA Competitions Fact Sheet”) (<http://www.comcom.govt.nz/dmsdocument/1105>, accessed on 25 February 2015).

¹¹⁵ FTA Competitions Fact Sheet.

¹¹⁶ FTA Competitions Fact Sheet.

¹¹⁷ CCH 29.

¹¹⁸ CCH 29.

¹¹⁹ [2010] NZCA 374.

related to a competition's time period. In that case, the supermarket sold cereals which displayed offers to win an overseas trip.¹²⁰ However, the competition had already closed and the in-store promotional material did not state the closing date.¹²¹ Consumers complained that the relevant packaging was still found in stores even though the competition had come to an end.¹²² In the District Court, it was held that Progressive Enterprises contravened section 17.¹²³ However, on appeal, both the High Court and the Court of Appeal found that the Commerce Commission had to prove that Progressive Enterprises intended for consumers to be misled (in other words, *mens rea* had to be present), and that the Commerce Commission failed to do so.¹²⁴

In structuring and running competitions in New Zealand, the provisions of self-regulatory industry codes need to be kept in mind as well.¹²⁵ There are various codes relating to advertising, which have been issued by the Advertising Standards Authority.¹²⁶ The advertising codes of practice relate to matters such as ethics, alcohol advertising, gaming and gambling advertising and advertising aimed at children.¹²⁷

Organisers of sales promotion schemes need to ensure that their promotions and advertising in general comply with the relevant advertising codes. For example, when competitions are aimed at children, the relevant rules must be made clear and the advertiser may not exaggerate prize values and the odds of winning.¹²⁸ Where competitions are aimed at children, promoters must take steps to ensure that "excessive repeat purchase" is not promoted.¹²⁹ In an alcohol related competition, hazardous prizes may not be awarded if alcohol must be purchased by entrants in order to participate in such a competition.¹³⁰ (The Code does not explain the reasoning

¹²⁰ Paras 5-7 of the judgement.

¹²¹ Par 7 of the judgement. The closing date was displayed only inside the cereal packaging and could not be discovered unless the packaging was opened.

¹²² Paras 13 and 15 of the judgement.

¹²³ Par 1 of the judgement. (For the District Court's judgement, see *Commerce Commission v Progressive Enterprises Ltd* DC Manukau CRI-2007-092-6035, 14 April 2008)

¹²⁴ Paras 2 and 30-40 of the Court of Appeal judgement.

¹²⁵ Hurley & Smedley 2; Bachman 193.

¹²⁶ See the Advertising Standards Authority's website: www.asa.co.nz (accessed on 28 March 2015).

¹²⁷ The Advertising Standards Authority has compiled a booklet which contains the various codes of practice. It is available at this link: [http://www.asa.co.nz/pdfs/ASA%20CoP%202014%20\(Web\).pdf](http://www.asa.co.nz/pdfs/ASA%20CoP%202014%20(Web).pdf) (accessed on 8 August 2015).

¹²⁸ Principle 2(f) of the Code for Advertising to Children.

¹²⁹ Principle 2(j) of the Code for Advertising to Children.

¹³⁰ Principle 1(f) of the Code for Advertising and Promotion of Alcohol.

behind this, but it is submitted that the prohibition is intended to protect consumers against harm that might be caused if hazardous prizes are used while people are under the influence of alcohol.) Further, if the prize is in the form of a large volume of alcohol, the prize may not be made available in one delivery.¹³¹ In gambling and gaming advertisements, advertisers may not exaggerate the odds of winning or the size of prizes.¹³² Advertisers must be able to substantiate winning claims as well and, unless skill plays a role in the outcome of a game, they may not create the impression that skill can influence the result of the game.¹³³ Alcohol advertisers must also ensure that their advertisements and competitions are not open to or aimed at minors.¹³⁴ In food advertising, promoters must take steps to make sure that their competitions “do not encourage excessive repeat purchases of foods high in fat, salt and sugar”.¹³⁵

In general, promoters should ensure that their sales promotions and competitions are conducted in accordance with the guidelines and standards of other industry organisations and authorities. These include the Broadcasting Standards Authority and the Interactive Advertising Bureau of New Zealand.

4.2.6 Remarks

In New Zealand, promotional competitions are still regulated by gambling legislation. The NZ Gambling Act specifically authorises promotional competitions, known as “sales promotion schemes” in that country.¹³⁶ In South Africa, a shift has been made by moving the regulation of these competitions from gambling legislation to consumer protection legislation.¹³⁷ Whereas New Zealand’s legislation has a few relatively

¹³¹ Principle 2(c) of the Code for Advertising and Promotion of Alcohol. The prize must also be in line with the Alcohol Advisory Council’s standard drink guidelines.

¹³² Principle 3(a) of the Code for Advertising Gaming and Gambling.

¹³³ Principles 3(a) and (b) of the Code for Advertising Gaming and Gambling.

¹³⁴ See principles 3(b), (c) and (i).

¹³⁵ Principle 2(f) of the Code for Advertising Food.

¹³⁶ S18 of the Gambling Act 2003.

¹³⁷ While this recognises the sales promotional nature of these competitions, the shift has not been made without resultant complications. For example, a chance based competition would still qualify as a lottery. As such, it would be unlawful by virtue of the provisions of s56 of the Lotteries Act, 1997, unless it is authorised by the Lotteries Act or any other law. Therefore, if a competition complies with s36 of the CPA, it would be authorised. If not, it would have to comply with the requirements of the Lotteries Act, which would be very difficult to meet. Formerly, promotional competitions were regulated and authorised by s54 of the Lotteries Act, but s54 has been repealed. Nevertheless, the Lotteries Act still refers to s54 in a number of places, including s56(b) and (c). Furthermore, whereas the Lotteries Act used to define “promotional competition” with reference to the definition contained in the CPA, the Lotteries Amendment Act, 2013 removed the definition, thereby making it difficult to interpret provisions

simple requirements for the legal conducting of promotional competitions, South African legislation contains detailed and somewhat lengthy provisions that regulate promotional competitions.¹³⁸ It is submitted that the reason for the more comprehensive approach in South Africa lies in the fact that those provisions are aimed at protecting consumers and that the legislature therefore meant to regulate promotional competitions more closely in order to protect consumers against abusive practices.

There is some merit in New Zealand's concise and uncomplicated regulation of promotional competitions. It provides promoters with the opportunity to conduct sales promotions in an environment that is not overly restrictive. For example, New Zealand's law does not require that the running of a promotional competition must be overseen by an independent attorney, advocate, auditor or the like.¹³⁹ That country's legislation also makes it clear that a sales promotion scheme can involve a requirement that entrants must purchase a promoter's goods or services in order to be able to participate in a competition. In South Africa, this position is not entirely certain and promoters would welcome clarification in this regard.¹⁴⁰ The NZ Gambling Act also allows for entry submission costs to be incurred at standard telecommunication or postage rates.¹⁴¹ South Africa similarly allows such charges,¹⁴² but the legislature chose to impose a specific monetary amount on the charges that may be incurred when entries are submitted electronically.¹⁴³ The monetary amount has not been updated for a number of years.¹⁴⁴ It is submitted that this makes it difficult

in the Lotteries Act that still refer to "promotional competitions". These issues will be discussed in further detail below. (See Chapter 5.)

¹³⁸ See s36 of the CPA.

¹³⁹ In South Africa, this is a requirement. See regulation 11(5) of the Consumer Protection Act Regulations.

¹⁴⁰ S36(3)(b) states that entrants may not be required to pay consideration in order to participate in a promotional competition. However, in an apparent attempt to clarify this, s36(4)(b) refers to a requirement that entrants must purchase goods or services, but states that the ordinary price for those goods or services may not be increased. This issue will be discussed in further detail below. (See section 5.4.6 below)

¹⁴¹ See paragraph c of the definition of "sales promotion scheme" in New Zealand's Gambling Act 2003. The position is also further clarified by s4(2A).

¹⁴² S36(3)(a) of the CPA.

¹⁴³ Regulation 11(1) of the Consumer Protection Act Regulations imposes a limit of R1.50 on charges relating to electronic competition entries.

¹⁴⁴ The relevant regulations were published on 1 April 2011.

for promoters to run competitions which involve electronic entries, due to the constant increase in service provider charges.

It is submitted that New Zealand's regulation of promotional competitions can serve as a model for uncomplicated regulation. Accordingly, if South Africa's regulation of such competitions is reviewed at some point in the future, the New Zealand model could serve as a benchmark against which South Africa's legislation can be measured.

4.3 Great Britain

4.3.1 Background

The United Kingdom of Great Britain¹⁴⁵ and Northern Ireland currently consists of England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.¹⁴⁶ The British country's roots can be traced back to the tenth century when a number of Celtic kingdoms were joined under King Athelstan.¹⁴⁷ Wales united with England during the 1500s, while Scotland entered the union in 1707 and the United Kingdom of Great Britain was established.¹⁴⁸ Ireland became part of the union in the nineteenth century, but the Republic of Ireland left the union again during the twentieth century.¹⁴⁹

The global history of gambling is intertwined with the history of gambling in Britain.¹⁵⁰ The lottery, in particular, has a long history in that country, Queen Elizabeth's lottery in the 1500s being one of the earliest examples.¹⁵¹ Under English common law, gambling was not unlawful and gambling debts were enforceable.¹⁵² However, legislation prohibited gambling to various degrees during the course of English history.

¹⁴⁵ Although this discussion also deals with gambling in the United Kingdom generally, the Gambling Act 2005 applies to only England, Scotland and Wales (the three countries that constitute Great Britain). [Crown G, Bray O & Earle R *Advertising Law and Regulation* (2nd ed) ("Crown 2010") 233] The discussion of the current British gambling legislation will therefore focus on only the Gambling Act 2005, and the position in Northern Ireland will not be examined.

¹⁴⁶ Central Intelligence Agency *The World Factbook* "United Kingdom" 10 April 2015 ("CIA Factbook UK") (<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/uk.html>, accessed on 18 April 2015); Encyclopaedia Britannica "United Kingdom" (<http://global.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/615557/United-Kingdom>, accessed on 18 April 2015) ("Britannica, UK").

¹⁴⁷ Britannica, UK.

¹⁴⁸ Britannica, UK.

¹⁴⁹ CIA Factbook UK; Britannica, UK.

¹⁵⁰ See Chapter 3 above, for an overview of the history of gambling, which includes information on gambling's history in Britain.

¹⁵¹ See pages 98-99 above.

¹⁵² Monkcom SP *ea Smith & Monkcom: The Law of Gambling* (3rd ed) ("Monkcom") 7. Gambling debts were made unenforceable by the provisions of the Gaming Act 1845. [Monkcom 5; Orford J *ea Gambling and problem gambling in Britain* ("Orford 2003") 2]

The Unlawful Games Act 1541 was the first notable statute in this regard.¹⁵³ The Lotteries Act 1823 banned lotteries in Britain, although they were conducted intermittently in earlier times.¹⁵⁴ (The aforesaid statute created a principle which underlies British lotteries law up to the present day: lotteries are unlawful in Britain except if legislation allows their operation.¹⁵⁵) The Betting Houses Act 1853 then outlawed betting houses and gambling remained unlawful for a number of years.¹⁵⁶

Legalised gambling returned to Britain during the twentieth century.¹⁵⁷ As a precursor, the Select Committee on Betting Duty in 1923 accepted (although only in principle) that gambling could be legal and regulated.¹⁵⁸ Lotteries were reintroduced, in a limited fashion, when lotteries incidental to exempt entertainment as well as some private lotteries were legalised.¹⁵⁹ These lotteries were legalised by the Betting and Lotteries Act 1934, which was promulgated as a result of the findings of the Royal Commission on Lotteries and Betting which held proceedings during 1933 and 1934. A major turning point was reached after the Royal Commission on Betting, Lotteries and Gaming 1949-1951 (the “1951 Commission”) issued its report.¹⁶⁰ The 1951 Commission found that “the object of gambling legislation should be to interfere as little as possible with individual liberty to take part in the various forms of gambling but to impose such restrictions as are desirable and practicable to discourage or prevent excess.”¹⁶¹ Consequently, the Betting and Gaming Act 1960 repealed the prohibition on gambling and made provision for a number of legalised, regulated forms of gambling.

¹⁵³ Monkcom 4. The said act even banned tennis in certain circumstances. See Monkcom 4-27 for an overview of the development of British gambling legislation

¹⁵⁴ Monkcom 25; Orford 2003 2; Merkin RM “Prize Competitions – The Lottery of the Law” 1981 *Lloyd’s Maritime and Commercial Law Quarterly* 66-82 (“Merkin”) 67. (Van Niekerk JP *The Development of the Principles of Insurance Law in the Netherlands from 1500 to 1800* 104 fn 73) The 1823 Act also prohibited the sale of foreign lottery tickets in Britain.

¹⁵⁵ Monkcom 26. South African lotteries law follows a similar approach. See, for example, s56 of the Lotteries Act, 1997.

¹⁵⁶ Orford 2003 2.

¹⁵⁷ See Dixon D *From Prohibition to Regulation: Bookmaking, Anti-Gambling, and the Law for a* discussion of British gambling history and, in particular, the legalisation of gambling in Britain during the twentieth century.

¹⁵⁸ Orford 2003 3.

¹⁵⁹ Monkcom 26; Orford 2003 3. Similar provisions only entered South African law at the end of the twentieth century by way of the Lotteries Act, 1997.

¹⁶⁰ Orford 2003 3.

¹⁶¹ Report of the Royal Commission on Betting, Lotteries and Gaming (Cmd. 8190) (“1951 Commission Report”) 55.

The 1951 Commission considered prize competitions in its report, mentioning that such competitions had to be determined by skill in order to be lawful.¹⁶² However, the Commission was also of the view that chance in fact determined the outcome of many prize competitions, but decided not to tighten the existing legal provisions on the basis that such competitions did not have significant adverse consequences for society.¹⁶³

The development of legislation relating to gambling and lotteries continued unabated. For example, the 1960 Act was overtaken by the Betting, Gaming and Lotteries Act 1963.¹⁶⁴ The Lotteries Act 1975 was then promulgated in order to deal with lotteries specifically. The Lotteries Act 1975 was promulgated as a result of the work of the 1973 Report of the Interdepartmental Working Party on Lotteries,¹⁶⁵ known as the “Whitney Report”.¹⁶⁶ It repealed and re-enacted some provisions found in the Betting, Gambling and Lotteries Act, 1963. However, the law relating to lotteries was then shifted to the Lotteries and Amusements Act 1976, which merged the Betting, Gaming and Lotteries 1963 and the Lotteries Act 1975.¹⁶⁷

Despite the changes brought about by the Betting and Gaming Act 1960, British regulation of gambling remained paternalistic, and the approach was to legalise gambling, but to regulate it strictly in order to avoid stimulating any demand for the activity.¹⁶⁸ However, views regarding gambling started to shift. For example, in 1978 the Royal Commission on Gambling (chaired by Lord Rothschild) issued its report.¹⁶⁹ It followed the 1951 Commission’s philosophy that gambling demand should not be stimulated, however it did report that members of the Commission held divergent views regarding whether a paternalistic approach should be followed in respect of gambling.¹⁷⁰ The 1978 Royal Commission also made a significant recommendation when it concluded that a National Lottery should be introduced.¹⁷¹ In this context, it

¹⁶² 1951 Commission Report 123.

¹⁶³ 1951 Commission Report 123.

¹⁶⁴ The legislation from the 1960s was promulgated to restrain the proliferation of the machine gaming that stemmed from the 1960 Act. (Monkcom 23)

¹⁶⁵ Cmnd. 5506.

¹⁶⁶ Miers D “From Constraint to Competition: 50 Years of Change in British Gambling Policy” 2011 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 15:3 93 (“Miers 2011”) 97.

¹⁶⁷ Monkcom 27.

¹⁶⁸ Reith G “The Culture of Gambling in Great Britain: Legislative and Social Change” in Spapens T, Littler A and Fijnaut C (eds) *Crime, addiction, and the regulation of gambling* 165 (“Reith 2008”).

¹⁶⁹ Royal Commission on Gambling Final Report (Cmnd. 7200) (“1978 Commission Report”)

¹⁷⁰ 1978 Commission Report 4-6.

¹⁷¹ 1978 Commission Report 225-231.

deviated from the philosophy that gambling demand should not be stimulated, and suggested that the National Lottery would have to be marketed in order to be successful.¹⁷² However, the broad recommendations of the 1978 Royal Commission were not implemented immediately and the National Lottery was only introduced in 1994. Murphy ascribes this lack of implementation to the restrictive controls of the British Gaming Board.¹⁷³

The 1978 Royal Commission examined promotional competitions in its proceedings as well.¹⁷⁴ It mentioned that many forms of competitions were in fact conducted for purposes of promoting sales.¹⁷⁵ At that stage, chance based promotional competitions were still unlawful, although some promoters nevertheless conducted some competitions.¹⁷⁶ The Commission reached various conclusions, including that it was unworkable to require that competitions had to be based on substantial skill to be lawful.¹⁷⁷ The Commission recommended that competitions without entry charges should be made lawful (even those that did not require skill), but that promoters should not be allowed to charge for entries and, if entrants are required to purchase goods in order to participate, the price of the goods should not be inflated as a result thereof.¹⁷⁸ The Commission noted that implementation of its recommendations would have a significant impact on the running of competitions, but that it supported the need to make the law less complicated, while guarding against abuse.¹⁷⁹ The Commission

¹⁷² 1978 Commission Report 5, 229-230.

¹⁷³ Murphy S "Towards Deregulation ... and Beyond: The Demise of the Gaming Board and the Gambling Bill 2005" 2013 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 17:6 413 ("Murphy 2013") 413-414.

¹⁷⁴ 1978 Commission Report 240-260. The Commission surveyed a broad spectrum of competitions, ranging from competitions that had entry charges, newspaper competitions, "spot the ball" competitions, competitions run by bookmakers, charitable competitions, free competitions, competitions with product purchase requirements and competitions that required no skill.

¹⁷⁵ 1978 Commission Report 256, 258. The Commission did query competitions where consumers were required to purchase extra products in order to enter, but did not see a need for changing the law in response thereto.

¹⁷⁶ S14 of the Lotteries and Amusements Act 1976 prohibited the conducting of competitions that involved the forecasting of the results of future events as well as other competitions in which success did not depend on substantial skill. The wording of s14 is very similar to the wording of s56 of South Africa's Lotteries Act, 1997, except that the latter statute contains an exception in respect of promotional competitions. (1978 Commission Report 240-258.)

¹⁷⁷ 1978 Commission Report 259. The Commission also remarked that it did not make sense that private lotteries were unregulated, while charitable lotteries had to comply with various requirements. Furthermore, it questioned why prize competitions should be permitted for personal gain. The Commission also mentioned that competition participants should have the opportunity to determine whether or not they had won a prize.

¹⁷⁸ 1978 Commission Report 260.

¹⁷⁹ 1978 Commission Report 260. A submission to the Commission stated that a change to the law would have a negative effect on skills based competitions, because promoters would choose to run

stated that it saw no need to implement onerous compliance requirements in respect of free competitions.¹⁸⁰ In dealing with the Commission's recommendations, Merkin agreed with the Commission's view that legal restrictions should be reduced. However, he was of the view that the Commission overlooked the consumer protection angle and that the law should also deal with sales promotions that motivated people to buy products they did not want. Merkin suggest that the law should also prohibit competitions that required more than one purchase in order for someone to enter, and that entries should be limited to one per household.¹⁸¹

4.3.2 English case law relating to promotional competitions

Before turning to the developments that occurred near the turn of the twentieth century, it is necessary to consider some of the judgements relating to promotional competitions that were handed down during that century. In discussing the development of promotional competitions in Britain, Miers points out that competitions generally fell into three categories: those requiring no skill at all (such as competitions that required coupon collecting), true skill competitions (such as crossword puzzles and chess problems) and the problematic competitions that fell in between (such as those where a missing word had to be inserted, a limerick had to be completed or the outcome of an event had to be predicted).¹⁸²

Many judgements from the twentieth century actually referred back to *Taylor v Smetten*,¹⁸³ which was decided in 1883 and seems to be one of the standard cases relating to competitions. In that matter, a travelling salesman sold packets of tea from his tent.¹⁸⁴ Each packet contained a coupon, entitling the purchaser to one of various prizes.¹⁸⁵ The court noted that, although salesmen employed these methods to

chance based competitions instead. The relevant party was of the view that this would reduce the number of competitions that require skill and that there would therefore be fewer competitions available to entrants that wished to exercise their skill. The Commission did not, however, share this concern. (1978 Royal Commission Report 259-260)

¹⁸⁰ 1978 Commission Report 260.

¹⁸¹ Merkin 81-82.

¹⁸² Miers D *Regulating Commercial Gambling* ("Miers 2004") 177-178, citing Monkcom S (ed) *Smith and Monkcom's The Law of Betting, Gaming and Lotteries* (2nd ed).

¹⁸³ 11 QBD 207.

¹⁸⁴ 211.

¹⁸⁵ 211.

increase sales, the scheme constituted an illegal lottery, because participants bought the packets not only in order to obtain the tea, but also to receive a price.¹⁸⁶

A similar judgement was delivered in *Willis v Young and Stembridge*.¹⁸⁷ In that matter, a newspaper distributed numbered medals to members of the public.¹⁸⁸ The newspaper selected random numbers and the holders of the relevant medals became prize winners.¹⁸⁹ Even though entrants were not obliged to purchase newspapers or buy the medals, the court found that the competition was an illegal lottery because persons who bought the newspapers increased the newspapers' funds and this constituted the consideration element of a lottery.¹⁹⁰

The question whether skill or chance determined the winners of a competition was central to the matter of *Witty v World Service, Ltd*,¹⁹¹ which involved what is often classified as a "newspaper competition".¹⁹² In that instance, a newspaper ran a competition in which participants had to identify geographical places that were represented by pictures that appeared in the newspaper.¹⁹³ The court found that this required entrants to exercise substantial skill and, as such, the competition did not constitute a lottery.¹⁹⁴ In *Whitbread & Co Ltd v Bell; Bell v Whitbread & Co Ltd*,¹⁹⁵ a scheme in which a brewer and owner of licensed premises handed out envelopes that contained letters and coupons was also not considered to be a lottery because entrants received the envelopes for free when visiting the brewers' venues.¹⁹⁶ However, the court found that the scheme constituted an illegal competition within the meaning of the relevant legislation at the time.¹⁹⁷ The court thus dismissed the appeal against the conviction in respect of s47 of the Betting, Gaming and Lotteries Act, 1963. However, the decision in the *Whitbread* case was subsequently criticised in *Imperial*

¹⁸⁶ 211-212.

¹⁸⁷ 1907 1 KB 448.

¹⁸⁸ 449.

¹⁸⁹ 449.

¹⁹⁰ 454-455.

¹⁹¹ 1935 All ER 243 (CD).

¹⁹² Towards the end of the nineteenth century, newspapers started to change their marketing and editorial policies and sought to increase sales by way of competitions, which often involved limericks, missing words and the like. (Miers 2004 176-184)

¹⁹³ 243-244.

¹⁹⁴ 245.

¹⁹⁵ 1970 All ER 64.

¹⁹⁶ 68.

¹⁹⁷ 70-71.

Tobacco Ltd v Attorney-General.¹⁹⁸ The competition in the *Whitbread* case was declared to be an unlawful competition even though no skill was involved, but in *Imperial Tobacco Ltd* the House of Lords criticised that finding and stated that a competition should involve at least some skill in order to fall foul of the statutory prohibition.¹⁹⁹

Section 47(1)(a) of the erstwhile Betting and Lotteries Act 1934 essentially prohibited competitions that were run by newspapers and in which prizes were offered for the forecasting of the results of a future event or a past event, the results of which were not yet known.²⁰⁰ This prohibition came under the spotlight in *News of the World v Friend*.²⁰¹ That matter involved a so-called “spot the ball” competition in which the newspaper published an action picture of a football match, showing the players but not the ball.²⁰² Readers had to exercise their skill, taking into account various factors in order to decide where the ball was located, and indicate the position on the picture.²⁰³ A panel of experts then evaluated entries and determined which entry best indicated the location of the ball.²⁰⁴ The newspaper was convicted of contravening section 47(1)(a),²⁰⁵ on the basis that readers were in fact forecasting the outcome of the experts’ decision. On appeal, the House of Lords disagreed with the court *a quo* and ruled that the appellant was convicted on a contrived construction of the relevant prohibition.²⁰⁶ It disagreed that readers were actually participating in a forecasting competition in which they had to determine how the experts would decide and, instead, was of the view that readers understood the competition as a challenge in which they had to determine the location of the ball.²⁰⁷

¹⁹⁸ [1980] All ER 866 (HL).

¹⁹⁹ See *Imperial Tobacco Ltd* 875, 879.

²⁰⁰ South Africa’s current Lotteries Act, 1997 contains similar wording in s56(a).

²⁰¹ [1973] 1 All ER 422 (HL).

²⁰² 426.

²⁰³ 426. They did not have to guess the location of the ball, but were required to exercise their skill to determine where best the ball could be located, based on factors such as the position of the players.

²⁰⁴ 426.

²⁰⁵ It should be noted that the newspaper was not charged with a contravention of s47(2), which prohibited competitions in which the outcome did not depend on substantial skill. See page 424 of the judgement.

²⁰⁶ 429.

²⁰⁷ 429.

In *Reader's Digest Association Ltd v Williams*²⁰⁸ the consideration element of lotteries came under the spotlight again. Reader's Digest sent to the public envelopes random numbers, some of which entitled the relevant recipients to prizes.²⁰⁹ Before sending out the envelopes, Reader's Digest drew a couple of random numbers. Recipients could take up the magazine's sales offer by sending back an envelope marked "Yes, please" and could at the same time send back their random number in order to see if their number matched one of the pre-drawn numbers.²¹⁰ If someone did not want to take up the offer, they could send back the "No, thank you" envelope in order to participate in the competition and see whether they had won a prize.²¹¹ A magistrates' court ruled that Reader's Digest contravened the Betting, Gaming and Lotteries Act 1963 by using premises to conduct an illegal lottery.²¹² However, on appeal, the Queen's Bench Division found that something would only be a lottery if it involved the distribution of prizes by means of chance, and participants had to make a contribution in order to participate.²¹³ The court found that one had to take into account the mischief which the legislation intended to prevent and pointed out that lotteries legislation protected poor people from wasting their money on lotteries.²¹⁴ As such, the court found that consideration constituted a key element of a lottery and that something would not be a lottery if no consideration was required.²¹⁵ Accordingly, the court upheld the appeal on the basis that participants in Reader's Digest's competition were not required to offer consideration or purchase the magazine's products, and that the competition therefore did not constitute a lottery.²¹⁶ Subsequent to this judgement, many promoters added a "no purchase necessary" alternative entry route to participants in an attempt to ensure that their competitions could not be classified as lotteries.²¹⁷

²⁰⁸ [1976] 2 All ER 737 (QBD).

²⁰⁹ 738. The envelopes also contained general marketing material regarding the products and magazines distributed by Reader's Digest.

²¹⁰ 738.

²¹¹ 738.

²¹² 738.

²¹³ 739.

²¹⁴ 739. The court stated that "the evil which the lottery law has sought to prevent was the evil which existed where poor people with only a few pence to feed their children would go and put these few pence into a lottery and lose them, and this sociologically was a bad thing".

²¹⁵ 739.

²¹⁶ 739 and 742.

²¹⁷ Lawson R "Game Over" 4 May 2007 *Solicitor's Journal* 151:17 unpagged ("Lawson 2007a") (<http://www.solicitorsjournal.com/employment/discrimination/game-over>, accessed on 2 May 2015)

Competitions that involve a purchase requirement continued to reappear in English case law. The House of Lords delivered an important judgement in this regard in the matter of *Imperial Tobacco Ltd v Attorney-General*.²¹⁸ In that case, a cigarette manufacturer inserted scratch cards inside cigarette boxes.²¹⁹ Purchasers of the cigarettes had to scratch the foil off the cards, and if three prizes on the cards matched, they won a prize.²²⁰ The prizes ranged from free cigarettes to big cash prizes.²²¹ The House of Lords considered various previous judgements on the matter and eventually decided that the competition was a lottery because participants had to purchase cigarettes in order to stand a chance to win prizes, and the price paid for the cigarettes constituted consideration.²²² The House held that it was not necessary to prove that the consideration contributed towards the pool of prize money. The mere fact that participants were required to purchase products constituted the consideration element.²²³ The House also mentioned that the Lotteries and Amusements Act 1976 was not necessarily aimed at the same kind of mischief as may have been discussed in older judgements and pointed out that lotteries had become lawful in the meantime.²²⁴

Some English judgements focussed specifically on so-called “hybrid schemes”.²²⁵ These were competitions that involved two phases. In the first phase, entrants were required to show some kind of skill (such as the answering of a question).²²⁶ Often participants also had to offer consideration (such as paying for the promoter’s product in order to enter the competition). However, since that phase of the competition involved skill, the consideration element did not turn it into a lottery. Because many participants usually sent in the correct answer, the competition moved to a second phase in which the winner was identified in a free, random draw.²²⁷ Promoters argued that the two phases could be split and that both phases were lawful - the first phase

²¹⁸ [1980] 1 All ER 866 (HL).

²¹⁹ 869.

²²⁰ 869.

²²¹ 869.

²²² 868-875.

²²³ 872.

²²⁴ 874. However, the House did not venture into declaring what kind of mischief the 1976 Act was aimed at.

²²⁵ FitzGerald S “Bradfute Revisited” 38-41 Autumn 1996 *Newsletter of the Society for the Study of Gambling* No. 28 38-41 (“FitzGerald 1996”) 38.

²²⁶ FitzGerald 38.

²²⁷ FitzGerald 38.

was a skill contest and the second phase did not constitute a lottery due to the absence of the consideration element.²²⁸ For good measure, promoters offered participants a “no purchase necessary” alternative as well, which allowed people to send in mail entries.²²⁹ However, this practice came to an end when a magistrates’ court analysed a purported hybrid scheme competition, found that it in fact constituted a lottery and illegal competition, that the “no purchase necessary” alternative was contrived, not really used and therefore did not save the competition from being unlawful.²³⁰

4.3.3 The National Lottery Act 1993 and the Gambling Act 2005

A turning point was reached in Britain when the National Lottery Act 1993 was promulgated.²³¹ The National Lottery Act 1993 made provision for the establishment of the National Lottery, which was launched in 1994. This was the first national lottery in Britain since 1826, national lotteries having been conducted at various times during the 1500s and 1700s, before they were outlawed during 1826.²³²

The establishment of the National Lottery initiated a noteworthy shift in the British gambling environment, because the National Lottery was vigorously advertised and marketed in order to promote participation.²³³ This clashed with the philosophy that gambling should be allowed, but that demand for it should not be stimulated. Despite this, the “unstimulated demand” philosophy still applied to other gambling activities.²³⁴ According to Miers, the British government’s policy towards the National Lottery

²²⁸ FitzGerald 38. FitzGerald points out that promoters based their arguments for splitting the competitions on the case of *Director of Public Prosecutions v Bradfute and associates, Ltd.* [1967] 1 All ER 112 (QB) in which the court found that a competition could be divided into two schemes, although in that matter the one scheme involved an illegal lottery.

²²⁹ FitzGerald 38; Dresden B “The Gambling Act 2005: What does it mean for promotional marketing in practice?” (“Dresden 2005”) (<http://www.gala-marketlaw.com.previewdns.com/joomla4/pdf/GamblingActDec05.pdf>, accessed on 30 April 2015)

²³⁰ *R v Interactive Telephone Services Limited* Southampton Magistrates’ Court, 1995 (unreported); FitzGerald 41; Dresden 2005 2; Lawson R “Everyone a winner?” 7 January 2005 *Solicitors Journal* Vol 149 (“Lawson 2005”) (<http://www.solicitorsjournal.com/public/local-government/everyone-winner>, accessed on 30 April 2005). The case is known as the *Telemillion* case, because of the name of the competition that was the subject of the case.

²³¹ Monkcom 27. The statute’s full title is actually “National Lottery etc. Act 1993”. The National Lottery was established as a result of the work of the 1978 Royal Commission. [See pages 150-152 above; Miers D “Regulating Great Britain’s National Lottery” in Eadington WR & Cornelius JA (eds) *Gambling: Public Policies and the Social Sciences* (“Miers 1997”) 488-491]

²³² Reith G “The Culture of Gambling in Great Britain: Legislative and Social Change” in Spapens T, Littler A and Fijnaut C (eds) *Crime, addiction, and the regulation of gambling* 165 (“Reith 2008”) 167 fn 4.

²³³ Reith 2008 167.

²³⁴ Reith 2008 167; Miers 1997 483.

challenged the official policy towards gambling and also strengthened the industry's demand for change.²³⁵ Murphy remarks that the National Lottery also compromised the government's moral position towards gambling.²³⁶ Miers, noting that one can distinguish between social and economic regulation, points out that the National Lottery was a form of economic regulation which was intended to benefit good causes.²³⁷ Reith notes that the introduction of the National Lottery brought about remarkable change in British gambling culture as well.²³⁸ Whereas gambling used to be prevalent amongst mainly male, working class people, the National Lottery caused people from various parts of society to start participating in the activity.²³⁹ Reith points out that the National Lottery removed some of the stigma attached to gambling activities, because the National Lottery was seen to be charitable and was marketed in "ordinary places" such as grocery stores and was televised nationally.²⁴⁰

The introduction of the National Lottery also stimulated change in the broader gambling scene.²⁴¹ In 2000, the Gambling Review Body was created, under chairmanship of Sir Alan Budd.²⁴² Its purpose was to review the state of the gambling industry, analyse the social impact, benefits and costs of gambling, and make recommendations for legislative reform.²⁴³ The Gambling Review Body recommended sweeping changes, including the abolishment of the policy that gambling should be allowed but that demand should not be stimulated (the "unstimulated demand" principle).²⁴⁴ Further, it recommended the establishment of the Gambling Commission (to replace the Gaming Board).²⁴⁵ The opinion of the Gambling Review Body view was that gambling legislation should be simplified and consolidated, and that the approach

²³⁵ Miers 2011 98.

²³⁶ Murphy 2013 414.

²³⁷ Miers D "The Gambling Review Report: Redefining the Social and Economic Regulation of Commercial Gambling" 2003 *The Modern Law Review* 66:4 604 ("Miers 2003") 611.

²³⁸ Reith 2008 168.

²³⁹ Reith 2008 168.

²⁴⁰ Reith 2008 168.

²⁴¹ While the National Lottery was allowed to operate freely and market vigorously, the rest of the industry was still under tight restriction. This inconsistency led to demands for change. (Reith 2008 168)

²⁴² Gambling Review Report (Cm 5206) (the "Budd Report"). (Monkcom 59.)

²⁴³ Budd Report 6. An important task for the Review Body was also to consider how the gambling industry could be strengthened in order to improve the British economy. (Miers 2011 100)

²⁴⁴ Budd Report 8, 78; Murphy 2013 416.

²⁴⁵ Budd Report 99; Murphy 2013 416.

should be one of “better regulation”, which should be “*facilitative* rather than restrictive” when it comes to gambling licensing.²⁴⁶

In its report, the Gambling Review Body also dealt with promotional competitions (referred to as “prize competitions” in the Budd Report).²⁴⁷ It considered various forms of prize competitions, such as competitions linked to products or services, competitions conducted by television or radio stations and skills contests.²⁴⁸ The Gambling Review Body’s view was that prize competitions need not be prohibited,²⁴⁹ but that legislation had to cater for them and recognise their difference from other lotteries.²⁵⁰ It was not persuaded that customers who participated in prize competitions regarded those as lotteries and that prize draws were therefore competing with lotteries for the public’s attention.²⁵¹ However, the Gambling Review Body was opposed to commercial lotteries (such as competitions that involved premium rated phone calls) and was of the view that those should not be allowed.²⁵²

Based on its considerations mentioned above, the Gambling Review Body recommended that there should be a statutory definition for lotteries which can be used to distinguish ordinary lotteries from prize competitions and prize draws.²⁵³ However, in order to maintain its views against commercial lotteries, but in order to allow promoters to require people to purchase their goods or services in order to enter their prize competitions, the Gambling Review Body recommended adoption of the so-called “New Zealand model”.²⁵⁴ In terms of this model, promoters would be allowed to run prize promotions and require participants to purchase their goods and services, as long as the consideration payable did not exceed the ordinary price of the goods or

²⁴⁶ Miers 2011 101 (emphasis in Miers’s text); Budd Report 2.

²⁴⁷ Budd Report 155. The Review Body noted that some lotteries were holding themselves out to be prize competitions, but that their operators were not prosecuted.

²⁴⁸ Budd Report 161.

²⁴⁹ At that stage, prize competitions were still banned by virtue of section 14 of the Lotteries and Amusements Act 1976.

²⁵⁰ Budd Report 155. The Review Body’s opinion was also that gambling regulators should rather focus on other forms of lotteries instead.

²⁵¹ Budd Report 155, 161. In the Review Body’s view, most people associated lotteries with charity.

²⁵² Budd Report 161.

²⁵³ Budd Report 155. Up to that time, there had been no definition for the term “lottery” in British legislation. (Monkcom 25)

²⁵⁴ Budd Report 162. The Review Body took note of the fact that “promotional lotteries” had become legal in New Zealand. The lotteries are in fact known as “sales promotion scheme” in New Zealand. (See s18 of the NZ Gambling Act and the definition in s4 thereof.)

services.²⁵⁵ Despite this, the Gambling Review Body did recognise that some minimal costs, such as postage fees, had to be incurred and therefore recommended that such costs be allowed, subject to a maximum limit in order to avoid competitions being turned into commercial lotteries.²⁵⁶

The Gambling Review Body considered skill competitions too and was of the view that allowance should be made for prize competitions that involved substantial skill, while incorporating some form of a draw at some stage.²⁵⁷ The Review Body also recommended the removal of the prohibition on competitions that involved the forecasting of a future event (or a past event, the results of which are unknown).²⁵⁸ It assumed that the prohibition was contained in earlier legislation in order to distinguish lotteries from betting.²⁵⁹

After the Gambling Review Body's report was published, a draft Gambling Bill was prepared and then introduced on 18 October 2004.²⁶⁰ It was based on the recommendations of the Gambling Review Body.²⁶¹ The Bill was met with some resistance, which revealed the fact that many people in Britain still had strong views about and against gambling.²⁶² After some debates in the media and in parliament,

²⁵⁵ Budd Report 162. The Review Body pointed out that promoters in the United Kingdom were at that stage already allowed to run prize promotions, as long as there was no cost involved, and that many promoters offered a "no purchase required" alternative, although few people used the alternative route in reality.

²⁵⁶ Budd Report 162. The Review Body noted that judgements under the Lotteries and Amusements Act 1976 did not take real issue with the costs of postage in competitions. However, the Review Body's view was that a monetary limit had to be determined and suggested that an amount equal to twice the cost of a first class postage stamp could serve as a guideline in this regard. It also noted that some participants might send or phone in multiple entries, but did not have an issue with this.

²⁵⁷ Budd Report 162. The Budd Report states that entry fees for skill competitions "need not be minimal, in the same way as other prize competitions, not involving skill". It is submitted that this statement might contain a typographical error, because the Review Body recommended that prize competitions that involve chance should involve minimal entry fees only. As such, it is submitted that the Review Body was in fact referring to "other prize competitions, not involving *chance*". (own emphasis)

²⁵⁸ This prohibition was found in s14(1)(a) of the Lotteries and Amusements Act 1976. The Review Body did note that such competitions would still be governed by the laws relating to skill competitions.

²⁵⁹ Budd Report 162. The Review Body pointed out that these types of competitions might be regarded as betting.

²⁶⁰ Monkcom 61; Murphy 417; Miers 2011 101-102.

²⁶¹ Monkcom 60.

²⁶² Reith 2008 175-176; Murphy 418-422.

some amendments were made to the Bill.²⁶³ The Gambling Act 2005 eventually received royal assent on 7 April 2005 and came into force on 1 September 2007.²⁶⁴

The present position in Great Britain is therefore that gambling (including lotteries) is regulated by one piece of legislation, namely the Gambling Act 2005, while the National Lottery still operates by virtue of the National Lottery Act 1993.²⁶⁵ The Gambling Act 2005 is lengthy, containing 362 sections. It covers a wide spectrum of matters, ranging from the establishment of the Gambling Commission and the creation of various offences to the licensing of lotteries and various gambling activities and the regulation of gambling advertising. It also contains a part which is specifically aimed at the protection of children and young persons.²⁶⁶

4.3.4 Prize competitions under the Gambling Act 2005

In order to make provision for the lawful operation of prize competitions by promoters and to bring clarity to the legal position,²⁶⁷ section 339 of the Gambling Act 2005 states as follows:

Prize competitions

Participating in a competition or other arrangement under which a person may win a prize is not gambling for the purposes of this Act unless it is—

- (a) gaming within the meaning of section 6,

²⁶³ Monkcom 60-61; Reith 2008 177.

²⁶⁴ Intentions were for the Gambling Act 2005 to contribute to the economy, but commentators have queried whether it has in fact achieved this aim, particularly with regard to casino gambling. (Murphy 422; Miers 2011 102-103)

²⁶⁵ See s15 of the Gambling Act 2005. [Monkcom 44; Coles T “The Regulation of Lotteries in Great Britain Following the Gambling Act 2005” 2006 *Gaming Law Review* 10:5 465 (“Coles”)]

²⁶⁶ Part 4 of the Gambling Act 2005. Reith points out that the Gambling Act 2005 might make provision for the protection of children and young persons, but the onus is placed on gamblers themselves to act responsibly. She notes that the legislation is based on the assumption that the provision of sufficient information should assist gamblers to make their own decisions. She contrasts this with New Zealand’s “public health model”, which makes provision for training and awareness initiatives, and makes available treatment for persons that struggle with problem gambling. In Britain, on the other hand, charities are relied upon to provide such treatment. (Reith 2008 177-178)

²⁶⁷ Earlier legislation did not deal with the operation of prize competitions, but they were still covered by lotteries legislation (which did not define the term “lottery”). This situation led to numerous court cases that often revolved around the question of whether something amounted to a lottery. (See section 4.2.2). The various decisions did not always clarify the situation. The British legislature recognised this problem and suggested that a statutory definition for “lottery” would assist in giving clarity in respect of “arrangements whose status under the current law has proved problematic or uncertain”. [Explanatory Notes relating to the Gambling Act 2005 (“GA Explanatory Notes”) par 67] See Crown 2010 235, and also Circus P *Promotional Marketing Law: A Practical Guide* (“Circus”) 38-39; Macleod J *Consumer Sales Law* (“Macleod”) 313 and fn 179. For a discussion of problems experienced in respect of prize promotions under earlier legislation, see Dresden 2005 2-3.

- (b) participating in a lottery within the meaning of section 14, or
- (c) betting within the meaning of sections 9 to 11.

The section is not limited to competitions only but gives authorisation to any arrangement in terms of which someone could win a prize. Accordingly, if a promoter wishes to conduct a prize competition in Great Britain, it must ensure that the arrangement cannot be classified as gaming, betting or participation in a lottery, as set out in the Gambling Act 2005.²⁶⁸ If the arrangement does not meet the requirements for any of those activities, it will be lawful. If not, the arrangement would constitute gambling and would be illegal unless the promoter has obtained a licence to conduct the activity.²⁶⁹

In order to determine whether or not an arrangement will be regarded as a lawful prize competition, it is therefore important to understand what qualifies as “gaming”, “betting” and “participating in a lottery”. Part 1 of the Gambling Act 2005 contains certain “key concepts” and the aforesaid activities are found amongst those. One should also note that the Gambling Act 2005 defines “gambling” as meaning “gaming”, “betting” or “participating in a lottery”.²⁷⁰ This therefore ties in with section 339, leading to the conclusion that a prize competition will be lawful, unless it constitutes gambling.

4.3.4.1 Betting

The first concept to consider is “betting”. Section 9(1) defines this activity as follows:

In this Act “betting” means making or accepting a bet on—

- (a) the outcome of a race, competition or other event or process,
- (b) the likelihood of anything occurring or not occurring, or
- (c) whether anything is or is not true.²⁷¹

²⁶⁸ Crown 2010 234; Dresden B “United Kingdom” in *International Promotion Marketing Law Book* (2nd ed) (“Dresden 2010”) 275.

²⁶⁹ Crown 2010 234.

²⁷⁰ “Gaming” is defined in s6, “betting” in s9 and “participating in a lottery” in s14, subject to s15.

²⁷¹ S9(2) provides further that a transaction may still be betting if it concerns the outcome of a race, competition or other event or process, even if the race, competition, event or process has already occurred or been completed and one party to the transaction knows the outcome. Similarly, s9(3) states that a transaction might be betting if relates to the likelihood of anything occurring or not occurring and one party to the transaction knows the outcome. It is submitted that the intention of these subsections is to ensure that the relevant provisions do not apply to only future events, but that a transaction will also be covered if it involves betting on an unknown outcome which has already been achieved.

Section 11 goes further and sets out the principles relating to betting in the context of prize competitions specifically. It states:

For the purposes of section 9(1) a person makes a bet (despite the fact that he does not deposit a stake in the normal way of betting) if—

- (a) he participates in an arrangement in the course of which participants are required to guess any of the matters specified in section 9(1)(a) to (c),
- (b) he is required to pay to participate, and
- (c) if his guess is accurate, or more accurate than other guesses, he is to—
 - (i) win a prize, or
 - (ii) enter a class among whom one or more prizes are to be allocated (whether or not wholly by chance).

Accordingly, if participants in a competition are required to predict the outcome, occurrence or veracity of something, the competition could be categorised as betting.²⁷² However, it will only be classified as such if participants are required to make payment or contribute consideration in respect of the opportunity to participate (in other words, if they are required to deposit stakes on the event).²⁷³ The crucial test is therefore to determine whether or not the competition involves payment.²⁷⁴ Schedule 1 was appended to the Gambling Act 2005 in order to provide more clarity in this regard. It states that payment includes the payment of money, the transferring of money's worth, or payment for goods or services where the price "reflects the opportunity to participate in an arrangement under which a participant may win a prize".²⁷⁵ This means that a promoter may lawfully conduct a competition in which

²⁷² Lawson points out that, contrary to the position under s14 of the repealed Lotteries and Amusements Act 1976, the prohibition would affect any forecast, irrespective of whether it involves substantial skill or judgement. [Lawson R "Prize competitions in the new gambling regime" 2005 *New Law Journal* 155:7179 872 electronic version unpagged ("Lawson 2005")] In this regard, one must note that s11(2) provides that guessing includes "predicting using skill or judgment".

²⁷³ Circus 46; Dresden 2010 277; Kolah A *Essential Law for Marketers* 302. The Explanatory Notes point out that the Act does not contain a definition for "betting" as such, but that it generally means "the staking of money or other value on the outcome of a doubtful issue". (GA Explanatory Notes par 58) However, the payment element can be removed if the promoter also provides an alternative, free entry route in accordance with par 8 of Schedule 1 of the Gambling Act 2005.

²⁷⁴ However, it must be noted that all three elements in s11 must be present before a prize competition will constitute betting. Accordingly, in addition to payment for entry, entrants must also be required to make a guess and winners must be entitled to prizes or be entered in a class of persons (some of whom may receive prizes).

²⁷⁵ Par 2 of Schedule 1. Par 3 clarifies that it does not matter "to whom a payment is made" or "who receives benefit from a payment". Lawson points out that this clarification relates to case law. (Lawson 2007a unpagged) In *Atkinson v Murrell* [1972] 2 All ER 31 the court held that the identity of the person receiving payment was irrelevant. Par 4 also provides that it is irrelevant whether or not a participant knew that he stood a chance to win a prize when making the payment. Lawson notes that this

participants are required to forecast something and could even require participants to purchase the promoter's goods or services, as long as the price for the goods or services is not inflated in consideration for the competition opportunity and as long as no other consideration or payment is required.²⁷⁶

4.3.4.2 Gaming

Section 6(1) defines "gaming" as "playing a game of chance for a prize". Section 6(2) continues and describes a "game of chance" as follows:

- (a) includes—
 - (i) a game that involves both an element of chance and an element of skill,
 - (ii) a game that involves an element of chance that can be eliminated by superlative skill, and
 - (iii) a game that is presented as involving an element of chance, but
- (b) does not include a sport.

Section 6(3) also adds that it does not matter whether or not other people are involved in the game or whether the person plays against a computer. However, in order for gaming to take place, someone must have the opportunity to win a prize, but it does not matter whether or not the person might lose something in the course of playing the game.²⁷⁷ This is somewhat problematic, because it seems that a competition might therefore constitute gaming, even if there is no consideration involved. Despite this, commentators on the Gambling Act 2005 are of the view that prize competitions and free prize draws will not constitute gaming because those competitions do not involve the active playing of a game.²⁷⁸ Circus mentions "throwing a dice or spinning a wheel" as examples of active playing, but is of the view that scratching of a scratch card is a passive activity and does not constitute gaming.²⁷⁹

clarification voids the decision in *Minty v Sylvester* (1915) 84 LJKB 1982 in which it was held that there was no lottery because participants did not know that they were entered as a result of paying for their theatre seats. (Lawson 2007a unpagged; Circus 41)

²⁷⁶ Dresden 2010 277. Par 5 also deals with entries by way of post, telephone or another communication method, and states that the ordinary costs relating thereto will not be regarded as payment. However, par 6 states that a payment required to reveal whether some has won a competition will be regarded as payment to enter. Also, par 7 states that payment for claiming of a prize will constitute payment to enter.

²⁷⁷ S6(4).

²⁷⁸ Dresden 2010 277; Circus 244. However, Dresden warns that some online promotional games are at the risk of being classified as gaming. (Dresden 2010 277)

²⁷⁹ Circus 44.

This author has not been able to locate case law relating to whether a promotional competition can be regarded as gaming in terms of the provisions of the Gambling Act 2005. However, FitzGerald²⁸⁰ refers to a decision²⁸¹ of the United Kingdom's Upper Tribunal (Tax and Chancery Chamber) in which the Tribunal had to consider, in the context of tax legislation, whether "Spot the Ball" constitutes a game and, if so, whether participants were playing a game of chance. In that matter, the Tribunal held the view that a game involves some form of contest, which is played in terms of specific rules.²⁸² In its view, a game involves changing circumstances and playing the game entails the player reacting to those circumstances.²⁸³ The Tribunal also referred to case law²⁸⁴ in which it was found that "playing a game of chance involves some active participation" and that it could not take place without "some degree of skill or physical act or by exercising some choice". It mentioned that one must distinguish between a competition and a game, and that a game was accompanied with detail rules relating to the actual playing of the game.²⁸⁵ In the end, the Tribunal held that there was no game in the matter before it and that "completing and posting a coupon is not 'playing'".²⁸⁶

In view of the above, it is submitted that the conclusion may be drawn that ordinary promotional competitions would not constitute gaming, as long as participation in the competition is passive and does not involve active participation where circumstances change in the competition and the participant has to react accordingly and in terms of detailed game rules.

4.3.4.3 Lotteries

As mentioned before,²⁸⁷ the Gambling Act 2005 contains the first statutory definition for the term "lottery" in British history. Section 14(1) provides that something will be a

²⁸⁰ FitzGerald S 12 November 2014 "Case Law Update for the Institute of Licencing" (sic) (<http://www.instituteoflicensing.org/Public/National%20Events/NTE%202014/Presentations/D3%20S1%20-%20Susanna%20FitzGerald%20-%20Case%20Law%20Update.pdf>, accessed on 2 May 2015)

²⁸¹ *Commissioners for Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs v IFX Investment Company Ltd and others* [2014] UKUT 0398 (TCC)

²⁸² Page 12, par 21.

²⁸³ Page 12, par 22. The judge mentioned chess and board games as examples of games that involved more than one player, but also regarded patience (the card game) as a game.

²⁸⁴ *DPP v Regional Pools Promotions* [1964] 2 QB 244

²⁸⁵ Page 20, par 37.

²⁸⁶ Page 23, par 10.

²⁸⁷ See page 157 above.

lottery if it satisfies the description of a “simple lottery” or a “complex lottery”.²⁸⁸ The elements of a simple lottery are as follows:

- (a) persons are required to pay in order to participate in the arrangement,
- (b) in the course of the arrangement one or more prizes are allocated to one or more members of a class, and
- (c) the prizes are allocated by a process which relies wholly on chance.²⁸⁹

A complex lottery involves prize allocation by way of a series of processes. This is reflected in the definition, which contains a different third element and an additional fourth element:

- (a) persons are required to pay in order to participate in the arrangement,
- (b) in the course of the arrangement one or more prizes are allocated to one or more members of a class,
- (c) the prizes are allocated by a series of processes, and
- (d) the first of those processes relies wholly on chance.²⁹⁰

Both of these definitions display the three traditional elements of a lottery: consideration, prizes and chance.²⁹¹ If a promoter wishes to lawfully conduct a prize competition, it would have to omit one or more of the lottery elements from the competition.²⁹² It would be difficult to remove the prize element from the competition, because a competition would not really be a competition if there are no prizes, and it would be difficult to offer something to participants, without it being classified as a

²⁸⁸ Coles points out that the definitions follow those contained in decisions of the courts, but the distinction between the two types of lotteries is novel. (Coles 466) Lawson remarks that the concepts of simple and complex lotteries feature only in s14. (Lawson 2007a unpagged) However, it is submitted that the definition of “complex lottery” was inserted in order to regulate so-called “hybrid schemes”. (See page 156 above).

²⁸⁹ S14(2).

²⁹⁰ S14(3).

²⁹¹ The definitions in section 14 confirm the lottery definition found in *Reader’s Digest Association Ltd v Williams* [1976] 2 All ER 737 (QBD). [Crown 2010; Lawson R “When some prizes are more equal than others” 14 September 2007 *Solicitor’s Journal* 151:34 (“Lawson 2007b”) <http://www.solicitorsjournal.com/commercial/company/when-some-prizes-are-more-equal-others>, accessed on 3 May 2015, electronic version unpagged; FitzGerald S “Government gamble” 22 July 2005 *Solicitor’s Journal* 149:29 (“FitzGerald 2005”) <http://www.solicitorsjournal.com/public/local-government/government-gamble>, accessed on 3 May 2015, electronic version unpagged]

²⁹² All of the elements of a lottery must be present in order for the arrangement to constitute a lottery. (Macleod 314) True free draws therefore remain outside the scope of the Gambling Act 2005, due to the absence of the consideration element. [Gambling Commission “Prize competitions and free draws: The requirements of the Gambling Act 2005” December 2009 (“GC Guidance”) 8 <http://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/pdf/prize%20competitions%20and%20free%20draws%20-%20the%20requirements%20of%20the%20gambling%20act%202005%20-%20december%202009.pdf>, accessed on 3 May 2015]

prize.²⁹³ This is because the Gambling Act 2005 defines “prize” in very broad terms, stating that it includes “any money, articles or services”.²⁹⁴ Generally, this means that the promoter would have to ensure that the competition does not require payment and/or that the prizes are not allocated by way of chance.²⁹⁵ If the promoter cannot achieve this, and all the elements of a lottery are present, the arrangement would be illegal unless the promoter has obtained a licence to conduct a lottery²⁹⁶ or unless the arrangement constitutes an exempt lottery.²⁹⁷ It is therefore crucial to understand when an arrangement will involve payment or the allocation of prizes by way of chance.

If a promoter explicitly requires a participant to make payment in order to enter a competition (for example, the participant must pay a specified entry fee), the payment element of a lottery would be present.²⁹⁸ However, in order to cover other payments and payment requirements that might not be that obvious, section 14(6) refers one to Schedule 2 of the Gambling Act 2005.²⁹⁹ Paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 explains that paying would include “paying money” or “transferring money’s worth”.³⁰⁰ The Schedule

²⁹³ Lawson debates whether all things would necessarily be classified as prizes, mentioning that “facilities” and “accommodation” might not fall within the description of “money, articles or services”, but then points out that S14(4) uses the term “includes” and is therefore not a closed list. (Lawson 2007b) FitzGerald also points out that s14(4) does not specifically mention a chance as a prize, but that a chance (such as the opportunity to participate in a television show) could constitute a prize as well. (FitzGerald 2005 unpagged)

²⁹⁴ S14(4). It also does not matter whether or not the prize is in fact described as a prize. [S14(4)(a)] Circus deals with the use of the term “gift” too, and mentions that the terms “gift” is usually used in a sale promotion context if all customers become entitled to something free. (Circus 40)

²⁹⁵ Dresden 2010 275.

²⁹⁶ In terms of s98 of the Gambling Act 2005, licensed lotteries must be conducted by non-commercial societies for good causes or by local authorities for public purposes. A promoter will therefore have difficulties in obtaining a lottery licence, unless it is a non-commercial society or a local authority. [FitzGerald S November 2013 “Lotteries and Competitions” (“FitzGerald 2013”) 3 <http://www.instituteoflicensing.org/Public/National%20Events/NTE%202013/NTE%20DOCS/handouts%20not%20in%20delegate%20pack/d2%20s1%20Lotteries%20and%20Competitions%20Susanna%20F.pdf>, accessed on 3 May 2015]

²⁹⁷ Crown 2010 234. The Gambling Act 2005 provides exemptions for the running of incidental non-commercial lotteries (Schedule 11, Part 1), private lotteries (Schedule 11, Part 2), customer lotteries (Schedule 11, Part 3) and small society lotteries (Schedule 11, Part 4), and contains specific requirements for operating exempt lotteries. (Crown 2010 234 fn 4) The requirements for a customer lottery include that the promoter must be based and do business at specific premises, prize values must not exceed £50 and profits must not be generated by the lottery. (Circus 42)

²⁹⁸ Crown 2010 238.

²⁹⁹ Schedule 2 contains provisions that are virtually identical to those of Schedule 1 (which contains provisions relating to payment requirements in the context of betting).

³⁰⁰ Some promoters require entrants to provide their contact details or other data, but the Gambling Commission has stated that this would not be regarded as consideration, provided that a reasonable quantity of data is required. (GC Guidance 7)

further records that it does not matter “to whom payment is made”,³⁰¹ “who receives benefit from a payment” or whether a participant knows that he is entering a competition by making some form of payment.³⁰² In addition, a payment requirement will be present if participants are required to make payment in order to find out whether they have won a prize or if payment must be made by them in order to receive a prize.³⁰³

The Gambling Act 2005 also clarifies the position relating to a requirement that participants must purchase the promoter’s goods or services in order to enter a competition.³⁰⁴ Paragraph 2(c) of Schedule 2 states that “paying for goods or services at a price or rate which reflects the opportunity to participate in an arrangement” will be regarded as payment in respect of a competition. Accordingly, if the price is the ordinary price³⁰⁵ of the goods or services, the price will not be regarded as payment in respect of the competition.³⁰⁶ However, the price must not be increased so as to incorporate or make provisions for consideration in exchange for entry into the competition.³⁰⁷

There is now also some clarity regarding the costs associated with entering a competition.³⁰⁸ According to Schedule 2, the expense of mailing a letter, making a phone call or “using any other method of communication” will not be regarded as payment, as long as the expense occurs at the “normal rate”.³⁰⁹ A rate will be the

³⁰¹ In other words, if the promoter will not receive payment, but a fee is charged by the telecommunications service provider involved in the competition, participants will be regarded to have made payment in relation to participating in the competition. (Crown 2010 239 fn 22)

³⁰² Par 3 of Schedule 2. See fn 275 above for the background to these provisions.

³⁰³ Paras 6 and 7 of Schedule 2. However, the Gambling Commission’s view is that “costs needed to obtain or use [a] prize” (for example, delivery charges or road tax relating to the use of a car) will not be regarded as payments for receiving of a prize. (GC Guidance 8; Crown 2010 238 fn 21) It appears that a competition will not be a lottery if entrants are, for example, required to pay for a holiday and then stand the chance of winning a discount. (GC Guidance 8, par 4.10; Dresden 2010 276; Circus 40)

³⁰⁴ Previously, a competition was regarded to be a lottery if entrants were required to purchase goods or services in order to enter. [*Imperial Tobacco Ltd v Attorney-General* [1980] All ER 866 (HL)] (Crown 2010 241; Dresden 2010 276; Lawson 2007a unpagd)

³⁰⁵ Crown warns that it might be difficult for promoters of new products to show what the ordinary price would be if the products are not yet on the market. (Crown 2010 241)

³⁰⁶ According to Crown, a price will be regarded as payment for the right to enter a competition if there is no correlation between the price and the cost of the goods or the price of similar goods. (Crown 2010, 241)

³⁰⁷ Dresden 2010 276; Circus 39.

³⁰⁸ This was not regulated by legislation in the past, but costs of entry (such as postage charges) used to be overlooked. (Lawson 2007a unpagd; FitzGerald 2005 unpagd)

³⁰⁹ Schedule 2, par 5(1).

“normal rate” if it “does not reflect the opportunity to enter a lottery”.³¹⁰ (In other words, the rate must not be increased in order to include consideration for the opportunity to enter the competition.) In the Gambling Commission’s view it does not matter if different entrants pay different rates due to differences in service providers’ charges, as long as there is no specific charge in relation to participation in the competition.³¹¹

In order to give promoters the opportunity to avoid a situation where their competitions might be regarded as lotteries due to the presence of a purchase requirement, the legislature has made provision for competitions that involve a free entry alternative.³¹² However, promoters must comply with specific requirements in this regard.³¹³ In particular, every participant must have the opportunity to either pay for an entry or send in a communication in order to enter.³¹⁴ The communication can be sent by normal mail or another method (as long as that method is not “more expensive or less convenient than entering the lottery by paying”).³¹⁵ The alternative entry route must also be publicised in such a manner that potential entrants will be aware of it and the competition process must not discriminate between paying entrants and those that make use of the alternative route.³¹⁶

Apart from the payment element, one needs to examine the provisions that relate to allocation of prizes by way of chance as well.³¹⁷ If winners are determined by way of chance, a competition would be regarded as a lottery (and thus unlawful) unless one of the other lottery elements (consideration and prizes) is omitted.³¹⁸ In relation to the chance element, the Gambling Act 2005 states that a competition will be a lottery if it

³¹⁰ Schedule 2, par 5(2)(a).

³¹¹ GC Guidance 7. It seems that a premium rate would constitute consideration relating to participation in a competition. (Dresden 2010 276; Circus 39) Lawson, however, states that “even premium calls have a normal rate” and that the position is thus unclear. He mentions that the legislature could have specifically stated that premium rates would not be regarded as normal rates. (Lawson 2007a unpagged)

³¹² Circus 48-49; Dresden 2010 276; 238-240. It is no longer necessary for all promoters to offer free entry routes to avoid contravening lotteries legislation, but promoters will need to make free entry routes available if their competition involves some form of payment requirement (such as a premium rated phone call). (Dresden 2010 276; 49)

³¹³ See par 8 of Schedule 2.

³¹⁴ Par 8(1)(a) of Schedule 2.

³¹⁵ Par 8(1)(b) of Schedule 2. The Gambling Commission has noted that some promoters allow internet entries as free alternatives, but has noted that internet access might not be convenient or available to all participants. (See GC Guidance 7 for the Commission’s principles in this regard.)

³¹⁶ Paras 8(1)(c) and (d) of Schedule 2.

³¹⁷ Sections 14(2)(c) and 14(3)(d).

³¹⁸ Dresden 2010 276.

relies “wholly on chance”. In order to avoid the chance element, many promoters require participants to display some kind of skill.³¹⁹ However, in order to deal with a situation where a promoter builds a superficial skill requirement into a competition in an attempt to avoid the application of the Gambling Act 2005, section 14(5) states that an arrangement will still be a lottery if:

- (a) the requirement cannot reasonably be expected to prevent a significant proportion of persons who participate in the arrangement of which the process forms part from receiving a prize, and
- (b) the requirement cannot reasonably be expected to prevent a significant proportion of persons who wish to participate in that arrangement from doing so.³²⁰

In other words, the competition must involve some kind of requirement which will prevent a significant part of entrants from winning or from participating in the competition in the first place.³²¹ If the requirement does not serve that purpose, the competition will be regarded as a chance based lottery. The Gambling Commission has mentioned that crossword puzzles as well as “word and number puzzles” are proper skill based competitions.³²² Competitions that involve many answers or relate to a “more obscure or specialist” topic, will likely qualify as skill based competitions.³²³ However, the Commission’s view is that a competition will be chance based if entrants must answer a question and the answer can be found on the internet, is general knowledge or can be located in the text that accompanies the competition material.³²⁴

³¹⁹ Earlier legislation, such as s14(1)(b) of the Lotteries and Amusements Act 1976 prohibited “any other competition in which success does not depend to a substantial degree on the exercise of skill”. In view of this, promoters attempted to structure their competitions in such a way that entrants would be required to display skill, but this led to various cases in which the courts had to determine whether or not substantial skill was involved. (See Miers 2004 206-208 and the cases cited there.)

³²⁰ S14(5)(a) and (b).

³²¹ Dresden 2010 276; Crown 2010 236-238; Circus 44-45.

³²² GC Guidance 2. Pursuant to the definition of “complex lottery”, the Gambling Commission has also pointed out that a competition will still be lawful, even if a two phase approach is followed, as long as the first phase involves a skill requirement.

³²³ GC Guidance 2. See also the other skill indicators mentioned in par 3.17 by the Commission. (GC Guidance 5)

³²⁴ GC Guidance 2.

4.3.5 The impact of European Union law on prize promotions

The United Kingdom is part of the European Union. As such, the United Kingdom has to implement legislation adopted by the European Commission or Council.³²⁵ The European Union's regulations apply automatically in the United Kingdom and do not have to be enacted by way of separate legislation.³²⁶ However, the European Union's directives have to be made law in the United Kingdom by way of national legislation.³²⁷ When it comes to the implementation of directives, the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union states that member's legislatures have "the choice of form and methods" to implement same.³²⁸ This relative flexibility allows for laws across the European Union to be harmonised to various degrees.³²⁹

One can distinguish between minimum harmonisation and maximum (full) harmonisation.³³⁰ A directive will provide minimum harmonisation if it sets the minimum standard by which its provisions must be implemented on a national level, while allowing member states to enact stricter legislation based on those provisions.³³¹ In contrast, a directive will entail maximum harmonisation if member states must implement its rules on the same level and if they may not enact provisions that are

³²⁵ See Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Art 288; European Communities Act 1972, s2(1) and (2). Miller V "Making EU law into UK law" House of Commons Library, Standard Note SN/IA/5419 22 October 2014 3-4 ("Miller 2014") (<http://www.parliament.uk/briefing-papers/SN05419.pdf>, accessed on 4 May 2015).

³²⁶ Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Art 288; European Communities Act 1972, s2(1).

³²⁷ Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, Art 288; European Communities Act 1972, s2(2); Miller 2014 2.

³²⁸ Art 288.

³²⁹ The process by which the laws of European Union member states are harmonised forms part of the wider process of "Europeanisation". Falkner G *ea Complying with Europe: EU Harmonisation and Soft Law in the Member States* 11.

³³⁰ Weatherill S "Harmonisation: How Much, How Little?" 2005 *European Business Law Review* 16:3 533-545; Weatherill S "Maximum versus Minimum Harmonization: Choosing between Unity and Diversity in the Search for the Soul of the Internal Market" in Shuibhne NN and Gormley LW (eds) *From Single Market to Economic Union; Essay in Memory of John A Usher* ("Weatherill 2012") 176; Howells GG "The Rise of European Consumer Law – Whither National Consumer Law?" 2006 *Sydney Law Review* 28 63 ("Howells") 64-65.

³³¹ Weatherill 2012 176. The implementation of European Union directives that involve minimum harmonisation can lead to so-called "gold plating". This phenomenon is encountered "when implementation goes beyond the minimum necessary to comply with a Directive", and currently the United Kingdom's policy is to prevent this from happening. [Her Majesty's Government "Transposition Guidance: How to implement European Directives effectively" April 2013 8-9, https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/229763/bis-13-775-transposition-guidance-how-to-implement-european-directives-effectively-revised.pdf, accessed on 11 July 2015; Gerner-Beuerle C "United in Diversity: maximum versus minimum harmonization in EU securities regulation" 2012 *Capital Markets Law Journal* 7:3 317 ("Gerner-Beuerle") 317]

stricter than those contained in the directive.³³² Minimum harmonisation provides greater independence and flexibility for member states, allows the enactment of laws that suit local conditions and encourages legal development because member states can learn from the legislating experience in other states.³³³ Maximum harmonisation, on the other hand, centralises the regulatory responsibility, provides legal certainty on a regional level, and promotes cross-border trade due to legal uniformity.³³⁴ While the European Union initially followed a minimum harmonisation approach, its current policy is to foster maximum harmonisation.³³⁵

Apart from other areas, European Union law has also developed in the area of consumer protection as well as advertising and marketing.³³⁶ In particular, the Unfair Commercial Practices Directive (“UCP Directive”)³³⁷ seeks to protect consumers against misleading practices³³⁸ (including actions or omissions that are untruthful, deceptive or incorrect) as well as aggressive practices (the use of harassment, coercion or undue influence in order to manipulate a consumer’s decisions).³³⁹ In keeping with the European Union’s policy shift in this regard, the UCP Directive provides for maximum harmonisation.³⁴⁰ The UCP Directive contains provisions that relate to prize promotions specifically.³⁴¹ It provides that a commercial practice will

³³² Weather 2012 176. Weatherill explains that a directive entails maximum harmonisation if it prescribes “both floor and ceiling”, while minimum harmonisation would only prescribe “the floor”.

³³³ Loos MBM “Full harmonisation as a regulatory concept and its consequences for the national legal orders. The example of the Consumer rights directive” July 2010 *Centre for the Study of European Contract Law Working Paper Series* No. 2010/03 (“Loos”) 5 http://www.researchgate.net/publication/228245729_Full_Harmonisation_as_a_Regulatory_Concept_and_its_Consequences_for_the_National_Legal_Orders_The_Example_of_the_Consumer_Rights_Directive, accessed on 11 July 2015; Gerner-Beuerle 318-319; Howells 64; Loos 5; Weatherill 2012 176.

³³⁴ Gerner-Beuerle 319; Howells 64; Weatherill 2012 176.

³³⁵ Howells 64; Weatherill S *EU Consumer Law and Policy* (“Weatherill 2013”) 25.

³³⁶ See Directive 2006/114/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 concerning misleading and comparative advertising. See Weatherill 2013 216-253 in relation to advertising and marketing in a European Union law context.

³³⁷ Directive 2005/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2005 concerning unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices in the internal market (the “UCP Directive”).

³³⁸ UCP Directive, art 6 and 7.

³³⁹ UCP Directive, art 8 and 9.

³⁴⁰ Loos 6; Weatherill 2012 176.

³⁴¹ The provisions are found in Annex I, which contains a list of practices that will in all circumstances be considered unfair. This is known as a “black list”. (See, for example, Howells GG *European fair trading law: the unfair commercial practices directive* 158-163) Regarding the use of grey and black lists in a South African context, see Naudé T “Unfair Contract Terms Legislation: The Implications of Why We Need it for its Formulation and Application” 2006 *Stellenbosch Law Review* 17:3 361 373-374; Naudé T “The Use of Black and Grey Lists in Unfair Contract Terms Legislation in Comparative Perspective” 2007 *South African Law Journal* 124:1 128; Naudé T “The consumer’s ‘right to fair, reasonable and just terms’ under the new Consumer Protection Act in comparative perspective” 2009

always be considered unfair if it involves a competition or prize promotion in which the relevant prizes are not awarded.³⁴² It also prohibits promoters from creating the false impression that someone has won a prize or will win a prize where there is in fact no prize or where the consumer will have to incur costs or expend money in order to take possession of the prize.³⁴³

The provisions of the UCP Directive have been incorporated into the United Kingdom's law by way of the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008 (the "CPUT Regulations"), which came into effect on 26 May 2008.³⁴⁴ In view of the UCP Directive's maximum harmonisation approach, the CPUT Regulation's provisions closely resemble those of the UCP Directive. In the context of prize promotions, it mirrors the UCP Directive's prohibitions and provides that it will in all circumstances be unfair to run a competition or prize promotion without awarding prizes,³⁴⁵ or to create the false impression that someone has won a prize when there is no prize or the consumer has to pay money or incur costs to claim the prize.³⁴⁶

The CPUT Regulations' provisions relating to prize promotions have led to a decision by the Court of Justice of the European Union ("ECJ") in *Purely Creative Ltd and others v Office of Fair Trading*.³⁴⁷ In that matter, promoters informed consumers that they had won prizes, but consumers had to incur costs in order to claim their prizes.³⁴⁸ The Office of Fair Trading instituted proceedings against the promoters, seeking an order restraining the promoters from carrying on similar promotions.³⁴⁹ The High Court ruled that the promoters' actions amounted to unfair practices in terms of the provisions of the CPUT Regulations.³⁵⁰ Both parties appealed against the decision. The appeal was

South African Law Journal 126:3 505; Naudé T "The consumer's 'right to fair, reasonable and just terms' under the new Consumer Protection Act in comparative perspective" 2009 *South African Law Journal* 126:3 505; Stoop PN *The Concept 'Fairness' in the Regulation of Contracts under the Consumer Protection Act 68 of 2008*.

³⁴² UCP Directive, Annex I (19).

³⁴³ UCP Directive, Annex I (31).

³⁴⁴ Items 19 and 31 of Schedule 1 to the CPUT Regulations. See *Circus* 49; *Crown* 2010 243; *Dresden* 2010 278; *Kolah* 308.

³⁴⁵ CPUT Regulations, Sch 1 (19).

³⁴⁶ CPUT Regulations, Sch 1 (31).

³⁴⁷ [2012] EUECJ C-428/11. See, for example, the discussion in Köhler H "Congratulations, you have won! New standards apply to announcements of wins: A discussion of *Purely Creative and others*" 2013 *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice* 8:5 399

³⁴⁸ Paras 13-14 of the judgement.

³⁴⁹ Par 13 of the ECJ judgement.

³⁵⁰ Par 18 of the ECJ judgement.

stayed by the Court of Appeal in order to refer questions regarding interpretation of the CPUT Regulations to the ECJ.³⁵¹ The ECJ found that the CPUT Regulations prohibited practices where traders gave consumers the impression that they had won prizes if the consumers were obliged to pay money or incur cost in order to receive the prizes.³⁵² The ECJ stated that it was irrelevant that those costs were minimal or that consumers were afforded alternative routes of entry.³⁵³

4.3.6 Compliance with industry codes

4.3.6.1 Code of Non-Broadcast Advertising, Sales Promotion and Direct Marketing

In Britain, competition promoters need to take note of the provisions of self-regulatory codes as well. The United Kingdom Code of Non-Broadcast Advertising, Sales Promotion and Direct Marketing (the “CAP Code”) is compiled by the Committee of Advertising Practice (“CAP”) and enforced by the Advertising Standards Authority.³⁵⁴ The CAP Code contains a section dedicated to sales promotions.³⁵⁵ In defining a sales promotion, the CAP Code states that it “can provide an incentive for the consumer to buy by using a range of added direct or indirect benefits, usually on a temporary basis, to make the product more attractive”.³⁵⁶ It mentions “text-to-wins, instant-wins, competitions and prize draws” as examples of sales promotions.³⁵⁷ The CAP has issued non-binding guidelines in respect of prize promotions as well.³⁵⁸

The CAP Code enjoins promoters to display equitable, prompt, efficient, fair and honourable conduct, and must avoid causing consumer disappointment when conducting sales promotions.³⁵⁹ Its provisions are also aimed at protecting consumers

³⁵¹ Par 23 of the ECJ judgement. The Court of Appeal sought clarification regarding the interpretation of Paragraph 31 of Annex I to the UCP Directive.

³⁵² Par 57 of the ECJ judgement.

³⁵³ Par 57 of the ECJ judgement.

³⁵⁴ The website of the Committee of Advertising Practice is located at www.cap.org.uk (accessed on 11 July 2015). The CAP Code is available at this link: <http://www.cap.org.uk/Advertising-Codes/~media/Files/CAP/Codes%20CAP%20pdf/The%20CAP%20Code.ashx> (accessed on 4 May 2015). See *Circus* 52-53; *Dresden* 2010 278-279; *Crown* 2010 242-243.

³⁵⁵ S8.

³⁵⁶ S8: “Definition”.

³⁵⁷ S8: “Definition”

³⁵⁸ CAP “Help note: Promotions with prizes” August 2013 (“CAP Help Note”), <https://www.cap.org.uk/~media/Files/CAP/Help%20notes%20new/PromotionsWithPrizesHelpNote.ashx> (accessed on 11 July 2015).

³⁵⁹ Rule 8.1.

and their safety and require that promotions must be suitable and not cause offense.³⁶⁰ In the context of prize promotions, this would mean that promoters must avoid competitions that could cause harm to consumers,³⁶¹ must not feature alcoholic drinks in competitions aimed at children,³⁶² must avoid competitions that promote “excessive consumption or irresponsible use”,³⁶³ must prevent “unsuitable or irresponsible material” from reaching consumers,³⁶⁴ and must ensure that their competitions do not lead to “serious or widespread offence to consumers”.³⁶⁵

Promoters often state that promotional goods are “subject to availability”, but the CAP Code requires that promoters must ensure that they anticipate reasonable demand.³⁶⁶ It is submitted that promoters would therefore have to ensure that sufficient levels of stock are available if they run competitions that require entrants to purchase goods. In general, promoters are required to ensure that they organise and administer their competitions properly in order to avoid consumer complaints.³⁶⁷ Prizes must also be awarded within the advertised time period - “normally within thirty days”.³⁶⁸

The CAP Code contains detailed provisions relating to the disclosure of information and promoters are required to communicate all key terms and conditions to consumers, particularly in circumstances where consumers might be misled if they are not aware of those terms and conditions.³⁶⁹ The terms and conditions must not be too complicated and promoters should only in exceptional circumstances amend or supplement them.³⁷⁰ If space and time does not permit disclosure of the full terms and conditions, promoters must direct consumers to another source where the terms and

³⁶⁰ See rules 8.1 to 8.7.

³⁶¹ Rule 8.3. It is submitted that a competition which requires entrants to perform dangerous stunts would contravene this rule.

³⁶² Rule 8.4.

³⁶³ Rule 8.5. It is not clear from the rule what this provision is aimed at, but it is submitted that the intention is to prohibit promoters from conducting promotions that will encourage excessive indulgence in their products.

³⁶⁴ Rule 8.6. It is submitted that promoters would therefore have to ensure that competition materials are not unsuitable.

³⁶⁵ Rule 8.7.

³⁶⁶ Rules 8.9-8.13.

³⁶⁷ Rule 8.14-8.15.

³⁶⁸ Rule 8.15.1.

³⁶⁹ Rule 8.17.

³⁷⁰ Rule 8.23. Promoters must inform participants where they can obtain the supplemental or changed rules and such rules must not contain anything that would cause someone to refrain from participating.

conditions can be found.³⁷¹ In the context of prize promotions, promoters must explain to consumers how they can participate,³⁷² describe any available alternative entry route³⁷³ and indicate the competition's start date³⁷⁴ and closing date.³⁷⁵ Promoters must mention any proof of purchase requirements,³⁷⁶ entry restrictions (such as age restrictions or consent requirements),³⁷⁷ and limits on the number of entries that will be accepted.³⁷⁸ The terms and conditions must disclose the date by which prizes will be handed over if this will happen more than thirty days after the competition has closed.³⁷⁹ They must also disclose how and when winning entrants will be notified that they have won and winners' names must be published or made available on request.³⁸⁰ The terms and conditions must contain details of how winners will be used for publicity purposes after the competition (if applicable).³⁸¹ The promoters name and correspondence address must be communicated as well.³⁸²

Prizes are central to competitions and the CAP Code contains detailed provisions in this regard. It requires promoters to disclose the number and nature of prizes.³⁸³ They may not create the impression that prizes can be won if that is not the case.³⁸⁴ They must not "exaggerate consumers' chances of winning",³⁸⁵ or create the false impression that the consumer has won a prize or stands a chance to do so if the

³⁷¹ Rule 8.16 and 8.28. It is submitted that promoters could, in such circumstances, display the terms and conditions on their websites. The rule also requires that participants must be able to retain the terms and conditions and refer to them during the course of the competition.

³⁷² Rule 8.17.1. The promoter must, *inter alia*, disclose significant participation conditions and costs.

³⁷³ Rule 8.17.2.

³⁷⁴ Rule 8.17.3.

³⁷⁵ Rule 8.17.4. Promoters must also avoid changing closing dates, unless due to circumstances beyond their control. (Rule 8.17.4.e)

³⁷⁶ Rule 8.17.5.

³⁷⁷ Rule 8.17.7.

³⁷⁸ Rule 8.28.1.

³⁷⁹ Rule 8.28.3.

³⁸⁰ Rule 8.28.5. Promoters must observe winners' privacy and comply with relevant legal restrictions in this regard.

³⁸¹ Rule 8.28.9.

³⁸² Rule 8.17.9. It is submitted that promoters must disclose these details in order for consumers to be able to contact them if they have queries regarding the prize promotion.

³⁸³ Rule 8.17.6. If the exact number of prizes is not known, the promoter must disclose a reasonable estimate. Prize descriptions must be clear and the associated costs must be disclosed clearly. (CAP Help Note 4)

³⁸⁴ Rule 8.19. The rule also requires promoters to distinguish between gifts (that are usually awarded to most consumers) and prizes (that are normally awarded to a few participants only). Promoters must also avoid using the term "awards" in a vague manner. (CAP Help Note 3)

³⁸⁵ Rule 8.20. Promoters may also not "claim or imply that consumers are luckier than they are". In particular, a consumer may not be described as a "finalist" or as being in the "final stage" unless this is in fact the case. (Rule 8.21)

consumer must incur a cost to do so or if there is no prize to be won.³⁸⁶ The promotion's rules must state whether the promoter will be entitled to substitute prizes with cash alternatives.³⁸⁷ A promoter should only withhold prizes if entrants have not complied with the entry requirements,³⁸⁸ but can do so if consumers were informed upfront that prizes might not be awarded if entries are not sufficient.³⁸⁹ If winners are determined by way of a prize draw, the process must be absolutely random and an independent person must oversee the draw (unless the results are determined by a computer).³⁹⁰ The CAP Code does not require that the independent person must be a specific professional (for example, a lawyer or accountant), but such person may not be employed by the promoter or an agency that provides services to it.³⁹¹ In instant-win competitions the prizes must be available immediately or winners must be able to receive their prizes without delay.³⁹²

4.3.6.2 Selected rulings of the Advertising Standards Authority

One can illustrate the practical application of the CAP Code by referring to some rulings by the Council of the Advertising Standards Authority ("ASA"). For example, in *British Midland Regional Ltd*³⁹³ an airline ran a competition in which the winner could win a trip from selected cities to Legoland in Billund. When the winner tried to book flights from Birmingham it turned out that the airline no longer flew to Billund from Birmingham, but the winner was offered flights from Stansted on an alternative airline.³⁹⁴ However, the winner would have had to incur additional costs in order to fly from Stansted.³⁹⁵ The ASA ruled that the advertiser breached rule 8.21.1 of the CAP Code on the basis that it falsely claimed that entrants stood a chance to win a specific prize, while the winner would in fact have to incur costs in claiming the prize.³⁹⁶

³⁸⁶ Rule 8.21.1.

³⁸⁷ Rule 8.28.2.

³⁸⁸ Rule 8.27. The qualifying criteria must therefore be disclosed in the prize promotion's terms and conditions.

³⁸⁹ CAP Help Note 5.

³⁹⁰ Rule 8.24.

³⁹¹ CAP Help Note 5.

³⁹² Rule 8.25. In addition, if a promoter ran an instant-win promotion, it must obtain an independently audited statement regarding the distribution of the prizes.

³⁹³ 20 August 2014 (Complaint Ref. A14-268463), https://www.asa.org.uk/Rulings/Adjudications/2014/8/British-Midland-Regional-Ltd/SHP_ADJ_268463.aspx#.Vav5BHKw9Ms, accessed on 19 July 2025. Online ruling unpagged.

³⁹⁴ *British Midland Regional Ltd* unpagged.

³⁹⁵ *British Midland Regional Ltd* unpagged.

³⁹⁶ *British Midland Regional Ltd* unpagged.

Similarly, in *Red Bull Company Ltd*³⁹⁷ the advertiser ran a competition in terms of which the winner could win a trip to watch a grand prix. The winner lodged a complaint on the basis that the trip was not a VIP prize as advertised and due to practical difficulties with the travel arrangements.³⁹⁸ The ASA upheld the complaint, finding that the VIP description was misleading and that significant exclusions were not publicised.³⁹⁹

A holiday prize was also the subject matter of *News Group Newspapers Ltd*.⁴⁰⁰ In that matter a newspaper's website advertised a competition in which the winner could win a "family holiday" to Walt Disney World Resort.⁴⁰¹ The winner wanted to take a family member's children along on the trip, but was informed that she could not claim the prize on that basis.⁴⁰² In ruling on the subsequent complaint, the ASA decided that the competition's terms and conditions did not make it clear that the winner had to take their own children on the trip and upheld the complaint.⁴⁰³

In *HarrisonCole*⁴⁰⁴ the advertiser ran some prize draws via *Twitter*. The complainant averred that the winners were connected to the advertiser and that they were not selected by an independent person.⁴⁰⁵ The advertiser denied this, but the ASA upheld the complaint when the advertiser could not provide proof that the winners were genuine and independently selected.⁴⁰⁶

The time period within which winners must claim their prize can lead to ASA complaints too. For example, in *Radge Media Ltd*⁴⁰⁷ the winner only had a week in order to respond and claim their prize. The ASA ruled that the promoter did not publish a

³⁹⁷ 27 February 2013 (Complaint Ref. A12-213426), https://www.asa.org.uk/Rulings/Adjudications/2013/2/Red-Bull-Company-Ltd/SHP_ADJ_213426.aspx#.Vav5SHkw9Ms, accessed on 19 July 2015. Online ruling unpagged.

³⁹⁸ *Red Bull Company Ltd* unpagged.

³⁹⁹ *Red Bull Company Ltd* unpagged.

⁴⁰⁰ 12 June 2013 (Complaint Ref. A13-224093), https://www.asa.org.uk/Rulings/Adjudications/2013/6/News-Group-Newspapers-Ltd/SHP_ADJ_224093.aspx#.Vav5gnkw9Ms, accessed on 19 July 2015. Online ruling unpagged.

⁴⁰¹ *News Group Newspapers Ltd* unpagged.

⁴⁰² *News Group Newspapers Ltd* unpagged.

⁴⁰³ *News Group Newspapers Ltd* unpagged.

⁴⁰⁴ 22 October 2014 (Complaint Ref. A14-275452), https://www.asa.org.uk/Rulings/Adjudications/2014/10/HarrisonCole/SHP_ADJ_275452.aspx#.Vav5xnkw9Ms, accessed on 19 July 2015. Online ruling unpagged.

⁴⁰⁵ *HarrisonCole* unpagged.

⁴⁰⁶ *HarrisonCole* unpagged.

⁴⁰⁷ 23 November 2011 (Complaint Ref. A11-168900), https://www.asa.org.uk/Rulings/Adjudications/2011/11/Radge-Media-Ltd/SHP_ADJ_168900.aspx#.Vav6Dnkw9Ms, accessed on 19 July 2015. Online ruling unpagged.

deadline within which the prize had to be claimed and, as such, upheld the complaint.⁴⁰⁸ The ASA made a similar ruling in *Trinity Mirror plc*⁴⁰⁹ where it found that the winner was not given sufficient time to take receipt of the prize.

A promoter's obligation to comply with the rules of a competition was one of the issues in *Sony Computer Entertainment UK Ltd*.⁴¹⁰ A number of consumers lodged a complaint in respect of a competition in which participants could win game consoles.⁴¹¹ The competition's terms and conditions provided that each person could enter the competition once only, but it turned out that some persons had more than one entry in the competition.⁴¹² The entry mechanism also disadvantaged some entrants. Accordingly, the complaint was upheld.⁴¹³

The importance of clear terms and conditions was emphasised in *PepsiCo International Ltd* as well.⁴¹⁴ One of the consumers in that matter complained that he had won several times, but was afterwards informed that he could only win once.⁴¹⁵ The ASA pointed out a number of deficiencies in the competition process and upheld the consumer's complaint on the basis that the terms and conditions did not state that entrants would only be entitled to one prize each.⁴¹⁶

Promoters also need to make sure that they describe prizes clearly. In *24.7 Tradesmen (Glasgow) Ltd*⁴¹⁷ the promoter invited consumers to enter a competition in which they could win an iPad.⁴¹⁸ The winner of the competition filed a complaint when

⁴⁰⁸ *Radge Media Ltd* unpagged.

⁴⁰⁹ 28 November 2012 (Complaint Ref. A12-203883), https://www.asa.org.uk/Rulings/Adjudications/2012/11/Trinity-Mirror-Plc/SHP_ADJ_203883.aspx#.Vav6OXkw9Ms, accessed on 19 July 2015. Online ruling unpagged.

⁴¹⁰ 13 May 2015 (Complaint Ref. A15-290175), https://www.asa.org.uk/Rulings/Adjudications/2015/5/Sony-Computer-Entertainment-UK-Ltd/SHP_ADJ_290175.aspx#.VavyuHkw9Ms, accessed on 29 July 2015. Online ruling unpagged.

⁴¹¹ *Sony Computer Entertainment UK Ltd* unpagged.

⁴¹² *Sony Computer Entertainment UK Ltd* unpagged.

⁴¹³ *Sony Computer Entertainment UK Ltd* unpagged.

⁴¹⁴ 21 November 2012 (Complaint Ref. A12-196585), https://www.asa.org.uk/Rulings/Adjudications/2012/11/PepsiCo-International-Ltd/SHP_ADJ_196585.aspx#.Vavyunkw9Ms, accessed on 19 July 2015. Online ruling unpagged.

⁴¹⁵ *PepsiCo International Ltd* unpagged.

⁴¹⁶ *PepsiCo International Ltd* unpagged.

⁴¹⁷ 16 July 2014 (Complaint Ref. A14-264899), https://www.asa.org.uk/Rulings/Adjudications/2014/07/247-Tradesmen-Glasgow-Ltd/SHP_ADJ_264899.aspx#.VawAPnkw9Ms, accessed on 29 July 2015. Online ruling unpagged.

⁴¹⁸ *24.7 Tradesmen (Glasgow) Ltd* unpagged.

it turned out that the iPad was second-hand and had been locked with a PIN code.⁴¹⁹ The ASA upheld the complaint on the basis that it would be reasonable for consumers to expect to win a new tablet and that the promoter should have made it clear that the prize was second-hand.⁴²⁰

4.3.6.3 Other industry codes

If a promoter will use premium rated telephone services as part of a competition, it will also have to observe the relevant provisions of the PhonepayPlus Code of Practice (“PCP”).⁴²¹ The PCP regulates the provision of premium rate telephone services in general.⁴²² It requires that service providers must make sure that consumers are provided with sufficient information, particularly relating to the costs of premium rate services.⁴²³ Consumers must be treated fairly and must not be misled.⁴²⁴ Consumer privacy must be respected and harm must be avoided.⁴²⁵ PhonepayPlus has also issued a guidance note in respect of prize promotions.⁴²⁶ It requires that promoters must compile comprehensive competition terms and conditions.⁴²⁷ Consumers must not be misled,⁴²⁸ and additional information should be made available to consumers upon request.⁴²⁹ Prize promotions should be conducted in a fair and equitable manner.⁴³⁰ Promoters must consider the implications of the Gambling Act 2005 as well and know when a competition will be classified as a lottery.⁴³¹

⁴¹⁹ 24.7 *Tradesmen (Glasgow) Ltd* unpagged.

⁴²⁰ 24.7 *Tradesmen (Glasgow) Ltd* unpagged.

⁴²¹ <http://www.phonepayplus.org.uk/For-Business/Code-and-Help.aspx>, accessed on 4 May 2015.

⁴²² The PCP has been accredited under s121 of the Communications Act 2003 and is binding in respect of controlled premium rate services, while compliance is voluntary in respect of other premium rate services. See par 1.2 of the PCP.

⁴²³ See par 2.2.

⁴²⁴ Par 2.3.

⁴²⁵ Par 2.4-2.5.

⁴²⁶ PhonepayPlus “Service-Specific Guidance Note: Competitions and other games with prizes” undated, (“PP Guidance Note”) <http://code.phonepayplus.org.uk/pdf/guidance-notes/competitions-and-other-games-with-prizes.pdf>, accessed on 12 July 2015.

⁴²⁷ Par 1 of the PP Guidance Note. The requirements are similar to those found in the CAP Code, except that they also contain specific guidance in the context of text messages.

⁴²⁸ Par 2 of the PP Guidance Note. The chances of winning must not be exaggerated.

⁴²⁹ Par 2 of the PP Guidance Note. The additional information includes details regarding how and when winners will be notified, judging criteria, the details of winners, alternative prizes and publicity.

⁴³⁰ Par 4 of the PP Guidance Note.

⁴³¹ Par 5 of the PP Guidance Note.

In the context of direct marketing, promoters also need to adhere to the provisions of the Direct Marketing Association's Code.⁴³² The Code does not contain provisions that relate to prize promotions specifically. However, it sets general standards in respect of direct marketing.⁴³³ Accordingly, where a prize promotion forms part of a direct marketing campaign, promoters need to ensure that their conduct is in line with the Code's requirements.

4.3.7 Remarks

It appears that there are historic links between British lottery legislation and South African legislation.⁴³⁴ In view of this, and the abundance of British case law relating to lotteries and prize competitions, it is submitted that British case law can provide useful guidance when it comes to the interpretation of South African legislation that deals with these topics. For example, British case law can be used to determine whether something is a lottery,⁴³⁵ and such case law has already featured in the decisions of South African courts.⁴³⁶

Great Britain's current legislation relating to promotional competitions appears to follow an approach which is simpler than the one found in South Africa (the relevant provisions are not as lengthy and comprehensive as those found in the Consumer Protection Act, 2008). However, the provisions of the Gambling Act 2005 that relate to the consideration element of a lottery are instructive and can be used as practical guidelines to determine whether a promoter has required an entrant to make payment in order to enter a competition.⁴³⁷ In particular, these provisions provide clarity regarding the question whether a promoter may require entrants to purchase its goods or services.⁴³⁸

⁴³² Dresden 2010 279. The Direct Marketing Association's Code is available online at http://www.dma.org.uk/uploads/Interactive-code-for-web_sept-11_54119ad59a64b.pdf (accessed 12 July 2015).

⁴³³ Direct marketers are required to respect privacy (rules 1.1-1.6), be honest and fair (rules 2.1-2.4), be diligent with consumers' data (rules 3.1-3.11) and to be responsible and accountable (rules 4.1-4.10).

⁴³⁴ For example, the similarity between s14 of the Lotteries and Amusements Act 1976 (Great Britain) and s56 of the Lotteries Act, 1997 (South Africa).

⁴³⁵ See, for example, *Reader's Digest Association Ltd v Williams* [1976] 2 All ER 737 (QBD).

⁴³⁶ The *Reader's Digest* judgement was referred to in *FirstRand Bank v National Lotteries Board* [2008] 3 All SA 121 (SCA)

⁴³⁷ See Schedules 1 and 2 of the Gambling Act 2005.

⁴³⁸ Par 2(c) of Schedule 2 of the Gambling Act 2005.

The British legislature has also chosen to move away from the prohibition relating to prize competitions that involve the forecasting of events,⁴³⁹ presumably on the basis that its legislation relating to betting and gaming adequately deals with that issue.⁴⁴⁰ As such, it is worth considering whether section 56 of South Africa's Lotteries Act, 1997 also needs to be reviewed. Section 56's provisions are very similar to the United Kingdom's former prohibition in respect of prize competitions which was contained in the repealed Lotteries and Amusements Act 1976. In essence, section 56 prohibits the conducting of a competition in which prizes are awarded based on forecasting of the results of a future event or a past event (the results of which are not yet known), unless such competition is authorised by the Lotteries Act, 1997 or any other law. Section 56's wording and relevance will be discussed below,⁴⁴¹ and recommendations will be made in this regard.⁴⁴²

4.4 Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to investigate the laws relating to promotional competitions in New Zealand and Great Britain, in order to compare them against the legal position in South Africa and to determine whether something in the legislation or case law of those countries can be useful for South African purposes. Those jurisdictions were chosen because they follow common law systems and since the relevant South African legislation has some ties with Great Britain in particular.

The examination of New Zealand's law showed that promotional competitions can be regulated in a clear and simple manner. In particular, legislative drafters can find examples of this in the provisions that relate to situations where promoters require consumers to purchase goods or pay for services in order to enter promotional competitions. The South African position in this regard is unclear and the relevant legislation could benefit from provisions like those in New Zealand. In regulating the costs that may be charged for competition entries, the New Zealand legislature also chose to refer to standard telecommunication or postage rates, instead of determining a monetary maximum, which is currently the case in South Africa and could become

⁴³⁹ The relevant prohibitions were found in s14(1) of the repealed Lotteries and Amusements Act 1976.

⁴⁴⁰ The Gambling Act 2005 does not contain the provisions that were found in s14 of the Lotteries and Amusements Act 1976.

⁴⁴¹ See pages 189-192 below for a more detailed discussion of s56.

⁴⁴² See pages 300-302 below.

outdated very quickly. On the other hand, the study of New Zealand's legislation has shown that South Africa's regulation of promotional competitions is quite comprehensive from a consumer protection perspective. It appears that local legislation does not fall short here. In fact, one may even submit that South Africa's legislation is more protective than New Zealand's law in this regard.

The discussion of the legal position in Great Britain proved that there is a close link between South Africa's current lotteries legislation and Great Britain's former legislation in this regard. It became clear that English case law can provide guidance regarding the principles that should be followed in determining whether an activity is gambling or a lottery. This is confirmed by the fact that South African courts have quoted such judgments on numerous occasions. The self-regulatory position in Great Britain was considered as well. The relevant industry code is clear and comprehensive, and some of its provisions could easily be used if wording is required to clarify or flesh out the provisions in South Africa's legislation and industry codes.

In the following chapters, South Africa's regulation of promotional competitions will be critically analysed and certain recommendations will be made. In some of those discussions, reference will be made to provisions examined in this chapter in order to suggest improvements to South Africa's legislation.

CHAPTER 5

PROMOTIONAL COMPETITIONS UNDER THE LOTTERIES ACT AND THE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Application of the Lotteries Act
- 5.3 Promotional competition provisions repealed by the CPA
- 5.4 Promotional competitions under the CPA
- 5.5 Conclusion

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will concentrate on South Africa's current law relating to promotional competitions. The relevant provisions will be critically analysed and commentary will be provided on them. A number of inconsistencies, defects and challenges will be highlighted in the process.

At present, two statutes that have a direct impact on the running of promotional competitions in South Africa: the Lotteries Act¹ and the Consumer Protection Act, 2008 ("CPA"). When someone intends to run a promotional competition, they need to consider the provisions of both statutes in order to determine if and how the promotional competition might be affected by them. The provisions of both these statutes have a bearing on promotional competitions in one way or another. Depending on the circumstances, a promotional competition might be prohibited, authorised or regulated by them.

¹ 57 of 1997. In this chapter, the Lotteries Act, 1997 will be referred to as the "Lotteries Act".

5.2 Application of the Lotteries Act

5.2.1 Lotteries and competitions generally

At common law, a lottery has the following key elements: (a) consideration (subscription); (b) prize; and (c) lot or chance.² In the early case of *R v Cranston*³ the court established that there were three essentials for a lottery: “there must be a prize or prizes, a distribution by lot or chance, and the payment of a subscription”.⁴ In *R v Lew Hoi*,⁵ the Appellate Division listed the essential components of a lottery under the then prevailing legislation as follows: “(a) some payment by the participant in the form of a stake, (b) in return for this payment or in consequence of it, acquisition by the player of a right to a prize on the occurrence of an event, (c) determination of the occurrence of the event by chance”.⁶ These elements were confirmed in *Minister of Mineral and Energy Affairs v Lucky Horseshoe (Pty) Ltd.*⁷

At present, the Lotteries Act regulates the operation of lotteries in South Africa.⁸ The Act’s definition of the term “lottery” reads as follows:

‘lottery’ includes any game, scheme, arrangement, system, plan, promotional competition or device for distributing prizes by lot or chance and any game, scheme, arrangement, system, plan, competition or device, which the Minister may by notice in the Gazette declare to be a lottery.⁹

In essence, it appears that a lottery therefore involves some arrangement in terms of which prizes are awarded by way of lot or chance. The following three key elements of the definition can thus be identified: (a) game (or the like); (b) prize; and (c) lot or chance.

² Bell, Dewar & Hall *Kelsey Stuart’s The Newspaperman’s Guide to the Law* (5th ed) (“Bell Dewar”) 204; Dendy M “Lotteries and the Law” 1989 *Witwatersrand University Student Law Review* 1 43 (“Dendy 1989”) 49-50; Dendy M “Pitfalls of Advertising – II. Lotteries.” 1988 *Businessman’s Law* 17 77 (“Dendy II”) 78; Carnelley M “Offences relating to gambling and lotteries” in Milton JRL, Cowling MG and Hocter SV *South African Criminal Law and Procedure Vol III: Statutory Offences* (2nd ed, service number 21, 2011) (“Carnelley 2011”) 59.

³ 1914 AD 238.

⁴ Page 238 of the judgement.

⁵ 1937 AD 215.

⁶ Page 220 of the judgement.

⁷ 1994 (2) SA 46 (A) at 52.

⁸ The Lotteries Act’s preamble commences with the following words: “To regulate and prohibit lotteries and sports pools [...]”.

⁹ Lotteries Act, s1.

It is submitted that the reference to “game, scheme, arrangement, system, plan, promotional competition or device” implies that there must be some form of structured, planned or organised activity, as opposed to a purely impulsive event without any prior organisation, thought or planning.¹⁰ The fact that rules apply to the playing of a game, implies that the game was developed in terms of a process that required thought and the actual playing of the game takes place in a structured manner due to the direction given by the rules. The word “scheme” also implies a structured arrangement, being defined as “[a] large-scale systematic plan or arrangement for attaining some particular object or putting a particular idea into effect”.¹¹ The words “system”, “plan” and “arrangement” evoke similar meanings. The word “device” could refer to some kind of apparatus, but also fits into the meanings associated with the other words mentioned here, when one considers the following definition: “A plan, method, or trick with a particular aim.”¹²

The prize is the second element of the “lottery” definition. The Lotteries Act defines a “prize” merely as “the prize awarded to the winner of a lottery”.¹³ It is submitted that a prize can therefore be anything awarded to someone who has won a competition.¹⁴ In *Director of Public Prosecutions v Bradfute & Associates, Ltd.*,¹⁵ Lord Parker was of the view that “a prize need not be a sum of money; it can of course be an article, a commodity, and it is submitted that it can be anything which can be sold, or indeed anything which can be said to be of value”.¹⁶ A reward can be a prize, even if it is insubstantial.¹⁷ In *R v Cranston*¹⁸ the court decided that even the interest payable on

¹⁰ The word “game”, for example, can be defined as “[a] form of competitive activity or sport played according to rules”. (Oxford Dictionaries. “Game”. Oxford University Press. <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/game>, accessed on May 09, 2015).

¹¹ Oxford Dictionaries. “Scheme” Oxford University Press. <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/scheme>, accessed on 9 May 2015

¹² Oxford Dictionaries. “Device” Oxford University Press. <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/device>, accessed on 9 May 2015.

¹³ Lotteries Act, s1.

¹⁴ See Carnelley 2011 63.

¹⁵ [1967] 1 All ER 112 (QB).

¹⁶ Page 115 of the judgement; Carnelley 2011 63 and 64 fn 3.

¹⁷ *Chief Constable, Durban v Stuart* (1909) 30 NLR 58; Carnelley 2011 63 and 64 fn 4. See also *Salisbury Bottling Co (Pvt) Ltd v Central African Bottling Co (Pvt) Ltd* 1958 (1) SA 750 (FC) where the court decided that numbered bottle corks could be regarded as prizes, because someone could win a bicycle if they managed to collect a sufficient number of corks in the prescribed manner. (Dendy 1989 49-50)

¹⁸ 1914 AD 238.

the bonds could be regarded as prizes.¹⁹ Carnelley submits that a prize does not have to be tangible and that “a claim or legal right will constitute a prize”.²⁰

Previously, regulation 6 of the Regulations on Promotional Competitions published in terms of the Lotteries Act²¹ (the “PC Regulations”) contained specific provisions that regulated the prizes that could be awarded in promotional competitions. (Those regulations would have been promulgated pursuant to the provisions of section 54(2) and (3), although the regulations merely referred to the Lotteries Act.) However, the PC Regulations are no longer of force because section 54 of the Lotteries Act was repealed by the CPA.²²

A competition can also be a lottery, even where a prize is offered but no participant receives one.²³ In *R v Lew Hoi*,²⁴ the court had to evaluate a Chinese game called “Pak-ku-pue”. Chance played a significant role in that game and, due to the mechanics of the game, the sizes of the prizes varied and sometimes no one won anything at all.²⁵ The court held that the game still displayed the essential characteristics of a lottery, even though someone did not always win.²⁶ The court reasoned that the purpose of the law was to prohibit an activity that involved a “gambling element” and found that the element was present in the game under discussion.²⁷ It is submitted, therefore, that a competition could still be a lottery even if, in the end, no participant actually receives a prize. This could happen, for example, where scratch cards are inserted in product packaging and the purchaser of a product fails to scratch a card and claim the prize. It is submitted that this eventuality cannot retrospectively remove the competition’s lottery status. Having said this, some authors state that a scheme cannot be a lottery if there is no prize.²⁸ However, seeing that they also state that “schemes where no prize is offered, must be very rare, if not non-existent”, it is

¹⁹ Page 239 of the judgement; Carnelley 2011 63 and fn 5 on 64.

²⁰ Carnelley 2011 64.

²¹ *Government Gazette* (GN R672) of 16 May 2003.

²² See Schedule 1, C2 of the CPA.

²³ Dendy 1989 43 fn 3.

²⁴ 1937 AD 215. (Dendy 1989 43 fn 3)

²⁵ Page 217-218 of the judgement.

²⁶ Page 221 of the judgement. The court referred to the British cases *Barclay & Pearson* [1893] 2 Ch 154, *Hall & McWilliam* 20 Cox CC 33 and *Santongeli v Neilson* 1900 3 F. 10 in which the courts found that schemes were lotteries even though prizes might not have been awarded.

²⁷ Page 222 of the judgement.

²⁸ Bell Dewar 205.

submitted that they are referring to competitions in which there were no prizes offered from the beginning. Such competitions would indeed not constitute lotteries because the prize element is lacking. However, it is submitted that a competition will in fact be a lottery where prizes are offered, but no one wins them.

Lot or chance constitutes the third element of a lottery, and plays such a crucial role that it warrants a separate discussion below.²⁹

If a promotional competition involves the distribution of prizes by way of lot or chance it would thus fall within the scope of the definition of a “lottery”. To provide more clarity, the definition includes an explicit reference to promotional competitions. Accordingly, the organiser of a promotional competition needs to determine whether or not the promotional competition satisfies the requirements of the Lotteries Act’s definition of a lottery. If the promotional competition can be classified as a lottery, it will be unlawful unless authorised by the Lotteries Act or other legislation.³⁰ It is also an offence to participate in or to conduct, facilitate, promote or derive any benefit from a lottery, promotional competition or sports pool, unless it has been authorised by the Lotteries Act or any other law.³¹ It is an offence to forge or change in a fraudulent way any ticket, document or thing pertaining to any promotional competition as well.³² Such a ticket, document or thing may not knowingly be sold or disposed of either.³³ In addition, it is an offence to alter any number or figure on any ticket, document or thing relating to a promotional competition.³⁴ A person may also not advertise or offer the opportunity to

²⁹ See section 5.2.3.

³⁰ S56 of the Lotteries Act reads as follows:

“Unless authorised by or under this Act or any other law, no person shall conduct through any newspaper, broadcasting service or any other electronic device, or in connection with any trade or business or the sale of any article to the public-

- (a) any competition or lottery other than one authorised by or under this Act in which prizes are offered for forecasts of the result of either-
 - (i) a future event; or
 - (ii) a past event, the result of which has not yet been ascertained or is not yet generally known;
- (b) any competition other than a promotional competition contemplated in section 54 in which success does not depend to a substantial degree on skill; or
- (c) any promotional competition which is the subject of a declaration contemplated in section 54 (4).”

³¹ Lotteries Act, s57(1).

³² Lotteries Act, s57(1)(b).

³³ Lotteries Act, s57(1)(c).

³⁴ Lotteries Act, s47(1)(d).

participate in a promotional competition if the person creates the false impression that the competition is connected with the National Lottery or a licensed sports pool.³⁵

Having said this, one must keep in mind that it will need to be shown that *mens rea* (fault or a “guilty mind”) was present in order for the offender to be convicted of an offence under the relevant legislation.³⁶ In order for someone to be convicted of a crime, the requirements for culpability need to be met. In other words, the accused must have committed an act which is unlawful and the act must constitute culpable conduct which accords with the definitional elements of the relevant crime. The act would only be criminal if the accused had *mens rea* (a culpable state of mind).³⁷ This does not only apply to common law crimes, but also in respect of statutory crimes,³⁸ including crimes relating to lotteries. The *mens rea* element featured in *S v Pepsi-Cola (Pty) Ltd*,³⁹ in which the court had to consider a promotional competition conducted by *Pepsi-Cola* and had to decide whether a lottery offence was committed under the Gambling Act, 1965.⁴⁰

Even if a scheme does not meet the Lotteries Act’s definition for a lottery, it might still be unlawful due to the provisions of section 56, which prohibits:

- (a) the conducting of a competition or lottery in which prizes can be won for the prediction of the outcome of a future event (or a past event, the results of which are not yet determined or generally known);⁴¹

³⁵ Lotteries Act, s58(1)(a).

³⁶ Dendy 1989 43 fn 3; Carnelley 2011 60.

³⁷ See Snyman CR *Criminal Law* (4th ed) 37.

³⁸ Regarding the role of *mens rea* in statutory crimes and the requirement to prove *mens rea* in respect of such crimes see, for example, *Amalgamated Beverage Industries Natal (Pty) Ltd v City Council of the City of Durban* [1994] 2 All SA 222 (A) and *S v Mbatha* 2012 (2) SACR 551 (KZP).

³⁹ 1985 (3) SA 141 (C).

⁴⁰ See pages 142 and 144 of the judgement.

⁴¹ S56(a).

- (b) any competition “in which success does not depend to a substantial degree on skill”,⁴² unless it is a promotional competition conducted pursuant to section 54;⁴³
- (c) a promotional competition which has been declared unlawful by the Minister of Trade and Industry by virtue of section 54(4) of the Lotteries Act.⁴⁴

However, the prohibitions in section 56 only apply to competitions conducted “through any newspaper, broadcasting service or any other electronic device, or in connection with any trade or business or the sale of any article to the public”. As such, it is submitted that the prohibitions would not apply to other competitions, for example competitions that are not conducted through any of the media mentioned above, or where a competition is not conducted as part of a trade, business or sale, for example a book club.⁴⁵ However, such competitions might still be unlawful if they could be classified as lotteries in terms of the definition of “lottery” or if they constitute gambling, in which event they may breach the provisions of the National Gambling Act, 2004. A competition could amount to betting or wagering, as contemplated in section 4(1) of the National Gambling Act, 2004 if participants stake money on a contingency. This would be the case, for example, if participants are required to pay an amount to enter a competition with the opportunity to win a prize, depending on the outcome of an event. A competition might also be classified as a gambling game in terms of the provisions of section 5(1) if participants are required to contribute consideration and they stand a chance to receive a pay-out. According to section 6(1), “a pay-out is any money, merchandise, property, a cheque, credit, electronic credit, a debit, a token, a ticket or anything else of value won by a player – (a) whether as a result of the skill of

⁴² In interpreting the identical wording in s47 of the British Betting, Gaming and Lotteries Act 1963, Lord Parker rejected the argument that this could mean that a competition would escape the prohibition if it involves no skill at all. In his judgement, the prohibition would “cover anything less than a substantial degree of skill including no skill at all”. (*Whitbread & Co Ltd. v Bell* [1970] 2 All ER 64 at 70h) However, Lord Parker’s judgement was subsequently overruled by the judgements in *Imperial Tobacco Ltd v Attorney-General* [1979] 2 All ER 592 (CA) and *Imperial Tobacco Ltd v Attorney-General* [1980] 1 All ER 866 (HL). See page 154 above.

⁴³ S56(b). The reference to s54 is problematic, because s54 has been repealed by the CPA. Accordingly, it is submitted that s56(c) should be amended in order to provide an exemption for promotional competitions conducted in accordance with s36 of the CPA. See the recommendation below at page 296.

⁴⁴ S56(c). In view of the repeal of s54, s56(c) serves no purpose and it is submitted that it should be deleted. See the recommendation at page 296 below.

⁴⁵ See Carnelley 2011 72.

the player or operator, the application of the element of chance, or both; and (b) regardless how the pay-out is made”.

It is also worth noting that section 56 refers to “competitions” specifically, whereas the definitions of “lottery” in the Lotteries Act and “promotional competition” in the CPA cover broader ranges of activities. The Lotteries Act’s definition of “lottery” refers to a “game, scheme, arrangement, system, plan, promotional competition or device” and s36(1)(d) of the CPA refers to “any competition, game, scheme, arrangement, system, plan or device” in defining a “promotional competition”. It might seem that the prohibitions in section 56 focus on competitions in particular.⁴⁶ However, in Carnelley’s view, the term “competition” should not be given a restrictive meaning, and she submits that it could cover any situation where entrants participate in an arrangement in the hope of winning prizes.⁴⁷ However, it is submitted that her view does not accord with the judgement of the English courts in respect of the similar prohibition in the (repealed) Lotteries and Amusements Act 1976.⁴⁸

The provisions of section 56 are virtually identical to those of section 14(1) of Great Britain’s Lotteries and Amusements Act 1976, as well as the 1976 Act’s predecessors: section 47(1) of the Betting, Gaming and Lotteries Act 1963 and section 26(1) of the Betting and Lotteries Act 1934.⁴⁹ It is submitted that the South African legislature must

⁴⁶ However, note that s56(a) also refers to lotteries in its prohibition of schemes that relate to forecasting.

⁴⁷ Carnelley 2011 72.

⁴⁸ Carnelley refers to the English case of *Whitbread & Co Ltd v Bell* [1970] 2 All ER 64. In that matter, participants had to collect letters in order to form prize winning words. Lord Parker held that the arrangement was still a competition in which the participants competed and strove against each other. (Page 69 of the judgement.) He referred to the *obiter* comments in *Elderton v United Kingdom Totalisator Co Ltd* [1954] 2 All ER 624, in which Lord Greene was of the view that contestants did not have to “pit their skill against one another”, that a newspaper competition could be regarded as a competition for purposes of the relevant legislation and that a narrow interpretation would defeat the legislation’s purposes. (Pages 626-627 of the *Elderton* judgement) Lord Justice Du Parc agreed with this view and thought that a competition did not necessarily have to involve “conflict of interest between participants”. (Page 629 of the *Elderton* judgement) However, Merkin refers to the matter of *Imperial Tobacco Ltd v Attorney-General* [1979] 2 All ER 592 (CA) and notes that the Court of Appeal in that matter overruled the *Whitbread* judgement, holding that a competition involved striving and that striving “could not be satisfied by mere passivity”. (Merkin 80-81) Although the House of Lords subsequently reversed the Court of Appeal’s judgement, it agreed with its overruling of the *Whitbread* judgement. (Merkin 81) In the House of Lords, Viscount Dilhorne noted that the relevant provision was drafted “to stop the loophole” – to prohibit competitions that were crafted in such a manner that they could not be regarded as lotteries due to the presence of some skill. He was of the view that all unlawful lotteries would not automatically be regarded as unlawful competitions, and that the relevant prohibition was only intended at prohibiting competitions that involved some degree of skill. He was also of the view that the prohibition did not apply only to competitions in which entrants had to pay. (*Imperial Tobacco Ltd v Attorney-General* [1980] 1 All ER 866 (HL) 874-875)

⁴⁹ See also Carnelley 2011 71.

therefore have replicated section 14 of the British statute and that British case law can therefore assist in the interpretation of section 56. In interpreting s47(1) of the Betting, Gaming and Lotteries Act 1963, Lord Hailsham explained that the relevant offence was created in British legislation as a result of competitions that were usually conducted by newspapers.⁵⁰ The competitions were often conducted in a manner which flouted lotteries prohibitions, usually by involving some questionable degree of skill, and because some of those competitions did not therefore qualify as lotteries, the offences in section 47(1) and its predecessors were consequently created to specifically prohibit such competitions.⁵¹ Presently, a similar position is in place in South Africa, where the Lotteries Act prohibits lotteries, forecasting competitions and competitions that do not depend on substantial skill, except to the extent that any of those are authorised under the Lotteries Act or other legislation.

5.2.2 The role of subscription

Traditionally, a scheme constituted a lottery if prizes were awarded by lot or chance and entrants had to pay in order to participate.⁵² Subscription (consideration) therefore constituted an essential element of a lottery,⁵³ and the subscription requirement clearly featured clearly in the provisions of early legislation.⁵⁴ In view of this, our courts have often had to determine whether or not a particular scheme involved subscription or consideration.⁵⁵ This was the case even though some of the legislation, such as the

⁵⁰ *News of the World Ltd v Friend* [1973] 1 All ER 422 424-425; Carnelley 2011 71; Merkin RM “Prize competitions – the lottery of legality” 1981 *Lloyd’s Maritime and Commercial Law* 66-82 (“Merkin”) 81.

⁵¹ See the sources cited in fn 50 above. Lord Hailsham’s judgement contained a warning regarding the use of commission reports to interpret legislation, specifically because the legislation under discussion was not necessarily in line with the report of the 1932 Royal Commission on Lotteries and Betting. In particular, he pointed out that the offence in s26(1) of the 1934 Act did not amend the definition of “lottery”, but created a separate offence. Accordingly, he pointed out, the legislation separately prohibited lotteries, forecasting competitions and competitions that did not involve substantial skill. (Page 425 of the *News of the World* judgement.)

⁵² See page 185 above in relation to the essential components of a lottery.

⁵³ Dendy 1989 62-67; Bell Dewar 205-207. In English law, past and present, subscription constitutes a key requirement for a lottery. See, for example, Merkin 70 and Monkcom SP *ea Smith & Monkcom: The Law of Gambling* (3rd ed) (“Monkcom”) 191-192 and s14 of Britain’s Gambling Act 2005.

⁵⁴ Law 7 of 1890 (Transvaal) defined a lottery as “every lottery in the general and accepted meaning of the word, *where subscription takes place*, and more especially every scheme, institution, system, plan, or design by means of which a prize or prizes are or may be won, drawn, or thrown for by lot, dice, or other method of chance” (own emphasis). (Translation from Dutch in Jeppe and Van Pittius *Statute Law of the Transvaal*.)

⁵⁵ For example, *R v Ellis Brown Ltd* 1938 AD 98 (where the price paid for tins of coffee was held to constitute consideration in exchange for the opportunity to participate in a competition); *R v Morrison* 1914 TPD 329 (where customers received prize coupons if they purchased the merchant’s goods, and the court decided that the purchasing of the goods amounted to consideration); and *Davis v Cape Times*

Gambling Act, 1965, did not pertinently require that consideration had to be paid in order for a scheme to be a lottery.⁵⁶

Legislation predating the Lotteries Act usually defined lotteries with reference to their generally accepted meaning, followed by specific examples.⁵⁷ This is not the case with the Lotteries Act, which contains a specific, closed definition that does not refer to subscription at all.⁵⁸ There is also no separate provision in the Lotteries Act that states that subscription must be present in order for a scheme to constitute a lottery. In fact, a search of the Lotteries Act reveals that the word “subscription” is only used twice in the Lotteries Act.⁵⁹ Related or synonymous terms, such as “consideration” and “payment”, are also not used in this context.

The term “subscription” is defined as “the payment, or delivery of any money, goods, article, matter or thing, including any ticket, coupon or entry form, for the right to compete in a lottery”.⁶⁰ This is a very wide definition, particularly if one considers that most lotteries and competitions require participants to deliver or send in entry forms or similar things to the organisers in order to participate. It is submitted that the exception provided by section 63 therefore serves no meaningful purpose, since it would be extremely difficult for the promoter of a scheme to rely on the exception in section 63.

Ltd 1915 WLD 82 (where payment for newspapers was considered to be consideration in a competition where the public had to purchase newspapers to see if they were winners). In *Boardman v Minister van Finansies* 1984 (1) SA 259 (T) and *S v Pepsi-Cola (Pty) Ltd* 1985 (3) SA 141 (C) the courts determined that subscription was not present, although those decisions have been criticised. See *S v Mbonambi* 1986 (3) SA 836 843; *FirstRand Bank Ltd v National Lotteries Board* 2008 (4) SA 548 (SCA) 128 par 28; Bell Dewar 207; Dendy 1989 64-67; Louw J “When a gamble is not a gamble: the *Pepsi-Cola* case” 1987 (February) *De Rebus* 65-68, 72.

⁵⁶ Carnelley 2011 62-63. Carnelley refers to *R v Cotterill* 1927 CPD 48 where the court had to decide whether something was a lottery under the Cape’s Lotteries Prohibition Act 9 of 1889. It is submitted that, from Carnelley’s comments on the *Cotterill* case, one could form the impression that the court required that the subscription element had to be present even though the legislation did not cater for same. It is correct that the Cape’s Act did not explicitly require consideration to be paid, and the court noted this, (Page 50 of the judgement.) But, the court was in fact entitled to refer to the generally accepted meaning of a lottery, since the statute’s definition commenced with the words “every lottery in the common and received acceptance of that term”. Accordingly, the court investigated the general meaning of the term “lottery” and decided that “there must be a contribution by some of the competitors to constitute a lottery”. (Pages 50-51 of the judgement)

⁵⁷ The definition of “lottery” in s1(i) of the Gambling Act, 1965 commences as follows: “means any lottery in the generally accepted meaning of the word, and more particularly [...]”.

⁵⁸ See the definition of “lottery” at page 185 above.

⁵⁹ The term is used in the definition of “subscription” and in s63. See also Carnelley 63 fn 6.

⁶⁰ S1.

This is because it would be challenging to create a competition that does not require the submission of entry forms or similar things.

The Lotteries Act states that its provisions will not “apply in relation to any lottery, sports pool or competition in respect of which there is no subscription”.⁶¹ This exception creates the impression that subscription is a requirement, even though no such requirement is to be found.⁶² One could therefore be led to conclude that subscription is not a requirement for a scheme to be classified as a lottery under the Lotteries Act, and that a scheme will be classified as such even if it involves only the awarding of prizes by way of lot or chance.⁶³ This would be extraordinary, particularly in view of the generally accepted meaning of a lottery and the fact that subscription (consideration) gives a lottery its gambling nature.⁶⁴ Consequently, it is submitted that consideration remains one of the key components of a lottery. Carnelley is of a similar view. After analysing the position, she concludes that subscription remains an essential element of a lottery, despite the fact that the Lotteries Act does not contain an explicit requirement in this regard.⁶⁵

The view that subscription is in fact an element of a lottery accords with the judgement of the Supreme Court of Appeal in *FirstRand Bank v National Lotteries Board*.⁶⁶ In that matter, the bank ran a competition in terms of which participants were required to

⁶¹ S63.

⁶² In *R v Cotterill* 1927 CPD 48 the relevant legislation defined the term “to subscribe”, but the court found that such references to subscription could not lead to the inference that subscription was therefore actually a requirement of the legislation. (Page 50 of the judgement; Carnelley 2011 63 fn 8) In contrast with this approach, Louw seems to assume that subscription is in fact a component of a prohibited lottery under the Lotteries Act, stating that “the requirement of ‘subscription’ arises from s63”. Louw J “Distortion of the law: A comment on the SCA judgment in *FirstRand Bank Ltd v National Lotteries Board* 2008 (4) SA 548 (SCA)” 2012 (August) *De Rebus* 59-60 (“Louw 2012”) 59.

⁶³ Carnelley 2011 61. Carnelley points out that this could lead to the extraordinary situation where a scheme in terms of which free clothes are handed out to disadvantaged people could constitute a lottery if the clothes are handed out by way of lot or chance. (Carnelley cites *R v Cotterill* 1927 CPD 48 52)

⁶⁴ Carnelley 2011 61. The “gambling element” is a crucial characteristic of a lottery, and this is the “mischief” which the legislation seeks to prohibit or regulate. (Carnelley 2011 61 and fn 4; *R v Lew Hoi* 1937 AD 219)

⁶⁵ Carnelley 2011 62. In writing about promotional competitions, Abdurahman also proceeds from the basis that subscription is an element of a lottery under the Lotteries Act. [Abdurahman Z “Everybody’s done it” 2006 (December) *Without Prejudice* 37-38 (“Abdurahman”)]

⁶⁶ [2008] 3 All SA 121 (SCA). The matter is sometimes referred to as the “MAMA” (Million-a-Month) case, due to the name of the special bank account that was the focus of the litigation. The matter was an appeal against a High Court decision which declared the competition to be unlawful. (*National Lotteries Board v FirstRand Bank Ltd* [2006] ZAGPHC 106) For a discussion of the High Court judgement, see Melamdowitz H “MAMA – they’re making eyes at me” 2007 (August) *Without Prejudice* 16-18. See also Carnelley’s discussion of the appeal judgement. (Carnelley M “Gambling law” (Recent Cases) 2010 *South African Journal of Criminal Justice* 3 439-453 451)

deposit funds in a special account and stood the chance to win randomly allocated prizes.⁶⁷ The funds attracted only nominal interest, but no banking fees were incurred in respect of the deposits (except for charges that would be levied if funds were withdrawn prematurely). The court proceeded from the basis that subscription or a stake is an essential element of a lottery.⁶⁸ In the end, it rejected the bank's reliance on section 63⁶⁹ and held that the bank's scheme was in fact an unlawful lottery, reasoning that participants' temporary loss of possession of their money constituted subscription.⁷⁰ Louw criticises the judgement, arguing that all parties overlooked the fact that the competition was an exempt promotional competition (as contemplated by section 54 of the Lotteries Act, which has since been repealed by the CPA).⁷¹ Despite this criticism, he does mention that it was not apparent whether or not the specific competition complied with the requirements of section 54.⁷² However, it is submitted that the court did take cognisance of the exemption provided for promotional competitions and the applicable conditions, but noted that "there [was] no suggestion that the Million-a-Month Account [conformed] with those conditions".⁷³

The subscription requirement was further entrenched in *National Lotteries Board v Bruss NO*.⁷⁴ In that case, persons entered a competition by way of premium rated text messages and stood the chance to win prizes allocated by way of random draws.⁷⁵ The court referred to the Lotteries Act's definition of "subscription" and the exemption for lotteries that did not involve consideration (in section 63), and found that it was clear from the provisions that "the right to compete in any lottery is dependent upon

⁶⁷ Pages 122-123 of the judgement.

⁶⁸ Pages 124-126 of the judgement.

⁶⁹ The bank (unsuccessfully) argued that there was no subscription because participants did not have to pay anything in order to participate in the scheme.

⁷⁰ Pages 127-128 of the judgement.

⁷¹ Louw 2012 60.

⁷² Louw 59.

⁷³ Page 129 of the judgement.

⁷⁴ [2009] 2 All SA 164 (SCA). The case is informally known as the "Winikhaya" case, due to the name of the competition which was its focus. The matter was an appeal against a decision of the High Court (*National Lotteries Board v Bruss NO* [2007] ZAGPHC 268) For discussions of the appeal judgement, see Carnelley M "Gambling law' (Recent Cases)" 2010 *South African Journal of Criminal Justice* 3 439-453 451-452) and Kingdon E & Jakhoet I "Is it ... or isn't it?" 2009 (February) *Without Prejudice* 9:1 34-35 ("Kingdon & Jakhoet"). Krige also provides a brief summary of the matter, but seems to state that the court decided that the competition was a promotional competition (whereas the court in fact found that the competition was not a promotional one because its main aim was to raise funds). (Krige J "Promotional Competitions 101" 24 December 2013 <http://www.golegal.co.za/legislation/promotional-competitions-101>, accessed on 16 May 2015)

⁷⁵ Pages 165-166 of the judgement.

there being payment of money or delivery of the goods or articles specified in the definition”.⁷⁶ The court determined that the premium rated text messages constituted consideration and that the competition was therefore an unlawful lottery.⁷⁷

Accordingly, despite the absence of a clear subscription requirement in the Lotteries Act, it would be safe to conclude that a scheme would be classified as a lottery if it contains a subscription element. One would therefore have to examine a scheme carefully in order to determine whether this element is present. In doing so, one must keep in mind that the term “subscription” has a very wide meaning.⁷⁸ Subscription would even be present if there is no cash payment requirement, but where participants must offer consideration or any other kind of contribution.⁷⁹

5.2.3 Lot or chance

Chance is probably the most defining attribute of a lottery.⁸⁰ In order for a scheme to qualify as a lottery, the prizes must be awarded by way of lot or chance.⁸¹ This

⁷⁶ Pages 168-169 of the judgement.

⁷⁷ Page 169 of the judgement. The court also held that the competition was not a promotional competition (as contemplated by s54), because it was conducted predominantly to raise funds for charities, and not to promote goods or services. (Pages 170-171 of the judgement) Louw criticises the *Bruss* judgement, stating that it “went badly awry”. (Louw 60) He does not provide reasons for his criticism, but it is assumed that his views stem from the court’s partial reliance on *FirstRand Bank Ltd v National Lotteries Board*.

⁷⁸ Subscription includes “the payment, or delivery of any money, goods, article, matter or thing, including any ticket, coupon or entry form, for the right to compete in a lottery”. (S1) In *FirstRand Bank Ltd v National Lotteries Board*, the Supreme Court of Appeal commented on the wording of the definition, and was of the view that the comma after the word “payment” must have been a drafting error. (Par 12 on page 124 of the judgement)

⁷⁹ Subscription does not have to take the form of “money or property having an intrinsic economic value”. (Dendy 1989 62) The Supreme Court of Appeal seems to share this view, bearing in mind that it regarded the loss of possession of funds to be subscription. (Pages 127-128 of the *FirstRand Bank* judgement) In that matter, the court saw no reason why the right to occupy a holiday home, use a car or a monetary loan could not be staked in gambling activities.

⁸⁰ Carnelley 2011 64.

⁸¹ The definition of the word “lottery” in s1 of the Lotteries Act refers to the distribution of prizes by lot or chance. Carnelley remarks that the use of the word “lot” might be superfluous, because determination by way of lot depends on chance in any event. However, in her view, the use of the word “lot” elucidates the point that a lottery is not restricted to a scheme where lots are drawn in one way or another, but encompasses any scheme where chance determines the winners. (Carnelley 2011 64) Accordingly, in deciding whether something is a lottery, one should not follow a narrow approach by looking for a scheme where persons submit entries and the winner is randomly drawn from those entries. Instead, one should look wider, identify the determining mechanism and establish whether or not it is rooted in chance. For example, in *R v Jones* 1925 AD 117 entrants had to indicate at what time a clock would stop. The court decided that chance determined whether or not an entrant would have estimated the correct time. (Page 121 of the judgement) As such, the competition did not involve a simple scheme in terms of which lots were entered and a winner was identified by way of a “lucky draw”, but chance decided the outcome nonetheless.

requirement is not only entrenched in lotteries legislation, but also pervades case law on the topic.⁸² If competition winners are identified by way of chance, the competition will be a lottery (provided that the other lottery requirements are met as well), but if participants' skill determines the outcome of the competition, it will not be a lottery.⁸³

The challenge is encountered when one has to establish whether chance or skill determines the outcome of a competition, particularly in competitions where the result is not determined by pure chance or pure skill on its own, but where there is a combination of the two. This challenge is often caused by the fact that chance is unavoidable in life, and that a measure of chance is even encountered in true skill based competitions.⁸⁴ To illustrate this point, Dendy mentions the situation where an unexpected blast of wind (a chance element) might influence the outcome of a golf game (which is normally regarded as a game of skill). He refers to *R v Livingstone*⁸⁵ in which the court explained that one should not classify a competition as a lottery merely because there was some element of chance involved, otherwise even proper competitive sports would be categorised as lotteries. However, the converse seems to apply as well, because chance based competitions may very well involve some measure of skill too.⁸⁶

However, our courts have held that one does not need to exclude chance in its entirety from a competition in order to ensure that it is not classified as a lottery.⁸⁷ Instead, in determining whether something is a lottery, one should examine the scheme and ascertain whether chance is the "guiding factor",⁸⁸ "dominating element"⁸⁹ or "determining factor".⁹⁰ A scheme will be a lottery where the outcome is determined "substantially by chance, and not by skill".⁹¹ The question is not whether chance or

⁸² For example, in *R v Bertram Davis* 1915 TPD 155 the court stated that "a lottery depends upon a distribution by lot, or in all events by some form of chance". (Page 158 of the judgement) In *R v Cotterill* 1927 CPD 48 the court explained that something "is a lottery if chance is the determining factor". (Page 54 of the judgement)

⁸³ *R v Bertram Davis* 1915 TPD 155 158.

⁸⁴ Dendy 1989 50-51.

⁸⁵ 1924 TPD 45 51.

⁸⁶ See, *R v James and Tennant* 1919 TPD 47 49, in which the court stated that every game of chance involves some element of skill.

⁸⁷ *R v Bertram Davis* 1915 TPD 155 158. (Dendy 1989 51)

⁸⁸ *R v Bertram Davis* 1915 TPD 155 158

⁸⁹ *R v Childs* 1924 TPD 155 158.

⁹⁰ *R v Cotterill* 1927 CPD 48 54; *R v Colborne* 1932 TPD 264 268; *R v Scandrogolio* 1951 (2) SA 297 (SR) 281; *R v Fleetwood* 1924 TPD 96 (Carnelley 2011 65 fn 2; Dendy 1989 57; Bell Dewar 208)

⁹¹ *Royal Baking Powder Co v Crystallisers Ltd* 1928 CPD 448 450. (Carnelley 2011 65 fn 2)

skill is the “dominant factor” in a competition, but whether it is the “determining factor”.⁹² Accordingly, Carnelley explains that one should not identify “whether there are elements of skill or chance in the process by which the result is determined, but rather which element has controlled the process”.⁹³ In view of this, a promoter will not be able to avoid a scheme from being classified as a lottery merely by incorporating some element of skill.⁹⁴ But, a skill based competition will also not be a lottery merely because there is some measure of chance involved.⁹⁵

Ultimately, in examining whether a competition is a lottery, “the substantial object and mode of operation of the scheme as a whole must be looked at”.⁹⁶ The courts will consider the scheme holistically and practically, and will ascertain whether “the scheme presents itself as an appeal to skill or an appeal to chance”.⁹⁷ In spite of how a competition might be portrayed, it will be necessary to determine whether the scheme involves “supervening elements of chance”.⁹⁸ A court will not be misled by a promoter’s attempts to portray a scheme as being a skill based competition, and will rather focus on distinguishing “the reality of the transaction from the appearance which for obvious reasons it is made to assume”.⁹⁹

⁹² *R v Ackerman* 1933 CPD 454 461 (Carnelley 2011 65) Carnelley points out that South African law does not follow the “pure chance” doctrine which holds that a scheme will be a lottery only if success is determined entirely by chance. (Carnelley 2011 64-65 and the sources cited there.)

⁹³ Carnelley 2011 65.

⁹⁴ *Dendy* 1989 51-52; Carnelley 2011 65; Bell Dewar 208. For this reason, a promoter will not be able to avoid a typical random draw competition from being classified as a lottery by requiring entrants to answer a simple question, the answer to which will be known by most people. (*Dendy* 2011 56-57, citing *S v Alexander* 1962 (3) SA 649 (A) 651-652.)

⁹⁵ *Davis* 158; *Livingstone* 47. (Carnelley 2011 65)

⁹⁶ *S v Midas Novelties (Pty) Ltd* 1966 (1) SA 492 (A) 498-499.

⁹⁷ *Barnes v Strathern* 1929 SLT 37 (“*Barnes*”) 41, quoted in the *Midas Novelties* case at 499. The reasoning in *Barnes v Strathern* was also applied in *R v Gondo* 1951 (3) SA 509 (A) 513-514 as well as *S v Bryant* 1962 (2) SA 702 (N), in which the court’s view in *Barnes v Strathern* was summarised as follows: “As was said by those learned Lords there is of course an element of chance in all human achievements and when success or failure, as the case may be, can be predicted or influenced by human knowledge, experience, art or skill the occurrence of success or failure is not in ordinary language said to be a matter of chance.” (Page 707 of the *Bryant* judgement)

⁹⁸ *Barnes v Strathern* 41.

⁹⁹ *Director of Public Prosecutions v Phillips* 1935 1 KB 391 400, quoted in *S v Midas Novelties* at 499. See also pages 270-271 of *R v Colborne* where Solomon J decided that a competition was a lottery, even though the competition materials repeatedly referred to the fact that “skill” was required in order to participate in the competition.

5.2.4 Interplay between the Lotteries Act and the CPA

If a promoter intends to run a promotional competition, it needs to determine how the outcome of the competition will be decided. If the outcome will be decided by way of lot or chance, it needs to be considered whether the competition will constitute a lottery. If the competition involves all three of the elements of a lottery – prize, chance and subscription – the competition will in fact be a lottery.¹⁰⁰ As mentioned above, participating in or conducting, facilitating, promoting or benefitting from a lottery, promotional competition or sports pool is an offence, unless it has been authorised by or under the Lotteries Act or the CPA.¹⁰¹ Further, section 56 prohibits certain competitions or lotteries “[conducted] through any newspaper, broadcasting service or any other electronic device, or in connection with any trade or business or the sale of any article to the public”, except if they are “authorised by or under [the Lotteries Act] or any other law”. In particular, the application of section 56 is limited to a competition or lottery in which prizes are offered for predicting the outcome of a future event (or a past event, if the results are not yet known),¹⁰² “any competition other than a promotional competition contemplated in section 54 in which success does not depend to a substantial degree on skill”,¹⁰³ and “any promotional competition which is the subject of a declaration contemplated in section 54(4)”.¹⁰⁴

The question then arises whether a promotional competition which meets the requirements for a lottery can be conducted lawfully. From sections 56 and 57, it appears that such a promotional competition will be saved if it is authorised by or under the Lotteries Act or any other law. In the past, before the CPA came into force, the Lotteries Act provided an exemption for promotional competitions by way of section 54 (provided that the competition satisfied the requirements of that section).¹⁰⁵ However, the CPA repealed section 54 in its entirety. Thus, the Lotteries Act’s authorisation in respect of promotional competitions has been removed and the exception for promotional competitions in section 56(b) has been rendered

¹⁰⁰ See the discussion above at pages 185-185 above.

¹⁰¹ Lotteries Act, s57. See page 188 above.

¹⁰² S56(a).

¹⁰³ S56(b).

¹⁰⁴ S56(c).

¹⁰⁵ See section 5.3 below for a brief overview of s54.

meaningless.¹⁰⁶ According to Louw, this has also resulted in a situation where “all promotional competitions that offend against the provisions of the Lotteries Act will be unlawful and liable to prosecution, whether or not they comply with the Consumer Protection Act”.¹⁰⁷

Louw bases his argument on “inconsistencies between [the Lotteries Act and the CPA]”, noting that section 36 of the CPA replaced section 54 of the Lotteries Act, but arguing that the CPA does not “[exempt] promotional competitions”.¹⁰⁸ However, Louw does not specifically mention that the Lotteries Act’s prohibitions on unlawful lotteries and competitions, which are found in sections 56 and 57, only apply if a lottery or promotional competition is not authorised by or under the Lotteries Act or any other law.¹⁰⁹ It is submitted that one can argue that promotional competitions have not become unlawful due to the repeal of section 54, because they are “authorised by or under [...] other law”, namely section 36 of the CPA. This argument might be supported by the fact that section 54 (which previously provided for the lawful operation of promotional competitions) was not merely repealed, but replaced by section 36, which makes provision for the continued regulation and operation of lawful promotional competitions. Section 36 contains requirements relating to promotional competitions, but does not specifically authorise the conducting of such competitions. In this regard, Louw’s argument that the CPA does not exempt promotional competitions may have merit. Yet, the legislature does not make meaningless laws. The mere fact that section 36 regulates and does not outlaw promotional competitions shows the legislature’s intention to permit promotional competitions. Thus, it is submitted that one could argue that it was the legislature’s intention to provide for the continued exemption of promotional competitions by way of section 36.

In the past, the argument in favour of the continued authorisation of promotional competitions could have been strengthened by the fact that the legislature replaced

¹⁰⁶ S56(c) serves no purpose either, since it refers to promotional competitions that are prohibited by way of a declaration made in terms of s54(4) – a section which no longer exists.

¹⁰⁷ Louw J, quoted in Koenderman T “Don’t bet on it” *Finweek* 4 March 2010 50-51 (“Koenderman 2010”). See also Louw J “Consumer Protection Act 2008 and Promotional Competitions. Promotional Competitions – The End of the Line: Lawful No Longer”. (“Louw *End of the Line*”) (Internet article accessed on 23 February 2014, but no longer available online. Article on file with author hereof.)

¹⁰⁸ Koenderman 2010 50.

¹⁰⁹ However, the fact that he refers to the CPA not exempting competitions could indicate that he might have borne this in mind.

the definition of the term “promotional competition” in the Lotteries Act with a new definition that specifically referred to the meaning given to that term in section 36 of the CPA.¹¹⁰ However, the position was clouded again by the Lotteries Amendment Act, 2013 which came into force on 14 April 2015. The Amendment Act removed the definition of the term “promotional competition” from the Lotteries Act, despite the fact that the term still appears in the Lotteries Act.¹¹¹ It is submitted that the legislature was under the impression that the regulation of promotional competitions had shifted from the Lotteries Act to the CPA, and that the intention was thus to “clean up” the Lotteries Act by removing the definition. However, it is submitted that this aggravated the situation and that an opportunity was wasted to clarify an unclear position, particularly since the Amendment Act was aimed at resolving other uncertainties.¹¹²

In summary, it seems that a promotional competition (which is a lottery) may be lawful if it complies with the requirements of the CPA.¹¹³ It is not entirely clear whether the CPA explicitly authorises the operation of such competitions, yet the legislature would not have created the CPA’s extensive regulation of promotional competitions if it did not intend to authorise them. However, even if it is authorised by the CPA, one must bear in mind that a competition might still be unlawful if it does not comply with the

¹¹⁰ The definition was replaced simultaneously with the repeal of s54. See Schedule 1C of the CPA.

¹¹¹ Despite the deletion of its definition, the term “promotional competition” still appears in the definitions of “lottery” and “participant” in s1, in the heading of Chapter 1 as well as in ss56, 57(1), 57(2) and 58(1)(a).

¹¹² The question whether the National Lotteries Board had *locus standi* to institute proceedings against operators of unlawful lotteries and competitions came up in *FirstRand Bank Ltd v National Lotteries Board* and *Bruss NO v National Lotteries Board*. One of the intentions behind the Lotteries Amendment Act, 2013 was to resolve the uncertainty and specifically to empower the Board to institute such proceedings. (Department of Trade and Industry *Lotteries Policy Review: A discussion document* August 2012, <http://www.icnl.org/research/library/files/South%20Africa/Lotteriespolicy.pdf>, accessed on 20 May 2015) The Lotteries Amendment Act, 2013 was also drafted, *inter alia*, to resolve issues caused by the Lotteries Act’s interchangeable use of the term “Board”, to eliminate overlapping of the Minister and the Board’s functions. (Para 2.2, Memorandum on the Objects of the Lotteries Amendment Bill, 2013; Department of Trade and Industry *Presentation to the Portfolio Committee on Trade and Industry on the Lotteries Amendment Bill* 23 July 2013, https://www.thedti.gov.za/parliament/2013/Lotteries_Bill_23July2013.pdf, accessed on 20 May 2015)

¹¹³ In his discussion of the CPA’s interface with the Lotteries Act, Eiselen reaches a similar conclusion. Eiselen S “Section 121” in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014) par 12. In the same vein, Van Heerden argues that section 36 of the CPA moves the regulation of promotional competitions away from the Lotteries Act, even though section 56 of the Lotteries Act should have been amended in order to make this clear. [Van Heerden C “Section 36” in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014) (“Van Heerden ‘Section 36’”) paras 3-4] See also Strachan D “Promotional competitions under the CPA” 2010 (December) *Without Prejudice* 34-35 (“Strachan”) 34.

CPA's requirements relating to promotional competitions.¹¹⁴ In that event, the competition would be unlawful, unless it is otherwise authorised by the Lotteries Act.¹¹⁵ However, if there is no scope to operate the competition as an authorised lottery under the Lotteries Act (or as a promotional competition under the CPA), the promoter would have to structure the competition so that it cannot be classified as a lottery.¹¹⁶ In order to do this, one of the lottery elements (such as subscription or chance) would have to be removed, although this could be a very difficult exercise.¹¹⁷ If that cannot be achieved, the competition will be unlawful.

5.3 The promotional competition provisions that were repealed by the CPA

Before the advent of the CPA, promotional competitions were regulated by section 54 of the Lotteries Act and the Promotional Competition Regulations ("PC Regulations").¹¹⁸ Section 54 contained a number of requirements that had to be met in order for a promotional competition to be lawful.¹¹⁹ The section created the first

¹¹⁴ An example of this would be where the competition does not comply with the CPA's definition of a promotional competition (s36(1)(d)).

¹¹⁵ It must be kept in mind that the Lotteries Act provides for the lawful operation of some lotteries, such as lotteries incidental to exempt entertainment (s36), private lotteries (s37) and society lotteries (s38).

¹¹⁶ See Louw, quoted in Koenderman 2010 50-51.

¹¹⁷ Louw points out that it might not be sufficient to remove chance and that one would have to introduce a requirement which requires entrants to display substantial skill – which may be difficult to achieve. (Koenderman 2010 51) He also remarks that it would be difficult to remove subscription from the equation, in view of the very wide definition accorded to that term by the Lotteries Act and the court in *National Lotteries Board v Bruss NO*. (Louw *End of the Line 2*)

¹¹⁸ It must be noted that the Lotteries Act entered into force on 17 July 1998, but that some sections (including s54) were held in abeyance. S54 only commenced on 2 May 2003. The wording of s54 (as contained in the original published version) was also amended before s54 came into effect in order to remove some very onerous requirements (such as maximum limits on cash prizes and limits on how frequently competitions could be held). See Lotteries Amendment Act, 2001. The original wording seems to have stemmed from the government's intention to follow a "conservative approach to promotional competitions" and to avoid a proliferation of such competitions. (Loxton L "Erwin to place curbs on promotional competitions" *The Star* 19 September 1997 1) However, the amendments were made as a result from pressure from the advertising and marketing industry. See Temkin S "Marketers up in arms over changes to Lotteries Act" *Business Day* 17 June 2003 1; DMA "SA Marketers hit the jackpot with Amendment to the Lotteries Bill" *Bizcommunity.com* 15 November 2001 (<http://www.bizcommunity.com/Article/196/14/366.html>, accessed on 23 May 2015); MacKenzie J "Wave good-bye to those lekker competitions" 2003 3:1 *Without Prejudice* 12-13 ("MacKenzie") 12. See also Koenderman T "The Last Word ..." *Financial Mail* 3 December 1999 80, in which that author argued that the public did not want to be protected from competitions, that big prizes and frequent competitions would not cause harm and that the Lotteries Board's argument in favour of consumer protection was compromised because the National Lottery would offer big prizes and regular competitions itself.

¹¹⁹ Abdurahman 37; Aguiar A "It can be dangerous to take a bet on the Lotteries Act" 2008 (February) *Without Prejudice* 44-45 ("Aguiar"); Carnelley M "Gambling, Gaming and Lotteries" in Joubert WA (founding editor) *The Law of South Africa* 2nd ed 10:2 ("Carnelley 2005"); Carnelley 2011 69-71; Louw J "The positive side of how section 54 of the Lotteries Act, 1997 affects consumer competitions" (30 June 2003) <http://www.bizcommunity.com/Article/196/14/2078.html>, accessed on 23 May 2015 ("Louw

exemption for the lawful conducting of promotional competitions in South African legislation.¹²⁰ Before this, promoters had to construct their competitions in such a manner that it could not be regarded as gambling or a lottery.¹²¹ As such, section 54 widened the scope for the lawful operation of promotional competitions.

However, compliance with the requirements of section 54 and the accompanying regulations did cause some challenges and frustration.¹²² Often these arose because section 54 did not explicitly list the requirements for the lawful operation of a promotional competition, but instead listed the circumstances under which a promotional competition would *not be unlawful*.¹²³ (In other words, the Lotteries Act provided a system of negative regulation.)

In practice, various issues were encountered with section 54's provisions. For example, the Lotteries Act defined a promotional competition as "a lottery conducted for the purpose of promoting the sale or use of any goods or services".¹²⁴ This definition was described as "circuitous", because the definition of "lottery" contained a reference to a "promotional competition".¹²⁵ It was also unclear whether section 54 only provided an exemption where a party promoted its own goods or services, or whether a competition would still be lawful even if the promoter marketed a third party's goods or services. Section 1 of the Lotteries Act described a "promotional competition"

2003"); MacKenzie 12-13; Young C "So you think it's easy to run a competition. Think again" 2006 (May) *Without Prejudice* 6:4 42-43 ("Young").

¹²⁰ Louw 2003 unpagued.

¹²¹ In order to conduct a lawful competition, a promoter would have had to remove one or more of the lottery elements (chance, subscription and prize) in order to avoid it being classified as a lottery. (See Louw 2003 unpagued.) Such an approach would have been similar to the one in Great Britain at the time. British case law such as *Witty v World Service, Ltd* 1935 All ER 243 (CD); *Reader's Digest Association Ltd v Williams* [1976] 2 All ER 737 (QBD); and *Imperial Tobacco Ltd v Attorney-General* [1980] All ER 866 (HL) could have provided useful guidance on issues such as whether the outcome of a competition depended on chance or skill (*Witty* and *Reader's Digest*). However, there were discrepancies between English case law and South African case law relating to whether a competition would be unlawful if entrants were required to purchase the promoter's goods. In the *Imperial Tobacco* case, such a competition was declared to be an illegal lottery, but in *S v Pepsi-Cola (Pty) Ltd* 1985 (3) SA 141 (C) the Cape Provincial Division came to a different conclusion. However, the *Pepsi-Cola* judgement has been criticised. (See fn 55 above.)

¹²² Louw referred to "negativity about section 54" and criticised the drafting of the section and its accompanying regulations. He noted contradictions in the provisions and remarked that the section was "based on an apparent complete lack of appreciation of what sales promotion is all about". (Louw 2003 unpagued) Other authors state that the "law relating to promotional competitions was in a mess". (Michalsons "Promotional competitions – a checklist to comply with the CPA" 5 April 2014 <http://www.michalsons.co.za/promotional-competitions/2432>, accessed on 23 May 2015)

¹²³ Introductory wording of s54(1).

¹²⁴ Lotteries Act, s1.

¹²⁵ Young 42.

merely as “a lottery conducted for the purpose of promoting the sale or use of any goods or services”, while regulation 1 of the PC Regulations defined “goods or services” as “goods or services which are ordinarily manufactured, sold, supplied, distributed or delivered or in any other way form a substantial part of the business of the promoter involved in a particular promotional competition in the calendar year during which that promotional competition is held”. Louw pointed out that regulation 1 would have created difficulties where a franchisor ran a competition to promote the goods or services of its franchisees (in circumstances where the franchisor did not trade in those goods or services as well.)¹²⁶ However, in *National Lotteries Board v Bruss NO*, the court held that the definition in a statute could not be interpreted by use of a definition in the accompanying regulations and that a promoter could therefore run a competition to promote a third party’s goods or services.¹²⁷ Despite this, it is unclear why the court did not also consider the fact that the statute itself contained a similar limitation in the form of s54(1)(g), in terms of which a promotional competition would not have been unlawful if “the goods or services manufactured, sold, supplied, distributed or delivered in connection with the right to participate in a promotional competition are usually or ordinarily manufactured, sold, supplied, distributed or delivered by the person for whose benefit the promotional competition is held”.

There were some misunderstandings regarding promotional competitions conducted by charities too. When section 54 (as amended) came into force, charitable organisations welcomed its provisions on the basis that it would allow them to conduct fundraising activities.¹²⁸ To this author, it appears strange that charitable organisations were under the impression that promotional competitions could be held to raise funds, if one bears in mind that a promotional competition was defined as “a lottery conducted for the purpose of promoting the sale or use of any goods or services”. In any event, this impression would have been corrected by the judgement in *National Lotteries Board v Bruss NO* where the court declared a competition unlawful on the basis that it was not a promotional competition and that its actual purpose was to raise funds for charitable organisations.¹²⁹

¹²⁶ Louw 2003 unpagged.

¹²⁷ Page 170 of the judgement; Kingdon & Jakhoet 35.

¹²⁸ Pather S “Lottery Act moves are welcomed” *Citizen* 18 October 2001 4.

¹²⁹ Page 170-171 of the judgement.

Furthermore, the section did not clarify whether a competition would be unlawful if entrants incurred costs in submitting their entries.¹³⁰ The provisions of section 54 also seemed to be contradictory regarding the price that could be charged for the goods or services to which the competition related.¹³¹ The role of goods and services in promotional competitions was also unclear to some. For example, it seems that Abdurahman was of the view that a promotional competition had to involve a requirement in terms of which participants were obliged to purchase the promoter's goods or services, because she states: "[...] participants *must* in addition to obtaining the chance to win a prize, also obtain goods and/or services" (own emphasis).¹³² However, it is submitted that the Lotteries Act merely required that the competition had to *promote* the sale of goods or the provision of services. If the Lotteries Act did in fact require that goods or services had to be purchased (which does not appear to be the case), it would have solved the question whether a promoter could have required participants to purchase goods or services to enter. (Section 54 was silent on this issue.) Nevertheless, it is submitted that section 54 implied that such a requirement would have been lawful, because it regulated the price that a promoter could charge for goods or services.

The fact that the Lotteries Act stated that a promotional competition would *not* have been unlawful if "it [was] conducted in the Republic" also leads to interpretational challenges. This could have created the impression that a promoter had to conduct the competition only within the Republic of South Africa, or that the administration of the competition and the random draw had to take place in South Africa (in view of the fact that "conduct" could have had different meanings). This would have caused problems for a foreign promoter who wanted to run a promotional competition in a

¹³⁰ Young 42. In *National Lotteries Board v Bruss NO* the court held that the competition in that matter was an illegal lottery because the R7.50 text message fee that had to be paid by entrants constituted subscription and that the competition was in any event not a promotional competition because it was not conducted to promote goods or services. (Pages 169-170 of the judgement) Similarly, in *FirstRand Bank v National Lotteries Board* the court held that the "Million-a-Month" competition contravened the Lotteries Act, due to the presence of the subscription element. (Page 128 of the judgement) See also Aguiar 44-45, and Hartley A "Illegal SMS competitions under the spotlight" IOL News 7 February 2006 (<http://www.iol.co.za/news/south-africa/illegal-sms-competitions-under-the-spotlight-1.265656>, accessed on 23 May 2015) in which the journalist reported on a National Lottery Board investigation into competitions which required entrants to enter by way of premium rated text messages.

¹³¹ S54(1)(b) prohibited a promoter from increasing the prices, while s54(1)(j) allowed price increases as long as prices were not increased to such an extent that the price actually constituted consideration for entry into the competition. (Louw 2003 unpagged)

¹³² Abdurahman 37.

number of countries (including South Africa), if the administration or random draw took place outside the Republic. However, from minutes of meetings of the Parliamentary Trade and Industry Portfolio Committee, it appears that the intention behind section 54(1)(a) was actually to clarify that section 54 only applied to promotional competitions conducted in South Africa, on the basis that the legislation could not apply extraterritorially. In view of this, it was intended that section 54(1)(a) would contain the word “only” (in order to convey the meaning that the legislation would apply in South Africa only), but the word “only” was omitted in the final wording because it could have created the impression that a competition would have been lawful only if the competition was conducted in South Africa only (and nowhere else).¹³³

Further challenges were faced because of restrictions relating to the nature of competitions and the prizes offered or awarded. A competition would have been unlawful if it was “substantially similar to any competition, game or sports pool conducted by or on behalf of the National Lottery”.¹³⁴ In those times (as at present) the National Lottery conducted a variety of games (such as the country’s main lottery as well as scratch card competitions), and it would have been difficult for a promoter to avoid such competition mechanisms.¹³⁵ The difficulty would have been compounded by the requirement that promoters were not allowed to award prizes that were similar to those offered or awarded by the National Lottery.¹³⁶ Additional restrictions in respect of prizes caused further challenges.¹³⁷ The provisions in terms of which a competition

¹³³ See Minutes of the Trade and Industry Portfolio Committee’s meeting on 17 October 2001 (<http://pmg-assets.s3-website-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/docs/2001/minutes/011017pctrade.htm>, accessed on 23 May 2015) and 26 October 2001 (<http://pmg-assets.s3-website-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/docs/2001/minutes/011026pctrade.htm>, accessed on 23 May 2015).

¹³⁴ S54(1)(i).

¹³⁵ Young 42; Mackenzie 12-13.

¹³⁶ Regulation 3(1)(a) prohibited the awarding of prizes “substantially similar to goods, services or benefits offered or awarded as prizes in a competition, game or sports pool conducted by or on behalf of the National Lottery during the period in which that promotional competition is being held”. This was problematic, because the National Lottery offered a wide range of prizes (for example cash and cars), and the nature of the prizes changed from time to time. (Mackenzie 13) Louw also pointed out that the wording of reg 3(1)(c) did not really make sense because the National Lottery was not an entity or organisation, but a lottery conducted by a licensee in terms of the Lotteries Act. As such, the wording should have referred to a lottery, competition and the like conducted by the particular licensee. (Louw 2003 unpagged)

¹³⁷ A prize could not be offered if “the possession, use, rendering, distribution or delivery [was] dependent on the payment of a fee or any consideration to any person in order to fully possess or use the prize”. (Reg 3(1)(c) of the PC Regulations; Young 42) This meant that a competition could have been unlawful if a winner had won a holiday in a hotel, but the winner had to pay entrance fees to the resort in which the hotel was located, or if a winner had won an overseas trip, but had to pay visa fees. Under reg 3(1)(d) it would also have been unlawful to award a prize if, *inter alia*, use of the prize required

would have been unlawful if it was the “only or the only substantial inducement to a person to purchase or use the goods or services to which the promotional competition [related]” were also difficult to interpret,¹³⁸ particularly because a promotional competition is intended to increase sales.¹³⁹

5.4 Promotional competitions under the CPA

5.4.1 Changes brought about by the CPA

When the CPA came into effect, it took over the regulation of promotional competitions by way of the provisions of section 36 and regulation 11 of the Consumer Protection Act Regulations¹⁴⁰ (the “CPA Regulations”).¹⁴¹ Although some commentators still complained about unclear or complex provisions,¹⁴² the CPA seems to have resolved some of the difficulties experienced under the Lotteries Act. The CPA has avoided the

a licence or authorisation from any organ of state or any other person. (Young 42) This would have meant that a vehicle could have been a prohibited prize, because the winner would have had to obtain a licence from the traffic authorities. In Young’s view, the relevant prohibitions were aimed at protecting consumers, particularly in a situation where a prize was offered and consumers would not have been aware that the prizes did not include something which would ordinarily have accompanied the prize. (Young 42) However, it is submitted that the purpose was also to protect consumers from entering a competition without knowing that there might be restrictions on the use of the prize or where the winner would have had to incur costs or spend effort in order to obtain the full benefit of use of a prize.

¹³⁸ S54(1)(c).

¹³⁹ It is submitted that this requirement was inserted in the Lotteries Act in an attempt to protect consumers from abuse, but that the requirement would have been difficult to enforce in practice (bearing in mind that it would have involved a value judgement).

¹⁴⁰ Published under GN R293 in *Government Gazette* 34180 of 1 April 2011.

¹⁴¹ Regarding the regulation of promotional competitions under the CPA, see Van Heerden “Section 36” paras 1-22; De Stadler E *Consumer Law Unlocked* (“De Stadler 2013”) 66-78; Van Eeden E *Consumer Protection Law in South Africa* (“Van Eeden 2013”) 169-174; Tennant S-L *The National Credit Act and Consumer Protection Act: A Guide for Credit Providers and Suppliers* (“Tennant”) 174-176; Gibson C & Hull G *Everyone’s Guide to the Consumer Protection Act* (Gibson & Hull) 116-122; Melville N (with Gordon F and Burt C) *Consumer Protection Act Made Easy* (“Melville”) 60-62; Opperman I & Lake R *Understanding the Consumer Protection Act (CPA)* (“Opperman & Lake”) 49-59; Du Preez ML “The Consumer Protection Bill: A few preliminary comments” 2009 *South African Law Journal* 58-83 (“Du Preez”) 77; Jacobs W, Stoop PN & Van Niekerk R “Fundamental Consumer Rights under the Consumer Protection Act 68 of 2008: A Critical Overview and Analysis” 2010 13:3 *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal* 302-406 (“Jacobs ea”) 342-344; Strachan 34-35; Taylor N “Promotional competitions – let the promoter beware” 2011 (April) *Without Prejudice* (“N Taylor”) 17-20; Monty S “The money or the box – getting competition rules straight” 2012 (May) *Without Prejudice* (“Monty”) 57-58; Mncwango S “The complex rules for promotional competitions” 2013 (April) *Without Prejudice* (“Mncwango”) 82; Honey E & Mare A “Promotional competitions in terms of the CPA” (10 August 2011) <http://www.bowman.co.za/News-Blog/Blog/promotional-competitions-in-terms-of-CPA> (“Honey & Mare”), accessed on 30 May 2015; Altini N “Dti relaxes stance on promotional competitions via SMS” (27 January 2012) <http://themediainline.co.za/2012/01/dti-relaxes-stance-promotional-competitions-via-sms/> (“Altini”), accessed on 30 May 2015; Krige J “Promotional Competitions 101” 24 December 2013 <http://www.golegal.co.za/legislation/promotional-competitions-101>, accessed on 16 May 2015.

¹⁴² Louw remarked that the CPA was “badly worded and even contradictory”, and that “[t]ried and tested wording from some of the old statutes has simply been cast aside and ignored”. In his view, the drafters of the legislation had to “take a lesson or two in legislative drafting”. (Louw quoted in Koenderman 2010)

circular definition of “promotional competition” that was contained in the Lotteries Act.¹⁴³ Further, it does not restrict prizes and competitions from being similar to those offered as part of the National Lottery.¹⁴⁴ It also does not prohibit promoters from awarding prizes if winners will need to pay fees to third parties or obtain licences, authorisations or the like in order to use the prizes.¹⁴⁵ Whereas contravention of the Lotteries Act’s provisions relating to promotional competitions would have attracted criminal sanctions, a promoter will face different consequences if it does not comply with the CPA’s requirements.¹⁴⁶ A consumer could file a complaint with the National Consumer Commission on the grounds that the promoter’s non-compliance constitutes prohibited conduct. A compliance notice may be served on the promoter and an administrative penalty might eventually be imposed.

A number of other provisions have not been carried over from the Lotteries Act. For example, the CPA does not contain the confusing wording which stated that a promotional competition would not be unlawful if it is conducted in South Africa.¹⁴⁷ The CPA also omits the requirement that the competition must not be the only or substantial factor that induces persons to purchase the goods or services to which a competition relates.¹⁴⁸ The Lotteries Act prohibited a competition which constituted an unlawful business practice under the Consumer Affairs (Unfair Business Practices) Act, 1988¹⁴⁹ or a restrictive practice under the Competition Act, 1998.¹⁵⁰ These provisions have not been mirrored in the CPA.

¹⁴³ Young 41-42; Abdurahman 37.

¹⁴⁴ Young 42.

¹⁴⁵ The prohibitions contained in reg 3(1)(c) and (d) of the PC Regulations have therefore not been repeated in the CPA. (Young 42) Having said this, the CPA does state that a promoter may not award a prize if the supply of the prize to the winner would be unlawful – for example, a promoter may not give a minor alcohol as a prize. However, a promoter is not prohibited from awarding a prize where possession or use of the prize “is or may be restricted or regulated by, or is otherwise subject to, any regulation”. See s36(3)(b)(i).

¹⁴⁶ See Van Heerden “Section 36” par 22.

¹⁴⁷ See s54(1)(a) of the Lotteries Act.

¹⁴⁸ Such a requirement was contained in s54(1)(c) of the Lotteries Act.

¹⁴⁹ In fact, s121(2)(f) of the CPA repealed the Consumer Affairs (Unfair Business Practices) Act, 1988. However the provisions of that Act were taken up in the CPA. As such, a promotional competition would still have to comply with similar provisions (now contained in other parts of the CPA). See, for example, the general standards that relate to the marketing of goods and services in s29 and the rights to fair and honest dealing contained in Part F of the CPA.

¹⁵⁰ S2(9) provides for the concurrent operation of the CPA and other legislation, except if there is a conflict – in which case the provision that affords better protection to the consumer would take precedence. As such, it is submitted that the Lotteries Act’s requirement relating to a restrictive practice

The Lotteries Act restricted a promotional competition to the promoting of goods or services usually manufactured, sold, supplied, distributed or delivered by the promoter.¹⁵¹ This meant that a promoter or its brand could not necessarily be promoted by way of a promotional competition.¹⁵² Furthermore, the goods or services of a third party could not be promoted in this manner.¹⁵³ The CPA has changed this situation. It specifically allows for the promotion of a “producer, distributor, supplier, or association of any such persons”, as well as *any* goods or services.¹⁵⁴ As such, it appears that the CPA allows a promoter to promote a third party’s goods or services by way of a promotional competition.

The CPA retains the Lotteries Act’s principle that a promoter may not charge consideration for entry into a promotional competition.¹⁵⁵ (The term “consideration” is defined in the CPA and has a very wide meaning.)¹⁵⁶ However, in contrast with the Lotteries Act, the CPA provides no exception for competitions that involve no subscription.¹⁵⁷ Consequently, it appears that the CPA’s provisions would apply even if entry into a promotional competition is absolutely free.¹⁵⁸ (This makes sense if one

would have been superfluous in the CPA, because the provisions of the Competition Act, 1998 would in any event apply if a promotional competition amounted to such a practice.

¹⁵¹ Lotteries Act, s54(1)(g) and the definition of “goods or services” in the PC Regulations.

¹⁵² See Louw 2003 unpagged.

¹⁵³ See page 203 above.

¹⁵⁴ CPA, s36(1)(d).

¹⁵⁵ S36(3)(a).

¹⁵⁶ According to s1:

“‘consideration’ means anything of value given and accepted in exchange for goods or services, including-

(a) money, property, a cheque or other negotiable instrument, a token, a ticket, electronic credit, credit, debit or electronic chip or similar object;

(b) labour, barter or other goods or services;

(c) loyalty credit or award, coupon or other right to assert a claim; or

(d) any other thing, undertaking, promise, agreement or assurance,

irrespective of its apparent or intrinsic value, or whether it is transferred directly or indirectly, or involves only the supplier and consumer or other parties in addition to the supplier and consumer”.

¹⁵⁷ Ilhaam Jakoet, quoted in Kingdon E “Competition regulations change under the Consumer Protection Act” Polity.org.za 10 January 2011 <http://www.polity.org.za/article/competition-regulations-change-under-the-consumer-protection-act-2011-01-10>, accessed on 24 May 2015 (“Kingdon 2011”). S63 of the Lotteries Act provides that the Lotteries Act’s provisions do not apply to a lottery that does not involve a subscription. As such, when promotional competitions were still governed by the Lotteries Act, the provisions of that statute would not have applied if a promoter managed to operate a promotional competition that involved no subscription.

¹⁵⁸ Even so, there is still an exemption for very small competitions, because the CPA will not apply if the prizes offered do not exceed the threshold determined from time to time. At the time of writing, the threshold is still R1.00. It is submitted that this threshold is extremely low and that most, if not all, competitions would exceed this threshold.

bears in mind that the CPA's main focus is the protection of consumers, and not the regulation of gambling and lotteries.) In the context of consideration, the CPA does make provision for the levying of "reasonable costs of posting or otherwise transmitting an entry form or device" – an issue that was unclear when the Lotteries Act regulated promotional competitions.¹⁵⁹ It is submitted that the exemption relating to transmission costs will provide some clarity to promoters. Nevertheless, the CPA's provisions relating to consideration are still unclear in some respects. For example, the CPA does not explicitly state whether a promoter may require entrants to purchase the promoter's goods or services in order to enter. These issues are discussed in further detail below.¹⁶⁰

Whereas section 54 of the Lotteries Act was mostly situated within the context of lotteries regulation, section 36 of the CPA has expanded the regulation of promotional competitions in order provide more comprehensive consumer protection provisions. For example, the CPA prohibits false statements relating to promotional competitions,¹⁶¹ includes provisions relating to competition rules,¹⁶² prescribes minimum requirements relating to promotional competition offers,¹⁶³ secures entrants' rights in relation to promotional competitions,¹⁶⁴ requires promotional competitions to be audited¹⁶⁵ and contains reporting and record keeping requirements.¹⁶⁶ Section 36 also exists within the broader context of the CPA as a whole. As such, the provisions found in other sections of the CPA (for example the provisions that regulate marketing in general) would have an impact on the running of promotional competitions as well.¹⁶⁷

5.4.2 Application of the CPA

Before determining when section 36 of the CPA will apply to a competition, one should consider whether the CPA applies at all. In essence, the CPA applies to the promotion

¹⁵⁹ CPA, s36(3)(a). The Lotteries Act was silent on whether it was allowed to charge for the costs of transmitting entries. As such, this is a welcome change.

¹⁶⁰ See pages 226-228 below.

¹⁶¹ S36(2).

¹⁶² S36(3)(c).

¹⁶³ S36(5) and (6).

¹⁶⁴ S36(8) and (9).

¹⁶⁵ CPA Regulations, reg 11(5).

¹⁶⁶ CPA Regulations, reg 11(6) and (7).

¹⁶⁷ See the provisions of s29 which regulate marketing. See page 252 below.

of suppliers or their goods and services,¹⁶⁸ transactions with consumers,¹⁶⁹ as well as the goods or services that are supplied pursuant to such transactions.¹⁷⁰ These grounds of application will now be examined in further detail.

The CPA applies to transactions that take place in South Africa,¹⁷¹ unless one of the exemptions in section 5(2) apply or if an “industry-wide exemption” has been granted in terms of the provisions of sections 5(3) and 5(4).¹⁷² In terms of section 5(2), the CPA does not apply to a transaction if “goods or services are promoted or supplied to the State”,¹⁷³ if an industry-wide exemption applies,¹⁷⁴ or if the transaction amounts to a credit agreement,¹⁷⁵ employment agreement,¹⁷⁶ collective bargaining agreement,¹⁷⁷ or collective agreement.¹⁷⁸ Further, the CPA does not apply to a transaction if “the consumer is a juristic person whose asset value or annual turnover, at the time of the transaction, equals or exceeds the threshold value determined by the Minister in terms of section 6”.¹⁷⁹ The current threshold is R2 million.¹⁸⁰

A transaction involves an agreement in terms of which goods or services are supplied or to be supplied to a consumer, as well as the supply of goods or services to a consumer in exchange for consideration.¹⁸¹ A promotional competition in itself would not ordinarily be regarded as a transaction. But, the CPA also applies, separately, to the promotion of goods or services as well as to the promotion of “the supplier of any

¹⁶⁸ S5(1)(b).

¹⁶⁹ S5(1)(a).

¹⁷⁰ S5(1)(c).

¹⁷¹ S5(1)(a).

¹⁷² See De Stadler 2013 7-11, 13-15; De Stadler E “Section 5” in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014) (“De Stadler 2014”) paras 6-59; Van Eeden 2013 49-50.

¹⁷³ S5(2)(a).

¹⁷⁴ See ss5(3) and 5(4).

¹⁷⁵ S5(2)(d).

¹⁷⁶ S5(2)(e).

¹⁷⁷ S5(2)(f). This refers to a collective bargaining agreement as defined in section 23 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 and the Labour Relations Act, 1995.

¹⁷⁸ S5(2)(g). This exemption relates to collective agreements under the Labour Relations Act, 1995.

¹⁷⁹ S5(2)(b).

¹⁸⁰ See GN 294, *Government Gazette* No. 34181, 1 April 2011.

¹⁸¹ See the definition of “transaction in s1 of the CPA.

goods or services”.¹⁸² (The terms “promote”,¹⁸³ “goods”¹⁸⁴ and “services”¹⁸⁵ are defined in section 1.) A promotional competition is a tool for promoting goods or services. As such, the CPA would apply to a promotional competition – hence the provisions contained in section 36.

Even if goods or services are promoted, the CPA will not apply if the goods or services “could not reasonably be the subject of a transaction to which [the CPA] applies”.¹⁸⁶ According to De Stadler, this means that if the transaction that might result from the promotion would not be subject to the CPA, the CPA would not apply to the promotion of the relevant goods or services either.¹⁸⁷ However, she explains that the CPA will still apply to the promotion of goods or services, even if the promotion does not lead to an eventual transaction (where such transaction would have been covered by the CPA’s provisions).¹⁸⁸ It is submitted that De Stadler’s explanations are correct and that the legislature intended to prevent a situation where the CPA’s protection extends to the promotion of goods or services where the relevant consumer would not be protected if they were to conclude a transaction in respect of the relevant goods or services.

However, the exemption in section 5(1)(b)(i) will lead to interpretational challenges in practice. For example, the CPA does not apply to a transaction if the consumer is a juristic person whose annual turnover or asset-value exceeds the relevant

¹⁸² S5(1)(b).

¹⁸³ See fn 220 below for the definition of “promote”.

¹⁸⁴ According to s1,

“‘goods’ includes –

- (a) anything marketed for human consumption;
- (b) any tangible object not otherwise contemplated in paragraph (a), including any medium on which anything is or may be written or encoded;
- (c) any literature, music, photograph, motion picture, game, information, data, software, code or other intangible product written or encoded on any medium, or a licence to use any such intangible product;
- (d) a legal interest in land or any other immovable property, other than an interest that falls within the definition of ‘service’ in this section; and
- (e) gas, water and electricity”.

¹⁸⁵ S1 contains a very long definition of “services”. It includes, *inter alia*, “any work or undertaking performed by one person for the direct or indirect benefit of another”; “the provision of any education, information, advice or consultation” (subject to exceptions); banking, financial and insurance services (subject to exceptions); transportation services; services related to accommodation, entertainment, and electronic communication; as well as rights of occupation and franchise related services.

¹⁸⁶ S5(1)(b)(i).

¹⁸⁷ De Stadler 2014 par 69.

¹⁸⁸ De Stadler 2014 par 68.

threshold.¹⁸⁹ If a promoter were to organise a promotional competition that might be aimed at the public at large (including individuals as well as corporate consumers that might be exempted from the CPA's application) the promotional competition would have to comply with section 36's requirements to the extent that individual consumers might wish to participate in the competition. However, at the same time, the CPA's requirements would not apply to the extent that the competition is aimed at corporate consumers to whom the CPA does not apply. It is submitted that the promoter would therefore have to ensure that the competition complies with the CPA's requirements even though the CPA might not apply to parts of the competition's target audience. However, it is arguable that the promoter would not have to comply with the CPA if the competition is aimed at only consumers to whom the CPA will not apply (for example, a trade promotion aimed at the promoter's distributors or sales agents who are juristic persons and whose asset-value or turnover exceeds the relevant threshold).

Further, the CPA will not apply if the promotion of goods or services is subject to an industry-wide exemption.¹⁹⁰ This would be the case if a regulatory authority has obtained an exemption on the basis that the CPA's "provisions overlap or duplicate the provisions of a regulatory scheme administered by that authority".¹⁹¹

5.4.3 Application of section 36

Section 36 of the CPA relates to promotional competitions. It defines a promotional competition as follows:

any competition, game, scheme, arrangement, system, plan or device for distributing prizes by lot or chance if -

- (i) it is conducted in the ordinary course of business for the purpose of promoting a producer, distributor, supplier, or association of any such persons, or the sale of any goods or services; and
- (ii) any prize offered exceeds the threshold prescribed in terms of subsection (11),

¹⁸⁹ See s5(2)(b). See De Stadler 2014 par 70. She also refers to the difficulties that will arise if one has to determine whether the CPA will not apply because the transaction takes place outside South Africa. (De Stadler 2014 par 67.)

¹⁹⁰ S5(b)(i) and (ii).

¹⁹¹ S5(3).

irrespective of whether a participant is required to demonstrate any skill or ability before being awarded a prize.¹⁹²

The definition applies to a wide variety of arrangements and would therefore apply to a scheme, even if it is not described as or appears to be a competition in the narrow sense. The definition is not limited to schemes which involve entrants contesting or competing against each other.¹⁹³ A scheme could be a promotional competition even if it involves a game played by consumers individually.¹⁹⁴ It is submitted that the definition would therefore cover schemes that involve the scratching of scratch cards as well as chance based games that can be played on the internet and via social media, even though the outcome of the game might not be influenced by the presence or success of other participants. Further, in order to cast the net as wide as possible, the definition would also cover any other kind of “scheme, arrangement, system, plan or device”.¹⁹⁵ Accordingly, when considering whether or not a scheme is a promotional competition under the CPA, one needs to look wider and keep in mind that something could fall within the scope of the CPA’s definition, even though it might not at first glance seem to be a competition in the usual or traditional sense.¹⁹⁶

Prizes play a key role in promotional competitions and this is reflected in the fact that the CPA’s definition of the term promotional competition refers to the distribution of prizes. The CPA contains an extensive definition of the term “prize”, and states that it “includes a reward, gift, free good or service, price reduction or concession, enhancement of quantity or quality of goods or services, or other discounted or free thing”.¹⁹⁷ (In contrast, the Lotteries Act has a much narrower definition of the term “prize” and merely refers to “the prize awarded to the winner of a lottery”.) When

¹⁹² S36(1)(d).

¹⁹³ See the discussion of the concept “competition” above at pages 191-192 and, in particular, the English courts’ interpretation of the term in fn 48 above.

¹⁹⁴ A promotional competition could therefore be a “passive competition” and does not need to involve elements of competition in the narrow sense, such as “rivalry” (term used in *Whitbread & Co Ltd v Bell* 69), “effort or striving or dexterity” (term used in *Imperial Tobacco Ltd v Attorney-General* 879) or “conflicts of interest” between participants (term used in *Elderton v United Kingdom Totalisator Co Ltd* 629).

¹⁹⁵ These elements correspond with those contained in the Lotteries Act’s definition of “lottery”. See the discussion at pages 185-198 above.

¹⁹⁶ One should therefore also look out for schemes that do not fit into the normal mould, such as the arrangement in *R v Cranston* which involved bonds (see page 186-187 above) as well as the scheme in *FirstRand Bank Ltd v National Lotteries Board* which involved bank accounts.

¹⁹⁷ S36(1)(b); De Stadler 2013 66.

evaluating a competition, one should therefore look out for extraordinary things that could constitute the prize, and not be limited by a narrow understanding of the term “prize”. However, it must also be kept in mind that if all consumers receive a prize, the scheme might be a promotional offer instead of a promotional competition.¹⁹⁸

Another key feature which needs to be kept in mind when considering the application of section 36 relates to the element of lot or chance. A promotional competition is defined as a competition or similar arrangement in terms of which prizes are distributed “by lot or chance”.

However, the question arises whether section 36 only applies to chance based competitions, or whether its scope extends to skill based competitions as well. Some authors are of the view that section 36 covers both chance based and skill based competitions.¹⁹⁹ De Stadler states that something will be a promotional competition if it involves “the slightest element of luck” and that a competition will only escape the application of section 36 if it is “entirely dependent on the skill of the participant”. Kingdon and Jakhoet believe that “it is irrelevant whether the competition awards prizes based on lot or chance, or on the skill of the participant – in both instances the competition must comply with the [CPA]”.²⁰⁰ Melville does not even mention lot or chance, and remarks that the CPA covers “games and other similar arrangements used for promotional purposes, irrespective of whether a participant is required to demonstrate any skill or ability before being awarded a prize”.²⁰¹

Despite these views, it is suggested that the reach of section 36 is limited to competitions in which lot or chance determines the outcome. It is submitted that authors who hold that section 36 applies to both chance and skilled based competitions are misled by the concluding text of the promotional competition definition: “[...] irrespective of whether a participant is required to demonstrate any skill or ability before being awarded a prize.”²⁰² When interpreting the definition, it may be

¹⁹⁸ De Stadler 2013 67. Promotional offers are regulated by s34 of the CPA. S34(2) defines a promotional offer as “an offer or promise, expressed in any manner, of any prize, reward, gift, free good or service, price reduction or concession, enhancement of quantity or quality of goods or services, irrespective of whether or not acceptance of the offer is conditional on the offeree entering into any other transaction”. Section 34(1)(c) specifically excludes promotional competitions from the operation of s34.

¹⁹⁹ De Stadler 2013 66.

²⁰⁰ Kingdon & Jakhoet 35.

²⁰¹ Melville 60.

²⁰² Extract from 36(1)(d).

that they regard it as stating that a promotional competition is something in which prizes are distributed by lot or chance, irrespective of whether a participant is required to show skill or ability. However, it is submitted that one must have regard to both the beginning and the end of the definition, in order to interpret its application. The beginning of the definition contains the essence and defines a promotional competition at the outset as “any competition [...] for distributing prizes by lot or chance”. It is submitted that the rest of the definition merely contains qualifications or clarifications relating to lot or chance based competitions (and only such competitions). It seems that authors who hold a contrary view argue that the concluding wording of the definition extends its reach in order to encapsulate skill based competitions as well. However, it is submitted that it would be senseless for the definition to state clearly that it pertains to the distribution of prizes by lot or chance, and to then make an about turn at the end and state that it also applies to competitions in which skill must be demonstrated. If this was the case, it is submitted that the introductory wording would have referred to the distribution of prizes by lot or chance *and/or on account of the skill demonstrated by participants*.

It is submitted that a promotional competition is first, foremost and solely a lot or chance based competition, and the concluding text was merely added to prevent promoters from introducing some slight measure of skill (such as a very simple general knowledge question) in an attempt to avoid a competition from being classified as a promotional competition. In support of this argument, it may be pointed out that the qualification at the end of the definition relates specifically to a skill requirement which must be shown before a prize is awarded, and not to skill or ability that must be shown in the course of the competition. The wording also does not refer to the demonstration of skill or ability in order to participate in the competition. It seems to relate merely to skill or ability that must be shown at the end of the competition in order for someone to receive a prize (and not in order for that person to win the competition). The wording might even mean that it contemplates the situation where someone has already won the competition, but needs to show skill or ability in order to then receive the prize.

It is submitted that the concluding text’s purpose of preventing promoters from avoiding the CPA’s application might have its roots in existing case law. In two

separate cases, *S v Bryant*²⁰³ and *S v Alexander*,²⁰⁴ the courts had to consider whether the competitions before them were lotteries. Both matters involved games of Bingo, in which the result depended on chance. After a person won a game of Bingo, they first had to answer a simple general knowledge question in order to receive their prize. The courts found that the competitions were predominantly chance based, and that the organisers could not prevent the competitions from being classified as lotteries by posing simple questions to winners at the end of the Bingo games.²⁰⁵ It is submitted that the concluding text of the CPA's definition of promotional competition was inserted to deal with such cases, and any other situations in which competition organisers attempt to avoid the CPA's application.²⁰⁶

It can be challenging to establish whether a competition is based on skill. The relevant considerations have already been discussed above,²⁰⁷ and the details will not be repeated here. In the context of the CPA, De Stadler avers that a competition will be a promotional competition if it involves "the slightest element of luck (as opposed to skill)".²⁰⁸ However, it is submitted that just as a slight element of skill cannot change a chance based competition into a skill based one, a slight element of chance cannot change a true skill based competition into a chance based one. If De Stadler's view was correct, virtually all competitions would in any event be chance based, even if they did involve substantial skill. This is because the outcome of even true skill based competitions could be influenced by chance, for example if there is a sudden gust of wind which changes the direction of a golfer's ball, if a runner slips on a wet running surface or if a chess player knocks over a chess piece by mistake.²⁰⁹ In fact, as the court pointed out in *R v James and Tennant*,²¹⁰ one finds "an element of chance in all human achievements". In *S v Alexander*,²¹¹ the court cited those words from *R v James and Tennant* and stated that "when success or failure, as the case may be, can be predicted or influenced by human knowledge, experience, art or skill the occurrence

²⁰³ 1962 (2) SA 702 (N).

²⁰⁴ 1962 (3) SA 649 (A).

²⁰⁵ *S v Bryant* 708; *S v Alexander* 652-653.

²⁰⁶ It is submitted that Abdurahman might have contemplated this purpose as well, because she seems to refer to these cases too, although she does not name them. (Abdurahman 37)

²⁰⁷ See pages 196-198.

²⁰⁸ De Stadler 2013 66.

²⁰⁹ See Dendy 1989 50-51.

²¹⁰ 1919 TPD 47 at 49.

²¹¹ 1962 (3) SA 649 (A).

of success or failure is not in ordinary language said to be a matter of chance”.²¹² Consequently, it is submitted that our courts should follow the tests set out in earlier case law and consider a scheme as a whole in order to determine whether chance is the determining or dominating factor in a competition, or whether the outcome of the competition is based on skill.²¹³

There are also other requirements contained in the definition of a “promotional competition”. To qualify as a promotional competition, it must be “conducted in the ordinary course of business for the purpose of promoting a producer, distributor, supplier, or association of any such persons, or the sale of any goods or services”. The CPA contains no definition for the phrase “ordinary course of business”, but it does define “business” as “the continual marketing of any goods or services”.²¹⁴ In the context of section 36, Jacobs and co-authors conclude that “[o]nce-off promotional competitions” will not be covered by section 36.²¹⁵ However, in commenting on the meaning of the phrase within the context of the term “supply”, Sharrock is of the view that one should not consider “the ordinary course of business in a general sense, but the ordinary course of business of the particular supplier in question”.²¹⁶ With reference to *Amalgamated Banks of South Africa Bpk v De Goede*,²¹⁷ he then states that it does not matter whether or not someone is regularly involved in a particular type of business, and that one should rather determine whether the transaction is one which would usually be concluded between businesspeople.²¹⁸ In dealing with this issue, Naudé cites the *De Goede* case as well, and notes that “[a] single, isolated activity [...] could in proper circumstances be regarded as being performed in the ordinary course

²¹² Page 707 of the *Alexander* judgement.

²¹³ See the case law discussions at pages 196-198 above.

²¹⁴ S1.

²¹⁵ Jacobs *ea* 342. Similarly, Opperman & Lake mention that “an occasional raffle or lucky draw by a school or church, for example, is not a promotional competition”. (Opperman & Lake 50) Barnard is also of the view that the CPA does not apply to once-off transactions. (Barnard J *The Influence of the Consumer Protection Act 68 of 2008 on the Common Law of Sale* 381 and 483)

²¹⁶ Sharrock RD 2010 *South African Mercantile Law Journal* 22:3 295-325 (“Sharrock”) 302. In the context of supplying, Sharrock is of the view that a transaction will not be in the ordinary course of business if a supplier usually deals in a particular product and then, as a once-off transaction, sells another product to someone. (See Burchell B “The CPA and Leases” 2011 (November) *Without Prejudice* 38-39 38.

²¹⁷ 1997 (4) SA 66 (SCA).

²¹⁸ Sharrock 302. He reasons that a lease agreement, for example, would qualify as a transaction in the ordinary course of business where a person who is employed on a full-time basis rents out premises to supplement his income.

of business”.²¹⁹ In view of the above discussions, it is submitted that the CPA does not require that a competition must be conducted as part of an enterprise that frequently conducts promotional competitions, and that a promotional competition would still fall within the ambit of section 36 if it is the kind of competition that would be held by a typical business. As such, it is submitted that a competition could still be classified as a promotional competition, even if it is a once-off or infrequent occurrence.

The provisions of section 36(1)(d)(i) require that the competition must be conducted “for the purpose of promoting a producer, distributor, supplier, or association of any such persons, or the sale of any goods or services”.²²⁰ As such, the competition cannot be conducted for other purposes, such as fundraising.²²¹ The competition can promote any of the parties above, but one needs to note that the CPA accords specific means to those parties.²²² As such, if the promoter cannot be classified as one of those parties, the competition might not meet the requirements of section 36(1)(d)(i).²²³

²¹⁹ Naudé T “The Consumer’s Right to Safe, Good Quality Goods and the Implied Warranty of Quality Under Sections 55 and 56 of the Consumer Protection Act 68 of 2008” 2011 *South African Mercantile Law Journal* 23:3 336 (“Naudé 2011”) 337. Naudé also refers to income tax law, and concludes that a lease agreement, for example, would be subject to the CPA’s provisions even if the lessor leases out only one property. (Naudé 2011 338)

²²⁰ The CPA (s1) states that “promote” means to:

- “ (a) advertise, display or offer to supply any goods or services in the ordinary course of business, to all or part of the public for consideration;
- (b) make any representation in the ordinary course of business that could reasonably be inferred as expressing a willingness to supply any goods or services for consideration; or
- (c) engage in any other conduct in the ordinary course of business that may reasonably be construed to be an inducement or attempted inducement to a person to engage in a transaction.”

A “distributor”, in the context of specific goods, is defined as:

“a person who, in the ordinary course of business –

- (a) is supplied with those goods by a producer, importer or other distributor; and
- (b) in turn, supplies those goods to either another distributor or a retailer”. (S1)

A “supplier” is “a person who markets any goods or services”. (S1)

²²¹ In *National Lotteries Board v Bruss NO* the court held that the Winikhaya competition was conducted for fundraising purposes and not to promote goods or services. In view of the wording of 36(1)(d)(i), it is submitted that the position would have been the same under the CPA.

²²² “Producer”, in relation to particular goods, is defined by s1 as a person who:

- “(a) grows, nurtures, harvests, mines, generates, refines, creates, manufactures or otherwise produces the goods within the Republic, or causes any of those things to be done, with the intention of making them available for supply in the ordinary course of business; or
- (b) by applying a personal or business name, trade mark, trade description or other visual representation on or in relation to the goods, has created or established a reasonable expectation that the person is a person contemplated in paragraph (a)”.

²²³ In view of this, it is doubtful whether a charitable organisation can qualify as promoters unless the competition is conducted, for example, in the context of the organisation’s supply of goods or services.

However, one person could conduct a competition to promote another person.²²⁴ A competition can also be held to promote goods or services on their own.²²⁵

Another key requirement is contained in section 36(1)(d)(ii), in terms of which a competition will only be regarded as a promotional competition if its prizes exceed the prescribed threshold. The current threshold is R1.00.²²⁶ It appears that the purpose of section 36(1)(d)(ii) is to allow the conducting of competitions in which prizes of negligible value are awarded. In this vein, De Stadler remarks that it would have been appropriate to differentiate between promotional competitions based on the value of the prizes involved, on the basis that a competition with low value prizes does not warrant the same strict regulation as a competition in which high value prizes are offered.²²⁷ Still, if the CPA's intention is to protect consumers against abuse, some might argue that the threshold exemption in section 36(1)(d)(ii) should not have formed part of the legislation and that all promotional competitions should have been covered by the CPA. Be that as it may, it is submitted that the R1.00 threshold is too low to achieve the purpose behind section 36(1)(d)(ii), and that virtually all competitions would exceed the threshold. In fact, it seems that a promoter would only benefit from the exemption if the relevant prizes had no value. Accordingly, it is submitted that the threshold should be increased.

It is important to determine whether a competition meets all of the requirements mentioned above and whether it thus falls within the scope of the CPA's definition of a "promotional competition". The reason for this lies in the fact that a promotional competition must comply with all of the CPA's provisions that pertain to the operation of promotional competitions. If the competition does not fall within the scope of the definition, compliance might not be required. However, if the competition falls outside such scope but can nonetheless be regarded as a lottery, the promoter might be faced with a situation where the competition could be classified as an illegal lottery, unless it otherwise complies with the Lotteries Act's requirements.²²⁸ This constitutes another

²²⁴ Compare this to the position under the erstwhile s54(1)(g) of the Lotteries Act, which required that "the goods or services manufactured, sold, supplied, distributed or delivered in connection with the right to participate in a promotional competition [had to be] usually or ordinarily manufactured, sold, supplied, distributed or delivered by the person for whose benefit the promotional competition is held".

²²⁵ It need not be the goods or services of the promoter, as opposed to the position under s54(1)(g) of the Lotteries Act.

²²⁶ CPA Regulations, reg 11(4).

²²⁷ De Stadler 2013 67.

²²⁸ See the discussion above at pages 199-202.

reason for the importance of establishing whether or not something is a promotional competition. Consequently, a promoter may wish to structure a competition in such a manner that it complies with the CPA's definition and that it is therefore a competition authorised by law and not one which may be prohibited by the provisions of sections 56 or 57(1) of the Lotteries Act.

5.4.4 The role-players in section 36 of the CPA

Section 36(1) makes mention of specific role-players in promotional competitions. The “promoter” plays a pivotal role in a promotional competition. This is “a person who directly or indirectly promotes, sponsors, organises or conducts a promotional competition, or for whose benefit such a competition is promoted, sponsored, organised or conducted”.²²⁹ The definition casts a wide net, particularly due to the words “directly or indirectly”. Consequently, someone would be regarded as a promoter if they sponsor a competition or benefit from it, even if they are not actively involved in the organisation of the competition. It is submitted that this could have far reaching consequences for a sponsor who merely donates a small prize, because the sponsor would still be regarded as a promoter of the competition and the sponsor's liability to consumers would be the same as that of the main organiser of the competition.²³⁰

The CPA deals with the persons who participate in a promotional competition as well. It describes the “participant” as “a person who enters, competes in or is otherwise eligible to win a promotional competition”.²³¹ De Stadler observes that this wording indicates that section 36 is not limited to situations where participants actively enter a competition, but that it would also apply to competitions in which participants are entered automatically.²³²

²²⁹ S36(1)(c).

²³⁰ See De Stadler 2013 68. She points out that the advertising agency, sponsor, brand owner and organiser could all be regarded as promoters of a competition, and suggests that such parties should ensure that a competition is conducted properly and perhaps conclude an agreement amongst themselves in this regard.

²³¹ S36(1)(a).

²³² De Stadler 2013 67. Her reasoning appears to be based on the fact that a participant includes someone who is “eligible to win a promotional competition”.

Further, the CPA contains restrictions that might indirectly prohibit some persons from participating in a promotional competition. Section 36(3)(b)(ii) lists the following persons who may not be awarded prizes in a promotional competition:

- (aa) a director, member, partner, employee or agent of, or consultant to the promoter or any other person who directly or indirectly controls or is controlled by, the promoter; or
- (bb) a supplier of goods or services in connection with that competition.

The purpose of the provision is to ensure the integrity and fairness of a competition and prevent any bias towards persons that might be connected to the promoter.²³³ In *Smart v The Really Great Brand Company (Pty) Ltd*,²³⁴ the court commented on similar provisions that were contained in the PC Regulations, and was of the view the provisions were “intended to protect consumers from misleading, deceptive, fraudulent and unfair conduct in competitions of this nature”.²³⁵

It should be noted that section 36(3)(b)(ii) does not explicitly prohibit the relevant persons from participating in a promotional competition, but they may not receive prizes.²³⁶ As such, it is arguable that such persons could still participate in the competition, but that they may not be awarded prizes if they are winners. Even so, it is submitted that this is an undesirable position. The outcome of a competition and the credibility of a promoter may be tainted if participants’ chances to win in a competition might be affected due to the participation of persons who will not ultimately be allowed to receive prizes, and an organiser might have to deal with a situation where it would have to disqualify a winner from receiving a prize because they are not allowed to do so. It is submitted that an outright prohibition would therefore have been clearer.²³⁷

Furthermore, it is submitted that the reach of 36(3)(b)(ii)(aa) is excessively wide, particularly if one bears in mind that the term “promoter” has a very broad definition (which is not limited to the business that runs a promotional competition, but would

²³³ Van Heerden “Section 36” par 13; N Taylor 18.

²³⁴ [2008] 2 All SA 474 (C).

²³⁵ Page 483 of the judgement.

²³⁶ Van Heerden also submits that a competition which is held for the sole benefit of the promoter’s employees should not be affected by the restrictions contained in s36(3)(b). (Van Heerden “Section 36” par 13)

²³⁷ It should be noted that the PC Regulations under the Lotteries Act contained a similar provision (although it did not also prohibit a supplier of goods or services in connection with that competition from receiving a prize). However, the PC Regulations also explicitly prohibited the relevant persons from participating in a competition, and the promoter was required to note this prohibition in the competition’s advertising material. (Reg 5 of the PC Regulations.)

include sponsors and other parties involved in the organisation of the competition too). Accordingly, the provision would prevent a wide range of persons from receiving prizes. It may also be very difficult for a promoter to comply with the provision and to determine whether or not someone is such a person. For example, the individual who is tasked with organising the competition would have to obtain a list of all of the promoter's directors, members, partners, employees, consultants and agents in order to make sure that they are not winners in the competition. It is also not clear what is meant by "any other person who directly or indirectly controls or is controlled by, the promoter". It is submitted that the provisions of section 2(2) of the Companies Act,²³⁸ which can be used to determine whether a person controls a juristic entity, might assist in this regard.

Section 36(3)(b)(ii)(bb) also excludes "a supplier of goods or services in connection with [a] competition" from receiving prizes. It is assumed that this refers to competition sponsors, but the exclusion could also relate to businesses that organise competitions for promoters (for example advertising agencies) or provide information technology services used in the running of the competition (for example a wireless application service provider that facilitates text message competitions). However, it is not very likely that a supplier (for example, an advertising agency) would enter a promotional competition. Instead, the supplier's employees or personnel might enter the competition, but the exclusion might not extend to such persons as well.

The onus on the promoter is also increased by the fact that regulation 11(6)(j) of the CPA Regulations requires the person who conducted the competition to depose to an affidavit in which they declare that the prize winners were not prohibited from receiving prizes.²³⁹ However, there are a number of issues with the provisions of regulation 11(6)(j).²⁴⁰

²³⁸ 71 of 2008.

²³⁹ De Stadler 2013 78 and fn 149.

²⁴⁰ See pages 245-247 below.

5.4.5 Protection against misleading information

In keeping with the CPA's purposes of advancing fair business practices, improving consumer information and protecting consumers from improper conduct,²⁴¹ and in line with section 29's general marketing standards, section 36(2) prohibits persons from making certain false or misleading statements in the context of competitions. In particular, a person is prohibited from informing another person that a participant has won a competition, if:

- (i) no competition has in fact been conducted;
- (ii) the person has not in fact won the competition;
- (iii) the prize for that competition is subject to a previously undisclosed condition; or
- (iv) the person is required to offer further consideration for the prize, after the results of the competition have been announced.²⁴²

The provision prohibits a "person" from making the relevant statements. Section 1 does not have a specific definition for that term, and states that "'person' includes a juristic person". As such, one could interpret the provision to mean that no one may make such statements, even if the person making the statement is not even connected to the competition. However, it is submitted that the prohibition's main purpose must be to prevent suppliers and promoters from making those statements.

Section 36(2)(b) contains further prohibitions, but in this case they relate specifically to prizes. A person may not inform someone else that they have a right to a prize:

- (i) to which the person does not in fact have a right;
- (ii) if the prize was generally available or offered to all similarly situated persons or class of persons; or
- (iii) if, before becoming eligible to receive the prize, the person is required to offer further consideration for the prize or to purchase any particular goods or services.

In essence, the provision prohibits statements to the effect that someone has won a prize, if that is not the case or if everyone actually has such a right.

²⁴¹ See s3 of the CPA, which outlines the purpose and policy of the CPA, including "promoting fair business practices" (s3(c)), protecting consumers from improper, misleading and similar conduct (s3(d)) and "improving consumer awareness and information" (s3(e)).

²⁴² S36(2)(a).

It is submitted that the provisions of section 36(2) are aimed specifically at preventing abuse of consumers. This would include situations where suppliers lure consumers in by exploiting their desire to win a prize or receive something for free. Often, suppliers might do this in order to corner consumers and then oblige them to purchase products or services or tender consideration for the prize.²⁴³ For example, in a Canadian case,²⁴⁴ a magazine's marketing materials boldly proclaimed that the recipient had won a prize. However, when reading the fine print, it was discovered that the recipient would only have one the prize if the recipient had the winning entry. As a result, the Superior Court held that the magazine had made misleading representations and breached the provisions of consumer protection legislation.²⁴⁵

The provisions of section 36(2) might be relevant in other circumstances as well. For example, in the Australian case of *Trade Practices Commission v Calderton Corp Pty Ltd*,²⁴⁶ a promoter was not satisfied with the success of a competition. Possibly in an attempt to avoid awarding prizes, the promoter announced the names of the winners, but those people did not in fact exist or enter the competition. It is submitted that one of the purposes of section 36(2) is to prevent such a situation and ensure that a promoter in fact awards the prizes that were offered to entrants.

The provisions of section 36(2)(b)(iii), and the similar provisions of section 36(2)(a)(iv), may be difficult to interpret in practice. They prohibit a promoter from stating that someone has won a competition or has won a prize if "the person is required to offer further consideration for the prize".²⁴⁷ On a strict interpretation, and in view of the CPA's wide definition of the term "consideration",²⁴⁸ these prohibitions could prohibit a promoter from offering a prize where the winner might have to incur expenses in obtaining use of the prize. For example, a promoter might be prohibited from offering

²⁴³ See De Stadler 2013 77. Gibson & Hull mention the example of a telemarketing firm that informs someone that they have won a prize (even though they might not have entered), but requires them to sit through a presentation in order to receive the prize. (Gibson & Hull 122)

²⁴⁴ *Richard v Time Inc. and Time Consumer Marketing Inc.* [2012] 1 R.C.S. 265; 2012 SCC 8 (CanLII). See Bowal P & Brunet A "Canadian Regulation of Contests, Prizes and Games" *LawNow* 5 September 2014, <http://www.lawnow.org/canadian-regulation-contests-prizes-games/>, accessed on 31 May 2015.

²⁴⁵ Page 268 of the judgement. See also *Speers v Reader's Digest Association (Canada) ULC* 2010 ONSC 6366 (CanLII), in which the court approved a settlement between the parties arising from the plaintiff's allegations that a magazine "used illegal and immoral business practices and targeted and exploited the vulnerable elderly across Canada".

²⁴⁶ (1994) ATPR 41-306.

²⁴⁷ See s36(2)(a)(iv) and s36(2)(b)(iii).

²⁴⁸ See the definition of "consideration" in s1 of the CPA.

air travel as a prize if the winner will be required to pay for visas or transport to the airport, or from offering free tickets to a concert if winners have to pay for access to the holiday resort where the concert will take place. However, it is submitted that the intention behind the provisions is to prohibit promoters from luring in participants by way of false claims or unexpected or undisclosed conditions, and not to compel promoters to bear all costs and expenses that might be associated with a prize. Even so, the promoter would have to ensure that the competition rules make it clear that winners might have to bear costs and expenses that are associated with the prize.

5.4.6 Consideration

In a promotional competition, the focus should be on promoting a supplier or particular goods or services.²⁴⁹ Accordingly, section 36(3)(a) prohibits a promoter from requiring “any consideration to be paid by or on behalf of any participant in the promotional competition”. A competition should therefore not be used to raise funds. (Even so, one might find some organisations, for example schools, that use promotional competitions in order to generate additional income by selling competition entries. Such competitions are actually lotteries, and it would be illegal to run them unless the promoters comply with the requirements of the Lotteries Act.)²⁵⁰

At first glance, the CPA’s prohibitions regarding consideration in promotional competitions might seem clear, but a close examination uncovers some issues. For example, are promoters prohibited from requiring consideration to be paid in general, or does the prohibition relate specifically to consideration in exchange for entry into a competition? An obvious effect of the provisions would be to prohibit the payment of entry fees. However, it is not clear whether the provisions also prevent promoters from requiring consideration in any other context. The uncertainty is compounded by the wide definition of the term “consideration”.²⁵¹ In this regard, the question arises

²⁴⁹ See the definition of “promotional competition” in s36(1)(d) and, for example, the judgement in *Bruss NO v National Lotteries Board* at 170-171.

²⁵⁰ In order for such a lottery to be legal, it would have to comply with the Lotteries Act’s requirements for a private lottery (s37 of the Lotteries Act), a society lottery (ss38-40 of the Lotteries Act), or a lottery that is incidental to exempt entertainment (s36 of the Lotteries Act).

²⁵¹ S1 defines “consideration” as follows:

“anything of value given and accepted in exchange for goods or services, including-

- (a) money, property, a cheque or other negotiable instrument, a token, a ticket, electronic credit, debit or electronic chip or similar object;
- (b) labour, barter or other goods or services;

whether a promoter may require consumers to purchase its products or services in order to enter a competition. As opposed to the position in other countries,²⁵² the CPA does not state whether or not such a requirement would be lawful.

Some guidance can be found in section 36(4), which envisages two situations in which a promoter would be regarded to have required participants to pay consideration “in respect of a promotional competition”:²⁵³

- (a) a participant is required to pay any consideration, directly or indirectly, for the opportunity to participate in the promotional competition, for access to the competition or for any device by which a person may participate in the competition; or
- (b) participation in the promotional competition requires the purchase of any goods or services, and the price charged for those goods or services is more than the price, excluding discounts, ordinarily charged for those or similar goods or services without the opportunity of taking part in a promotional competition.

The first subsection makes it clear that a promoter may not charge any entry or participation fee. Both direct and indirect payments are prohibited. The second subsection prohibits a promoter from increasing the usual price for goods or services if competition participants are required to purchase such goods or services. It is submitted that section 36(4)(b) by implication allows promoters to require participants to purchase goods or services. If that is not the case, and promoters are in fact prohibited from doing so, it is submitted that section 36(4)(b) would have served no purpose (contrary to the presumption that legislation does not contain provisions which have no purpose and that language is not used unnecessarily).²⁵⁴ However, it is

-
- (c) loyalty credit or award, coupon or other right to assert a claim; or
 - (d) any other thing, undertaking, promise, agreement or assurance, irrespective of its apparent or intrinsic value, or whether it is transferred directly or indirectly, or involves only the supplier and consumer or other parties in addition to the supplier and consumer.”

²⁵² In Great Britain, for example, a prize competition will constitute an unlawful lottery if entrants must make payment, but payment for goods or services will not be regarded as consideration unless the price is increased in order to reflect the opportunity to participate in the competition. See Schedule 2, par 2(c) of Great Britain’s Gambling Act 2005 and page 168 above. A similar position is in place in New Zealand, where a competition would be a lawful sales promotion scheme if participants are required to purchase goods or services, as long as the price does not exceed the usual retail price. See s4 of New Zealand’s Gambling Act 2003 and pages 136-138 above.

²⁵³ S36(4) refers to “consideration in respect of a promotional competition”, whilst s36(3) prohibits a promoter from requiring consideration without describing the consideration as “consideration in respect of a promotional competition”. It is submitted that if there was such a description in s36(3), the prohibition would have been clearer.

²⁵⁴ Du Plessis L *Re-Interpretation of Statutes* 187-190; 212-213.

submitted that promoters may require participants to purchase goods or services,²⁵⁵ and that section 36(4)(b) was therefore inserted in the legislation in order to prohibit promoters from increasing prices in such an event. In other words, a promoter is prohibited from adding a margin to its prices, because the margin would then constitute an entry fee.²⁵⁶ The provisions of sections 36(2)(a)(iv) and 36(2)(b)(iii) might cast some doubt on this author's view that promoters are allowed to require participants to purchase goods or services, but it is submitted that those provisions are intended to prohibit a promoter from requiring someone *who has already won a competition* to pay consideration or purchase goods or services in order to receive their prize. It is submitted that those provisions do not prohibit a promoter from requiring someone to purchase goods or services in order to enter the competition.²⁵⁷

The CPA's provisions relating to the costs of transmitting competition entries require some examination as well. Section 36(3)(a) allows "the reasonable costs of posting or otherwise transmitting an entry form or device" to be incurred in the course of a promotional competition.²⁵⁸ However, the CPA does not clarify what such costs may

²⁵⁵ De Stadler holds a similar view, and states that the provisions of s36(4)(b) do not imply "that the consumer cannot be required to purchase a product or service in order to enter the competition". (De Stadler 2013 70) Based on the example given by Tennant, it seems that she shares the same view. (Tennant 174) Tennant uses the example where consumers must purchase goods from a store in order to enter a competition, but notes that the "prize" (sic) must be the same for all consumers. (It is assumed that the word "prize" is a typographical error and that the text should have referred to "price" instead). However, it is submitted that the mere fact that all consumers are charged the same price for the goods might still breach the provisions of section 36(3)(a) if the price has been increased in view of the competition. Krige also holds the view that product purchase requirements are allowed. (Krige unpagged) Generally, in respect of whether promoters may require entrants to purchase goods or services, Melville appears to hold a view that is contrary to the one held by the author hereof and the other three authors referred to here. (See Melville 61.) On its website, the National Lotteries Board also stated that promoters may not require entrants to purchase goods or services in order to enter a competition. [National Lotteries Board "Promotional Competitions" <http://www.nlb.org.za/competitions/promotional-competitions.html>, accessed on 1 June 2015 (National Lotteries Board "Promotional Competitions")] Opperman & Lake's view on the issue is not really clear. They confirm that a promoter may not require entrants to purchase goods or services at an increased price, but in the same sentence they state that "for SMS entries the total amount charged must not be more than R1.50". It is therefore not clear whether they mean that the purchase price of the goods or services may not exceed R1.50, or whether they are in fact referring to the costs of the text messages themselves. (Opperman & Lake 51)

²⁵⁶ Compare the wording in Schedule 2, par 2(c) of the British Gambling Act 2005 which refers to "paying for goods or services at a price or rate which reflects the opportunity to participate in an arrangement". By way of example, Van Heerden states that a promoter would be regarded as having required consideration in a competition where the normal price of a soft drink is R5.00, but the price is increased to R6.00 – in which event the R1.00 price difference would constitute the consideration. (Van Heerden "Section 36" par 11 fn 2.)

²⁵⁷ See also De Stadler 2013 77 fn 144.

²⁵⁸ The provisions seem to have been drafted at a time when typical promotional competitions still required the submission of entry forms. It is submitted that the wording has become dated if one bears

amount to and does not give guidance for the calculation of such costs. Although, in respect of entries that are submitted electronically, regulation 11(1) states that the costs of such entries may not exceed R1.50.²⁵⁹ In view of regulation 11(2), it appears that the monetary amount constitutes the aggregate maximum limit, meaning that the limit would include the costs relating to subsequent communications “to the consumer”.²⁶⁰ These provisions would therefore allow a competition in which participants are required to submit text message entries, as long as the consumer is not charged at premium rates which exceed the maximum monetary limit. By implication, it seems that a promoter would therefore be allowed to charge up to a maximum of R1.50 in relation to the electronic submission of an entry, even in a case where a participant’s communications service provider might charge a smaller amount.²⁶¹

5.4.7 Prizes and the awarding thereof

A promoter is prohibited from awarding a prize to a winner of a competition if it is unlawful to supply the specific goods or services to that winner.²⁶² In discussing these provisions, Opperman and Lake state that the promoter may not award “illegal goods

in mind that many competitions are conducted via the internet these days, and those competitions do not necessarily involve the transmission of entry forms.

²⁵⁹ The monetary limit has not been increased since its initial publication on 1 April 2011. It is submitted that the limit would at some stage become unrealistic, in view of the increase in communication charges. As such, the limit would have to be increased. An alternative would be to follow the example in the British Gambling Act 2005, which allows for charges “at a normal rate” and clarifies that such a rate “is a rate which does not reflect the opportunity to enter a lottery”. (See Schedule 2, par 5 of the Gambling Act 2005.)

²⁶⁰ It is not really clear why regulation 11(2) seeks to limit the costs of communications directed to the consumer (as opposed to communications sent by the consumer to the promoter). Perhaps the intention is to deal with competitions where consumers are required to make payment to the promoter in order for the promoter to communicate with the consumer during the course of the competition or after the competition has ended. As an example in this regard, Van Heerden mentions that the prohibition would prevent a promoter from charging a flat fee for all communications exchanged between a promoter and a participant in relation to a competition. (Van Heerden “Section 36” par 10 and fn 2.)

²⁶¹ Altini (unpaged). Altini notes that the draft regulations would have restricted promoters from charging more than the rate ordinarily charged by their service providers, but the final regulations contain a nominal amount instead. He submits that a promoter might therefore use part of the R1.50 to cover, for example, the costs of a third party that provides services in relation to the competition. The nominal amount might also prevent the uncertain position that might have arisen if promoters would have been limited to charging only the amount usually charged by participants’ service providers, particularly if one bears in mind that different service providers charge different rates, and different rates might even apply to different persons (depending on their relevant contract package). (N Taylor 18)

²⁶² S36(3)(b)(i). Reg 3(1)(a) of the PC Regulations contained a wider prohibition, and stated that promoters were not allowed to “offer or award goods, services or benefits as prizes to a participant in a promotional competition – (a) in respect of which the sale, possession, use, distribution, rendering or delivery is unlawful”.

or services” as prizes.²⁶³ However, it is submitted that section 36(3)(b)(i) does not prohibit the awarding of illegal prizes as such, but rather the awarding of goods or services where the supply of such goods or services is illegal. If the prohibition was aimed at illegal goods or services only, a promoter would have been allowed to supply alcohol to children, because alcohol as such is not an illegal product (but the supply of alcohol to minors is illegal). Tennant seems to give an altogether different meaning to section 36(3)(b)(i) when she states that a promoter must “award prizes to lawful candidates such as to legal citizens of the Republic of South Africa”.²⁶⁴ However, it is submitted that the relevant prohibition is not aimed at the lawfulness or legality of the prize recipient, but concerns the lawfulness of the supply of the prize instead.

The focus of the abovementioned prohibition seems to be on the lawfulness of the supply of the prize to the winner, and not necessarily on the prize as such. In other words, when choosing prizes for a competition, a promoter would have to check whether there is any legislation that regulates or prohibits the supply of the relevant product or service to the persons that might be winners in the competition. For example, legislation might prohibit the supply of alcohol or tobacco to minors. As such, alcohol or tobacco should not be offered in a competition unless the competition is open for entry by adults only.²⁶⁵ In order to clarify the scope of the prohibition, the provision states that it is not intended to prevent a promoter from awarding a prize merely because “the winner’s right to possess or use the prize is or may be restricted or regulated by, or is otherwise subject to, any public regulation”.²⁶⁶ For example, a promoter may award a television as a prize, even though the winner may need to obtain a television licence in order to use the prize.²⁶⁷

Promoters must ensure that the promotional materials for their competitions are accurate.²⁶⁸ They should give attention to the description of the prizes being offered, and avoid any misleading, deceptive or ambiguous statements. The description must

²⁶³ Opperman & Lake 51.

²⁶⁴ Tennant 174.

²⁶⁵ See De Stadler 2013 72 fn 148.

²⁶⁶ S36(3)(b)(i).

²⁶⁷ As another example, Van Heerden mentions that a promoter would not be precluded from offering a motor vehicle as a prize, even though the winner will need a driver’s licence in order to use the prize. (Van Heerden “Section 36” par 12)

²⁶⁸ De Stadler 72.

be drafted in such a manner that consumers will understand what is included in the prize and what will be for the winner's own account.²⁶⁹ In illustrating this, De Stadler explains that consumers would think that they will win flights and a hotel stay if a promoter advertises the opportunity to win "a trip to Madagascar", and it would therefore be misleading if the promoter in the end provides the winner with airplane tickets only.²⁷⁰ It is submitted that consumers might also be misled if a promoter advertises a competition in which the winner will receive an "all-inclusive holiday in Thailand", but the winner then has to pay for hotel meals and resort fees. It may also be misleading to offer participants the opportunity to "win a year's supply of milk", if the intention is to provide the winner with a maximum of one litre of milk per day. Accordingly, if the promoter intends to impose such a limitation, the promoter would have to clarify this in the marketing material and the terms and conditions that relate to the competition.

Problems will arise if the description or illustration of prizes in marketing material does not match the prizes that are eventually awarded. This would be the case where a winner receives a budget range vehicle while the marketing material depicted a luxury sedan. Melville points out that the CPA's promotional competition provisions do not contain a specific prohibition against this, but submits that the promoter might still breach the CPA's provisions relating to false, misleading or deceptive marketing.²⁷¹

The CPA also deals with the availability of prizes – section 36(10) applies the provisions of section 35(5) to promotional competitions. If one adapts the wording of section 35(5) accordingly, it seems that promoters may not place any restrictions on the availability of prizes during a specific period unless the promoter has given twenty business days' written notice to participants.²⁷² Based on the wording of section 35(5), it would also appear that the periods during which the availability of prizes is restricted may not exceed a total of ninety days in any calendar year. De Stadler remarks that these provisions are "very awkward" in relation to promotional competitions.²⁷³ However, she submits that the provisions imply that promoters may not terminate a

²⁶⁹ De Stadler 72.

²⁷⁰ De Stadler 72.

²⁷¹ See s41. (Melville 62)

²⁷² However, See s35(5).

²⁷³ De Stadler 2013 74.

promotional competition and that the availability of prizes may be restricted only if the promoter complies with the requirements of section 35(5) (read with the necessary changes).²⁷⁴ This author agrees with De Stadler's remarks regarding the "awkwardness" of the provisions found in section 36(10). Although loyalty schemes and promotional competitions are both examples of promotional tools, they operate differently. Accordingly, it is submitted that the legislature took a "drafting shortcut" by merely stating that the provisions of section 35(5) would apply to the prize awarded to a competition winner. Section 35(5) deals with the availability of goods that can be purchased with loyalty points or credits, while section 36 deals with the availability of prizes. It is submitted that the legislature's direction that section 35(5) should be "read with the changes required by the context" is vague and impractical to apply, and that the legislature should rather have provided separate, substantial wording for section 36(5) instead of referring to a different subsection.

5.4.8 Competition rules

The CPA requires a promoter to prepare competition rules before a promotional competition begins.²⁷⁵ The promoter must "make the competition rules available to the [National Consumer] Commission and to any participant, on request and without cost".²⁷⁶ On its website, the National Lotteries Commission states that a promoter must "supply a copy of these rules to the National Consumer Commission, provide copies to members of the public on request and retain a copy after the end of the competition."²⁷⁷ However, it is submitted that there is no general obligation on promoters to provide the National Consumer Commission with copies of the rules for all competitions in all instances, and that this should only be done if the Commission requests a copy of the rules. A copy of the rules must be retained for a period of three years after conclusion of the competition.²⁷⁸

²⁷⁴ De Stadler 2013 74.

²⁷⁵ S36(3)(c)(i). Van Eeden notes that the CPA does not explain what is meant by the "beginning of the competition". In his view, this refers to the moment when the competition is announced the first time. (Van Eeden 2009 133 fn 144) However, it is submitted that the beginning could also refer to the date from which entries may be submitted.

²⁷⁶ S36(3)(c)(ii).

²⁷⁷ National Lotteries Commission "Promotional Competitions" <http://www.nlcsa.org.za/promotional-competitions/>, accessed on 15 July 2015.

²⁷⁸ S36(3)(c)(iii) and reg 11(6)(b).

The CPA does not prescribe the content for competition rules. However, section 36(5) prescribes certain details that need to be disclosed in offers to participate in promotional competitions. As such, it is submitted that competition rules should contain at least the details described by that subsection. However, promoters should ensure that they include all important terms and conditions in the rules (whether or not they are prescribed by the CPA).²⁷⁹ The competition rules should at least contain the competition's opening and closing date, details of who may enter the competition, the requirements for participation, any restriction on participation as well as clear details surrounding the prizes.²⁸⁰

Care should be taken in the drafting of competition rules. Section 22 of the CPA requires that all notices, documents and visual representations required by the CPA or other law must be in plain language.²⁸¹ Since the CPA requires promoters to prepare competition rules, those rules need to be in plain language. According to section 22(2), a document will be in plain language if:

[...] it is reasonable to conclude that an ordinary consumer of the class of persons for whom the notice, document or visual representation is intended, with average literacy skills and minimal experience as a consumer of the relevant goods or services, could be expected to understand the content, significance and import of the notice, document or visual representation without undue effort [...].²⁸²

In determining whether a consumer can understand the document, as set out above, one must consider the following factors: (1) the document's "context, comprehensiveness and consistency",²⁸³ (2) its "organisation, form and style",²⁸⁴ (3)

²⁷⁹ See De Stadler 2013 71. She notes that s36(2)(a)(iii) prohibits a promoter from notifying someone that they had won a prize if, inter alia, "the prize for that competition is subject to a previously undisclosed condition". As such, all relevant conditions should also be contained in the competition rules.

²⁸⁰ De Stadler 2013 71.

²⁸¹ Regarding the CPA's plain language requirements, see De Stadler 2013 104-112; Stoop PN "Section 22" in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014) paras 1-33 ("Stoop 2014"); Stoop PN & Chürr C "Unpacking the right to plain and understandable language in the Consumer Protection Act 68 of 2008" 2013 *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal* 16:5 514; Gouws M "A Consumer's Right to Disclosure and Information: Comments on the Plain Language Provisions of the Consumer Protection Act" 2010 *South African Mercantile Law Journal* 22:1 79; Louw E *The Plain Language Movement and Legal Reform in the South African Law of Contract* ("E Louw").

²⁸² S22(2).

²⁸³ S22(2)(a).

²⁸⁴ S22(2)(b).

its “vocabulary, usage and sentence structure”,²⁸⁵ and (4) “the use of any illustrations, examples, headings or other aids to reading and understanding”.²⁸⁶ According to section 22(3), the National Consumer Commission is also empowered to issue guidelines that can be used in order to determine whether a document is in plain language. However, to date, such guidelines have not yet been published. It is submitted that such guidelines would aid drafters in implementing the CPA’s broad plain language requirements.²⁸⁷ In the interim, drafters could refer to the guidelines published in other jurisdictions, such as the United States of America.²⁸⁸ Software can be used as an aid in plain language drafting too.²⁸⁹

When drafting competition rules, a promoter should determine the class of consumers at which the competition is aimed, and consider whether the rules will be appropriate and whether the class of consumers will be able to understand them. The rules must be drafted in such a manner that a consumer with “average literacy skills” can comprehend them. However, De Stadler explains that the document does not need to be “dumbed down”, but the language must still be simple and easy enough in order for the consumer to grasp the contents.²⁹⁰ She submits that one could therefore rather use the term “understandable language” instead of “plain language”.²⁹¹

Section 22 also places an emphasis on the presentation of a document, requiring that one must consider its “organisation, form and style” and the use of “aids to reading and understanding”.²⁹² One often encounters fine print competition rules that are shrunk into a tiny font size on a single page. It is likely that such rules might not pass the plain language test. Instead, promoters should consider using a font size that is easy to read (bearing in mind that some consumers might struggle with their vision). It is submitted that promoters should not try to save space, particularly if rules are displayed on a web page (where space should usually not be a problem). It would also

²⁸⁵ S22(2)(c).

²⁸⁶ S22(2)(d).

²⁸⁷ Louw E remarks that the CPA’s definition of plain language is “very broad” and it lacks clear guidance for drafters. (E Louw 137)

²⁸⁸ Stoop 2014 paras 27-28.

²⁸⁹ Stoop 2014 29.

²⁹⁰ De Stadler 2013 105. De Stadler also cites Baitsewe R “Plain Language: More than just ‘plain’ words” June 2012 *Consumer Law Review* https://jutalaw.co.za/newsletter/newsletter/consumer-law-database_jun-2012-1-1-1-1-1-1/, accessed on 17 July 2015 (“Baitsewe”).

²⁹¹ De Stadler 2013 105.

²⁹² Ss22(2)(b) and (c).

be easier to grasp the document's contents if it has a logical layout. This could be achieved by, for example, using numbering, headings and bullet points.²⁹³ Further, one could use bold type to highlight crucial provisions and text boxes that explain complicated concepts.²⁹⁴ In view of the many languages spoken in South Africa, it is submitted that a promoter must also consider whether the rules should perhaps be available in more than one language, or whether a specific language might be more appropriate for a particular target audience.

Apart from ensuring that competition rules are in plain language, promoters need to make sure that the contents of their competition rules are in line with the CPA's provisions. The CPA records consumers' rights to fair, just and reasonable terms and conditions.²⁹⁵ Suppliers are prohibited from offering to supply or supplying goods or services, or concluding agreements with consumers in regard to such supplying on prices or terms that are unfair, unreasonable or unjust.²⁹⁶ It is submitted that the terms and conditions that govern a promotional competition would not fall within the scope of the aforesaid prohibition, because a promotional competition is not a transaction in terms of which goods or services are supplied. However, the CPA also prohibits suppliers from marketing goods or services in a manner that is unfair, unreasonable or unjust.²⁹⁷ A promotional competition is a tool by which goods and services are marketed, and it is submitted that suppliers would therefore be prohibited from running a promotional competition in a manner that is unfair, unreasonable or unjust. Accordingly, a promoter would have to ensure that the terms and conditions of its competitions are fair, reasonable and just. The CPA also requires the promoter to draw certain onerous terms to the consumer's attention in a conspicuous manner.²⁹⁸

²⁹³ De Stadler 2013 110.

²⁹⁴ De Stadler 2013 110; Baitsewe (unpaged); Louw E 103.

²⁹⁵ Ss48-52. See Naudé T "Unfair Contract Terms Legislation: The Implications of Why We Need it for its Formulation and Application" 2006 *Stellenbosch Law Review* 17:3 361 373-374; Naudé T "The Use of Black and Grey Lists in Unfair Contract Terms Legislation in Comparative Perspective" 2007 *South African Law Journal* 124:1 128; Naudé T "The consumer's 'right to fair, reasonable and just terms' under the new Consumer Protection Act in comparative perspective" 2009 *South African Law Journal* 126:3 505; Naudé T "The consumer's 'right to fair, reasonable and just terms' under the new Consumer Protection Act in comparative perspective" 2009 *South African Law Journal* 126:3 505; Stoop PN *The Concept 'Fairness' in the Regulation of Contracts under the Consumer Protection Act 68 of 2008*.

²⁹⁶ S48(1)(a).

²⁹⁷ S48(1)(b).

²⁹⁸ S49. These onerous terms include provisions which limit the supplier's "risk or liability to the consumer" and indemnities granted by a consumer to a supplier. See s49(1).

Although the CPA contains a so-called “grey list” of terms and conditions that are deemed unfair, unreasonable and unjust,²⁹⁹ such list does not contain any terms that relate to promotional competitions in particular. However, some of the listed terms might be found in competition rules, for example a provision which excludes or limits the promoter’s liability for the consumer’s death or injury,³⁰⁰ a term which excludes the promoter’s liability for non-performance,³⁰¹ a provision in terms of which the consumer must “indemnify the supplier against liability incurred by it to third parties”,³⁰² a provision which allows the promoter unilaterally to alter the terms and conditions,³⁰³ an acknowledgement that is detrimental to the consumer,³⁰⁴ an exclusion of the consumer’s right of recourse against the promoter,³⁰⁵ or providing that the terms and conditions will be governed by the laws of a country other than South Africa.³⁰⁶ Even if competition rules do not contain terms that are on the grey list, a promoter would still have to consider the terms and conditions of the competition and determine, in general, whether or not they could be deemed unfair, unreasonable and unjust. In this regard, one must bear section 48(2) in mind, which provides that a term will be unfair, unreasonable and unjust if, *inter alia*, it is “excessively one-sided in favour of any person other than the consumer”,³⁰⁷ or if it is “so adverse to the consumer as to be inequitable”.³⁰⁸

Apart from the CPA’s provisions relating to terms and conditions that are deemed to be unfair, unjust or unreasonable, there are also prohibitions in respect of certain terms. These may be relevant in respect of competition rules too. The rules may not include, for example, a provision which is intended to circumvent the operation of the

²⁹⁹ Reg 44 of the CPA Regulations; De Stadler 2014 46.

³⁰⁰ Reg 44(3)(a). Promoters often insert this kind of term in competition rules in instances where consumers have to participate in potentially dangerous activities or where the use of the prizes awarded in the competition could be dangerous or harmful.

³⁰¹ Reg 44(3)(b) and (n). Competition rules often state that the promoter will be allowed to suspend or terminate the competition and that participants will have no claims against the promoter in this regard.

³⁰² Reg 44(3)(e).

³⁰³ Reg 44(3)(i).

³⁰⁴ Reg 44(3)(v).

³⁰⁵ Reg 44(3)(x).

³⁰⁶ Reg 44(3)(bb). This might be encountered in the case where a foreign promoter runs a promotional competition in South Africa. In such an instance, one might also find that the terms and conditions state that disputes will be subject to the jurisdiction of a foreign forum – which might also be deemed to be unfair.

³⁰⁷ S48(2)(a).

³⁰⁸ S48(2)(b).

CPA,³⁰⁹ or a provision in terms of which the promoter attempts to exclude its liability for harm caused by the promoter's gross negligence.³¹⁰ If the competition rules contain a prohibited term, such term would be void.³¹¹

Some competition rules contain requirements relating to the use of a winner's image or participation in marketing activities. However, a rule will be invalid if it requires the winner to allow the promoter to use their image in marketing material, "participate in marketing activity" or attend the competition draw.³¹² Having said this, the rule will only be invalid if the promoter did not give the winner "the opportunity to decline an invitation to do so or informing him or her of the right to decline such an invitation".³¹³ It is submitted that these provisions have been drafted in a clumsy manner, because they refer to only the declining of invitations whilst the use of someone's image is not usually the result of an invitation. As such, the wording should also have referred to an opportunity for the winner to object to the use of their image.

The importance and effect of competition rules should not be underestimated, particularly in view of our courts' decisions in this regard. For example, in *Smart v The Really Great Brand Company (Pty) Ltd*,³¹⁴ a liquor brand ran a competition which involved a number of random draws. The person who ultimately won the competition was entered into the final draw at the last minute, and it turned out that he was connected to the conducting of the competition.³¹⁵ The court found that the competition was a promotional competition, as contemplated by section 54 of the Lotteries Act, 1997 and that the winner was precluded by regulation 5 of the PC Regulations from participating in the competition due to his connection with the competition.³¹⁶ The court further pointed out that the competition's rules prohibited the winner from entering the competition.³¹⁷ As such, the court found that the competition did not comply with regulation 5 and the competition rules, that the winner's participation in the competition

³⁰⁹ S51(1)(a)(i) and s51(1)(b). A promoter can therefore not provide that the CPA will not apply to a promotional competition or its terms and conditions.

³¹⁰ S51(1)(c)(i). See also reg 44(3)(a) which provides that a term will be deemed unfair, unjust or unreasonable if it purports to exclude a supplier's liability for a consumer's death or injury.

³¹¹ S51(3).

³¹² Reg 11(3) of the CPA Regulations.

³¹³ Reg 11(3).

³¹⁴ [2008] 2 All SA 474 (C).

³¹⁵ Pages 475-479.

³¹⁶ Pages 483-484.

³¹⁷ Page 484.

was invalid and ordered that the final draw should be repeated in order to comply with the competitions rules.³¹⁸

Competition rules also played a pivotal role in *Van de Wetering Engineering v Regent Insurance*,³¹⁹ even though the particular rules were verbal. In that matter, a manufacturer held a skill based competition in which a participant would win a cash prize if they managed to hit a golf ball into a trailer.³²⁰ The manufacturer obtained prize indemnity insurance to cover itself against the risk of someone hitting the golf ball into the trailer.³²¹ Before the competition, the manufacturer's managing director announced that employees could participate but would not be eligible to receive the prize.³²² The managing director proceeded to participate in the competition, and hit the ball into the trailer. The manufacturer then tried to claim against the insurance, but the claim was repudiated on the basis that the winner was an employee and was not eligible to receive the prize.³²³ The court agreed with the insurer, on the basis that the parties had to comply with the terms and conditions of the competition.³²⁴ In view of these decisions, promoters should make sure that they comply with their own terms and conditions. They should also consider the content of their competition rules carefully and bear in mind that such rules might be used against them, as was the case in the *Van de Wetering Engineering* matter.

5.4.9 Offers to participate in promotional competitions

Section 36(5) prescribes the following information, which must be clearly stated in an offer to participate in a promotional competition:³²⁵

- (a) the benefit or competition to which the offer relates;
- (b) the steps required by a person to accept the offer or to participate in the competition;
- (c) the basis on which the results of the competition will be determined;
- (d) the closing date for the competition;

³¹⁸ Pages 484-485.

³¹⁹ (383/2013) [2014] ZASCA 18 (26 March 2014).

³²⁰ Page 3.

³²¹ Pages 3-4.

³²² Page 5.

³²³ Pages 6-7.

³²⁴ Pages 9-10.

³²⁵ De Stadler describes this as the "entry form" (De Stadler 2013 68). However, it is submitted that the offer to participate could also be interpreted in broader terms to include promotional material that invites the public to enter. See also Van Heerden "Section 36" par 18 regarding ss36(5) and 36(6).

- (e) the medium through or by which the results of the competition will be made known; and any person from whom, any place where, and any date and time on or at which –
 - (i) a person may obtain a copy of the competition rules; and
 - (ii) a successful participant may receive any prize.³²⁶

Section 36(5) does not make it clear whether this information must be stated in all offers and marketing materials relating to a competition. It prescribes what must be contained in “[a]n offer to participate”. This prescription could create the impression that every offer must therefore contain such information. However, section 36(6) seems to clarify this situation somewhat by stating that the requirements of section 36(5) may be met by displaying the relevant information directly on the competition entry medium (for example, the entry form) or on documentation that accompanies that medium or in any advertisement.³²⁷ The information may also be made known in an advertisement “published during the time and throughout the area in which the promotional competition is conducted”, but the advertisement must draw attention to the promotional competition and it must be obvious that the advertisement is associated with the promotional competition.³²⁸ When reading section 36(6), it appears that the prescribed information must not be contained in anything and everything that constitutes an offer to participate, and that the requirement will be fulfilled as long as all the information is disclosed in any of the manners set out in that sub-section. Even so, it is submitted that the requirements of section 36(5) could have been clearer.

One must consider how the requirements of section 36(6) will feature in practice. In traditional on-pack competitions,³²⁹ it may be easy to display the required information on the packaging or a label, tag or entry form that accompanies same. However, it might be difficult to display all of the information on a small product (such as a pen). De Stadler argues that it should be acceptable for the packaging to refer to the fact that terms and conditions apply, and that the terms and conditions “need not be contained in one ‘document’”, and that it should suffice if the entry form refers to terms and conditions that can be found elsewhere.³³⁰

³²⁶ S36(5).

³²⁷ Ss36(6)(a) and 36(6)(b).

³²⁸ S36(6)(c).

³²⁹ These are competitions that are advertised or displayed on the outside of product packaging.

³³⁰ De Stadler 2013 69.

If the prescribed details of the offer to participate are not displayed on the entry form or accompanying documentation, it would have to be contained in an advertisement.³³¹ The advertisement must also appear during the competition period and throughout the area in which the competition is run. It is not clear whether the word “during” implies that the advertisement must be in circulation for the entire length of the competition period, or whether it would be sufficient if it appears at some point in time between the beginning and end of the competition. In view of the broad definition of the word “advertisement”,³³² it seems that the advertisement does not necessarily have to be published in a newspaper or other traditional printed medium. Often, a promoter refers entrants to the promoter’s website where the full terms and conditions of the competition can be found. Due to the wide definition of the term “advertisement”,³³³ it is submitted that a website might fall within the scope of that definition and qualify as an advertisement for purposes of complying with section 36(6).

5.4.10 Consumers’ rights in respect of competitions and prizes

In terms of section 36(7) someone’s right to participate in a promotional competition is fully vested as soon as they comply with the promotional competition’s entry requirements, and acquire or possess any relevant entry medium or device. Furthermore, if someone becomes entitled to a benefit or right because they participate in a promotional competition (for example, if they win a prize), the right thereto will vest in the person as soon as the competition results are determined.³³⁴ All of these rights may not be made subject to any further conditions or made

³³¹ S36(6)(c).

³³² In s1, “advertisement” is defined as:

“any direct or indirect visual or oral communication transmitted by any medium, or any representation or reference written, inscribed, recorded, encoded upon or embedded within any medium, by means of which a person seeks to-

- (a) bring to the attention of all or part of the public-
 - (i) the existence or identity of a supplier; or
 - (ii) the existence, nature, availability, properties, advantages or uses of any goods or services that are available for supply, or the conditions on, or prices at, which any goods or services are available for supply;
- (b) promote the supply of any goods or services; or
- (c) promote any cause”.

³³³ See fn 332 above.

³³⁴ S36(8).

conditional upon payment to the promoter for the prize or compliance with any other requirements.³³⁵

The provisions of sections 36(7) and 36(8) may lead one to examine the legal nature of the relationship between a promoter and participant (or winner), particularly since it refers to the vesting of the consumer's rights. It is submitted that an agreement is concluded between the promoter and consumer when the consumer enters a promotional competition. This reasoning is based on the fact that section 36(5) refers to the "offer to participate in a promotional competition" which is directed at the consumer. Usually, an offer must be directed at a specific person, but it is also possible to make an offer to the public at large.³³⁶ Authority for this can be found in English as well as South African case law.³³⁷ However, in order for such an offer to lead to a binding agreement, the offeror must express the clear and unequivocal intention of entering into a binding agreement with persons that accept it.³³⁸ It must not be a mere invitation to business.³³⁹

Accordingly, it is submitted that a binding agreement will be formed if a promoter announces a promotional competition, making it clear that participants will be entered into the competition and stand a chance to win a prize if they do so, and a consumer enters such competition. In such a situation, a participant should be able to enforce the agreement against the promoter if the promoter breaches the terms and conditions that apply to the competition or fails to comply with the promoter's obligations. These submissions are in line with the reasoning of the court in *Smart v The Really Great Brand Company (Pty) Ltd*³⁴⁰ (the facts of which were discussed above).³⁴¹ In that matter, the court was also of the view that a competition advertisement constituted an

³³⁵ S36(9).

³³⁶ See Christie RH (with McFarlane V) *The Law of Contract in South Africa* (5th ed) ("Christie 2006") 39; Hutchison D & Pretorius C-J (eds) *Kontraktereg in Suid-Afrika* 52 ("Hutchison & Pretorius"). The English case of *Carlill v Carbolic Smoke Ball Co* [1893] 1 QB 256 appears to be the *locus classicus* on this topic. See also Woker T *Advertising Law in South Africa* 50-67.

³³⁷ See the cases cited in Christie 2006 at 39 and Hutchison & Pretorius at 52. In the United States, there is also authority for the argument that a valid agreement can be formed between a promoter and participant in a competition. See Wessman MB "Is 'Contract' the Name of the Game? Promotional Games as Test Cases for Contract Theory" 1992 *Arizona Law Review* 34:4 635.

³³⁸ Christie 2006 39; Hutchison & Pretorius 53. Hutchison & Pretorius (52 fn 30) also refer to *Steyn v LSA Motors Limited* 1994 (1) SA 49 (A) in this regard.

³³⁹ See *Crawley v Rex* 1909 TS 1105. Christie 40-41; Hutchison & Pretorius 53.

³⁴⁰ [2008] 2 All SA 474 (C).

³⁴¹ See page 237 above.

offer which would lead to a binding agreement if accepted.³⁴² In addition, the court stated that “the participant becomes eligible for winning a prize or consideration by entering the competition and complying with all the terms of the offer”.³⁴³ If the competition rules contain certain conditions, a participant’s vested right will arise when the conditions are met.³⁴⁴ Furthermore, participants have a legitimate expectation that a promotional competition would be conducted in accordance with the rules of the competition.³⁴⁵ Accordingly, if the promoter does not conduct a competition in accordance with the competition rules, a court may, for example, order that the competition draw must be conducted afresh.³⁴⁶

In order to avoid disputes, competition rules often provide that “the judges’ decision will be final” and that “no correspondence will be entered into”. Further, in an apparent attempt to limit participants’ rights in a promotional competition, promoters often reserve the rights to amend or supplement the terms and conditions unilaterally or to cancel or suspend the competition. It is submitted that such provisions might not be valid under the CPA, particularly in view of consumers’ rights to fair, just and reasonable terms and conditions.³⁴⁷ Even before the advent of the CPA, the court in *Smart v The Really Great Brand Company (Pty) Ltd* criticised a last-minute change to competition rules which “was done in an unreasonable and arbitrary manner to the detriment of all contestants”. In that matter, the court was of the view that the change created “disparities in the treatment of contestants and compromised the fairness and integrity of the competition”.³⁴⁸

5.4.11 Oversight of promotional competitions

A promoter must ensure that the conducting of a promotional competition is overseen and certified by an independent accountant, registered auditor, attorney or advocate.³⁴⁹ This is quite a burdensome compliance requirement – which applies to

³⁴² Page 484 of the judgement.

³⁴³ Page 484 of the judgement.

³⁴⁴ Page 484 of the judgement.

³⁴⁵ Page 484 of the judgement.

³⁴⁶ Page 484 of the judgement. In the case under discussion, the court found that it was “just and equitable if the final draw is conducted *de novo*, excluding the second respondent”.

³⁴⁷ See ss48-52 of the CPA.

³⁴⁸ Page 484 of the judgement.

³⁴⁹ Reg 11(5) of the CPA Regulations. In *De Stadler*’s view, the accountant, auditor, attorney or advocate may not be employed by the promoter, but may be an independent contractor who does work

all promotional competitions without exception. It can be very costly for a promoter to arrange for the competition to be overseen, and this would be particularly onerous if it is a small competition with an insignificant prize.³⁵⁰ It is also not clear what “overseen” means, and whether only the actual random draw must be witnessed by the independent person or whether such person must supervise the entire competition from start to finish. De Stadler submits that it might be sufficient if the independent party verifies the promoter’s competition processes in general, and that it might not be necessary to oversee every individual competition.³⁵¹ However, it is submitted that the wording of regulation 11(5) is quite particular and that it would not allow such an approach.

Regulation 11(5) also requires that the fact that a competition was overseen by the relevant professional must be reported through “the promoter’s internal audit reporting or other appropriate validation or verification procedures”. This requirement is not entirely clear. Should a promoter require its internal auditors to verify whether or not the promoter’s competitions are overseen by independent professionals? Must this be contained in their audit reports? It is not clear who must do this validation or verification in a situation where a promoter does not have internal auditors. Must it then appoint external auditors to do so? It is submitted that this requirement is excessive, particularly if one bears in mind that some businesses might not normally have to appoint an auditor.³⁵²

The oversight requirement might prove to be very impractical too. For example, participants might be required to scratch a scratch card hidden inside a cereal box in order to see whether they have won a prize. In the digital age, many competitions are also conducted in the form of automated games on the internet (and some social media platforms in particular). Participants can win prizes by way of playing random, instant games. In these examples, numerous promotional competitions could be taking place at the same time across the country or the world. It would be extremely unreasonable and virtually impossible for each such event to be overseen by an

for the promoter. However, it is submitted that it would best to avoid using independent contractors that are connected with the promoter in order to ensure that the person is wholly and truly independent.

³⁵⁰ De Stadler shares this view. (De Stadler 2013 74)

³⁵¹ De Stadler 2013 75

³⁵² Private companies, for example, only need to have their annual financial statements audited if the Companies Regulations, 2011 require the company to do so or if the private company voluntarily elects to do so. (See s30(2)(b) of the Companies Act, 2008)

independent auditor. As such, it is submitted that this requirement needs to be reviewed and brought into line with reality.

5.4.12 Retention of information

Regulation 11(6) prescribes a long list of information and documentation that must be retained by the promoter for a period of three years. A promoter must provide the National Consumer Commission with a report based on the listed information, if the Commission requests such a report.³⁵³ For ease of reference, the list of information is reproduced below:

- (a) full details of the promoter, including identity or registration numbers, as the case may be, addresses and contact numbers;
- (b) the rules of the promotional competition;
- (c) a copy of the offer to participate in a promotional competition contemplated in section 36(5);
- (d) the names and identity numbers of the persons responsible for conducting the promotional competition;
- (e) a full list of all the prizes offered in the promotional competition;
- (f) a representative selection of materials marketing the promotional competition or an electronic copy thereof, but such copy must be easily accessible in a generally available format;³⁵⁴
- (g) a list of all instances when the promotional competition was marketed, including details on the dates, the medium used and places where the marketing took place;
- (h) the names and identity numbers of the persons responsible for conducting the selection of prize winners in the promotional competition;
- (i) an acknowledgment of receipt of the prize signed by the prize winner, or legal guardian where applicable, and his or her identity number, and the date of receipt of the prize, or where this is not possible, proof by the promoter that the prize was sent by post or other electronic means to the winner using his or her provided details;
- (j) declarations by the persons contemplated in paragraph (d) made under oath or affirmation that the prize winners were to their best knowledge not directors, members, partners, employees, agents or consultants of or any other person who directly or indirectly controls or is controlled by the promoter or marketing service providers in respect of the promotional competition, or the spouses, life partners, business partners or immediate family members;

³⁵³ Reg 11(7). There seems to be a typographical error in the text. See page 245 below.

³⁵⁴ It is submitted that the promoter must therefore use an electronic medium and format that is commonplace and readily available, and which can be accessed without complicated technical procedures or specialist knowledge.

- (k) the basis on which the prize winners were determined;
- (l) the summary describing the proceedings to determine the winners, including the names of the persons participating in determining the prize winners, the date and place where that determination took place and whether those proceedings were open to the general public;
- (m) whether an independent person oversaw the determination of the prize winners, and his or her name and identity number;
- (n) the means by which the prize winners were announced and the frequency thereof;
- (o) a list of the names and identity numbers of the prize winners;
- (p) a list of the dates when the prizes were handed over or paid to the prize winners;
- (q) in the event that a prize winner could not be contacted, the steps taken by the promoter to contact the winner or otherwise inform the winner of his or her winning a prize; and
- (r) in the event that a prize winner did not receive or accept his or her prize, the reason for his or her not so receiving or accepting the prize, and the steps taken by the promoter to hand over or pay the prize to that prize winner.³⁵⁵

It is submitted that the CPA's provisions regarding the retention of documents and information are rather unpractical. It is uncertain whether promoters will fully comply with the requirements of regulation 11(6), *inter alia* due to the volume of documentation that needs to be gathered and retained, as well as the possible cost implications. It is also unlikely that a promoter will ensure that the persons involved in the conducting of the competition will depose to the affidavits required by regulation 11(6)(j) or that the promoter will check that winners provide it with written acknowledgement of receipt of their prizes.³⁵⁶

It also needs to be noted that there are some typographical errors in the above provisions. Regulation 11(7) contains a cross-reference to regulation 11(7). However, it is submitted that this should in fact be a reference to regulation 11(6).³⁵⁷ Another typographical error is found at the end of regulation (6)(j), where the full stop should be replaced with a semi-colon.

There appears to be an inconsistency between regulation 11(6)(j) and section 36(3)(b)(ii) too. The latter lists the persons that may not participate in a promotional

³⁵⁵ Reg 11(6) of the CPA Regulations. See also De Stadler 2013 75-77.

³⁵⁶ Reg (6)(i).

³⁵⁷ Van Heerden "Section 36" par 17; Honey & Mare 3.

competition. Regulation 11(6)(j) requires that the persons who were involved in the conducting of the competition must declare the following under oath or affirmation:

the prize winners were to their best knowledge not directors, members, partners, employees, agents or consultants of or any other person who directly or indirectly controls or is controlled by the promoter *or marketing service providers in respect of the promotional competition, or the spouses, life partners, business partners or immediate family members*". (Own emphasis)

On the other hand, section 36(3)(b)(ii) states that the following persons may not enter a promotional competition:

- (aa) a director, member, partner, employee or agent of, or consultant to the promoter or any other person who directly or indirectly controls or is controlled by, the promoter; or
- (bb) a supplier of goods or services in connection with that competition.

If one compares regulation 11(6)(j) with section 36(3)(b)(ii) it can be seen that regulation 11(6)(j) excludes persons that are not excluded in section 36(3)(b)(ii). (See the text emphasised above.) However, regulation 11(6)(j) does not exclude "a supplier of goods or services in connection with [a] competition".³⁵⁸ It is submitted that regulation 11(6)(j) attempts to exclude persons that are not excluded in section 36(3)(b)(ii), and that one may argue that regulation 11(6)(j) is *ultra vires* to the extent that it excludes persons that are not excluded in section 36(3)(b)(ii).

It is also difficult to understand the scope of regulation 11(6)(j). Must the relevant persons declare that the winners are not "directors, members, partners, employees, agents or consultants of or any other person who directly or indirectly controls or is controlled by the promoter" only, or does it extend to "directors, members, partners, employees, agents or consultants of or any other person who directly or indirectly controls or is controlled by" the marketing service providers in respect of the promotional competition as well? Or does the wording mean that the declaration must state that marketing service providers were not prize winners? The reference to "the spouses, life partners, business partners or immediate family members" at the end of regulation 11(6)(j) is unclear too. It is assumed that the intention is that the relevant person must also declare that the prize winners were not "spouses, life partners,

³⁵⁸ S36(3)(b)(ii)(bb).

business partners or immediate family members” of any of the excluded persons mentioned before that reference.

5.5 Promotional competitions and consumer privacy

In the course of running a competition, it is quite common for a promoter to collect consumers’ personal information for marketing and other purposes. However, promoters need to respect consumers’ privacy rights when doing so. Under common law, a person will under certain situations have a claim against someone who invades their privacy.³⁵⁹ The right to privacy is enshrined in section 14 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 as well.³⁶⁰ The CPA also recognises the right to privacy – section 11(1) commences with the following words: “The right of every person to privacy includes [...]”. The collection of consumer data and the sending of direct marketing and unsolicited communications might be regarded as an invasion of privacy.³⁶¹ However, Van Zyl and De Stadler argue that the CPA implicitly allows suppliers to conduct direct marketing, as long as they comply with the CPA’s requirements.³⁶² In particular, a supplier must cease sending direct marketing to a consumer if the consumer has requested the supplier to do so.³⁶³ Once the relevant provisions of the CPA have come into force, consumers will have the opportunity to pre-emptively block direct marketing as well.³⁶⁴

The Electronic Communications and Transactions Act, 2002 (“ECTA”) also contains provisions that might assist in protecting consumer privacy. Section 45(1)(a) of the ECTA requires that senders of unsolicited commercial communications must provide consumers with the option to opt-out from receiving further communications. The sender must also provide the recipient with the particulars of the source from which the sender received the consumer’s contact particulars, if requested by the consumer.³⁶⁵ A sender of unsolicited commercial communications commits an offense if it fails to comply with the ECTA’s provisions in this regard.³⁶⁶

³⁵⁹ Van Zyl E & De Stadler E paras 7-8.

³⁶⁰ Van Zyl E & De Stadler E “Section 11” in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014) (“Van Zyl & De Stadler”) para 7.

³⁶¹ Van Zyl & De Stadler 10.

³⁶² Van Zyl & De Stadler 11.

³⁶³ S11(4) read with ss11(1) and (2).

³⁶⁴ S11(3) and s11(4)(b)(ii).

³⁶⁵ S45(1)(b) of the ECTA.

³⁶⁶ S45(3) and (4).

In view of the CPA and ECTA's provisions discussed above, promoters need to ensure that they allow consumers to opt out from receiving marketing communications. In the context of promotional competitions this would apply if promoters send out emails or text messages in which they publicise their promotional competitions. Promoters have to implement appropriate systems in order to avoid a situation where they continue sending such materials to consumers that have requested them to stop sending those. The relevant provisions also need to be kept in mind when promoters gather consumer information in the course of running a promotional competition and wish to send future communications, such as newsletters or information about promotions, to consumers.

In future, promoters will have to adhere to the requirements of the Protection of Personal Information Act ("POPI").³⁶⁷ When POPI comes into force, it will regulate the processing of personal information comprehensively.³⁶⁸ The term "personal information" is defined in very broad terms. In general, this includes "information relating to an identifiable, living, natural person, and where it is applicable, an identifiable, existing juristic person".³⁶⁹ Personal information includes, *inter alia*, information relating to a person's "race, gender, sex, pregnancy, marital status, national, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, physical or mental health, well-being, disability, religion, conscience, belief, culture, language and birth" as well as medical and employment history, contact particulars, biometric information, as well as opinions and views.³⁷⁰ The term "processing" is equally broad and is defined as "any operation or activity or any set of operations, whether or not by automatic means, concerning personal information".³⁷¹ This includes a variety of actions, such as the collection, storage, dissemination and destruction of personal information.³⁷²

In order to process consumers' personal information, a promoter would have to ensure that it complies with the conditions for the lawful processing of personal information.³⁷³

³⁶⁷ 4 of 2013. At the date hereof, the substantive provisions of POPI are not yet in force, although the provisions that provide for the establishment of the Information Protection Regulator and the drafting of regulations have come into effect. (See No. R. 25, 2014 *Government Gazette* No. 37544, 11 April 2014.)

³⁶⁸ See Mncwango S "The complex rules for promotional competitions" 2013 (April) *Without Prejudice* 13:3 82.

³⁶⁹ POPI, s1.

³⁷⁰ POPI, s1.

³⁷¹ POPI, s1.

³⁷² POPI, s1.

³⁷³ POPI, S4(1) and S8.

POPI allows the processing of personal information in specific circumstances only, including where the data subject has consented to the processing.³⁷⁴ Accordingly, it would be best for promoters to seek competition entrants' consent for the collection and processing of their personal information,³⁷⁵ since it may prove more difficult to rely on the other grounds for justification of processing.³⁷⁶

POPI will also regulate unsolicited electronic communications, but only in the context of direct marketing that takes place by way of electronic means.³⁷⁷ Once POPI has come into force, a promoter will only be allowed to process a consumer's personal information for direct marketing purposes if the promoter has obtained the consumer's consent or if the consumer is an existing customer of the promoter.³⁷⁸ If the promoter wishes to undertake the direct marketing on the basis that the consumer is a customer of the promoter, it must have obtained the consumer's personal information in the context of a transaction with the consumer for purposes of marketing the promoter's own goods or services.³⁷⁹ Furthermore, the promoter must have afforded the consumer the opportunity to object to the collection of the consumer's personal information at the time of collection, and the consumer must have the opportunity to object again "on the occasion of each direct marketing communication" thereafter.³⁸⁰

5.6 Sanctions

Although this thesis will not focus on the enforcement of the law in relation to promotional competitions,³⁸¹ attention should be drawn to the penalties that can be imposed on promoters that transgress the relevant provisions. The law can only be fully effective if it is complemented by sanctions that are sufficiently daunting in order to dissuade persons from committing contraventions. The Lotteries Act and the CPA

³⁷⁴ POPI s11(1).

³⁷⁵ S1 defines "consent" as "any voluntary, specific and informed expression of will in terms of which permission is given for the processing of personal information".

³⁷⁶ Taylor D & Cronjé F *101 Questions and Answers About the Protection of Personal Information Act* ("Taylor & Cronjé") 30; De Stadler E & Esselaar P *A Guide to the Protection of Personal Information Act* ("De Stadler & Esselaar") 13.

³⁷⁷ Van Zyl & De Stadler par 14; De Stadler & Esselaar 64.

³⁷⁸ POPI, s69(1); Van Zyl & De Stadler par 14; De Stadler & Esselaar 65-67.

³⁷⁹ POPI, s69(a) and (b).

³⁸⁰ POPI, s69(3)(c).

³⁸¹ Regarding enforcement of the CPA, see De Stadler 2013 169-182, Van Eeden 2013 387-456 and Van Heerden C "Enforcement of the Act" in Naudé and Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* 99-1 to 119-2 ("Van Heerden 'Enforcement'").

are the two statutes that have a bearing on the regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa. Accordingly, the applicable penalties found in them are discussed below.

The interplay between the Lotteries Act and the CPA was discussed above.³⁸² It was pointed out that sections 56 and 57 of the Lotteries Act prohibit a broad range of conduct relating to lotteries and that a promoter would have to structure its competition in such a way that it complies with the CPA's requirements relating to promotional competitions in order to be lawful. If this cannot be achieved, the promoter would have to remove one of the lottery elements (chance, prize or consideration) in order to prevent the competition from being an unlawful lottery. If this is not done, the board of the National Lotteries Commission might investigate the matter and take steps against the promoter.³⁸³ If the promotional competition is unlawful, the promoter might be guilty of an offence in terms of the provisions of section 57(1) of the Lotteries Act. Conviction of such an offence can lead to a fine, imprisonment or both.³⁸⁴ Under earlier legislation, many unlawful lotteries ended up in our courts and led to convictions.³⁸⁵ However, on occasion, it was also questioned whether the criminal justice system's time should be wasted on such matters when other, more serious crimes were proliferating.³⁸⁶ Promotional competitions have also featured in judgments based on the Lotteries Act, although the relevant competitions were merely declared unlawful lotteries and no penalties were imposed.³⁸⁷

If a competition falls within the classification of a promotional competition in terms of the CPA and is not an unlawful lottery under the Lotteries Act, there may still be ramifications if the promotional competition is not conducted in accordance with the CPA's provisions. In the event of non-compliance, the matter could be investigated by the National Consumer Commission ("NCC"), through its own initiative or in response to a consumer complaint.³⁸⁸ The NCC can issue a compliance notice if it concludes

³⁸² See section 5.2.4 above.

³⁸³ See the board's functions in s10(1)(d) of the Lotteries Act.

³⁸⁴ See s62 of the Lotteries Act.

³⁸⁵ See the cases discussed in section 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 in chapter 3 above.

³⁸⁶ See *S v Pepsi-Cola (Pty) Ltd* 1985 (3) SA 141 (C) 142.

³⁸⁷ See *FirstRand Bank v National Lotteries Board* [2008] 3 All SA 121 (SCA) and *National Lotteries Board v Bruss NO* [2009] 2 All SA 164 (SCA).

³⁸⁸ S99(d) read with sections 72 and 73 of the CPA. See De Stadler 2013 175-178; Van Eeden 2013 394-407; Van Heerden C "Protection of Consumer Rights and Consumers' Voice".

that there is a contravention of the CPA's provisions.³⁸⁹ The offending promoter will be obliged to comply with the compliance notice, unless it is successful in an objection against the compliance notice.³⁹⁰ If the promoter does not adhere to it, the NCC can apply to the National Consumer Tribunal for the imposition of an administrative fine.³⁹¹ The Tribunal can impose a fine which may not exceed the greater of R1 million or ten percent of the offender's annual turnover during the preceding financial year.³⁹² Alternatively, failure to comply with the compliance order can be referred to the National Prosecuting Authority.³⁹³ This is because such non-compliance constitutes an offence.³⁹⁴ If prosecution of the matter leads to a conviction, a fine and/or imprisonment of up to 12 months can be imposed.³⁹⁵

In view of the above, promoters should ensure that they conduct their promotional competitions in a lawful manner. If this is not done, they could face significant penalties. However, the penalties can only serve as real deterrents if the relevant legislation is actively enforced. Accordingly, the National Lotteries Commission and the NCC should monitor promotional competitions, investigate non-compliance and take steps to ensure that offenders are sanctioned. Consumers will receive effective protection only once this is done.

5.7 Conclusion

If a promoter wishes to conduct a competition in South Africa for purposes of promoting goods or services, it first needs to establish whether the competition will be based on skill or chance. If the outcome is determined by chance, the promoter needs to ensure that the competition will not be prohibited by the provisions of section 56 of the Lotteries Act. In order to achieve this, the promoter would have to ensure that the competition complies with the requirements contained in the CPA and the CPA Regulations. In particular, the competition would have to be conducted in accordance

³⁸⁹ S100 of the CPA. See De Stadler 2013 178-180; Van Heerden "Enforcement" 100-1 – 100-15; Van Eeden 2013 408-413.

³⁹⁰ S101 of the CPA. See Van Heerden "Enforcement" 101-1 – 101-4; Van Eeden 2013 413-414.

³⁹¹ S100(6)(a). See De Stadler 2013 180-181; Van Heerden "Enforcement" 112-1 – 112-4; Van Eeden 2013 415.

³⁹² S112(2).

³⁹³ S100(6)(b). See Van Heerden "Enforcement" 100-14 – 100-15.

³⁹⁴ S110(2). See Van Heerden "Enforcement" 111-1 – 111-2; De Stadler 2013 181-182.

³⁹⁵ S111(1)(b).

with the provisions of section 36 of the CPA as well as regulation 11 of the CPA Regulations.

Apart from the provisions that relate to promotional competitions specifically, a promoter also needs to comply with such other provisions of the CPA as may be applicable. These would include the provisions that protect consumers against false, misleading, fraudulent or deceptive marketing.³⁹⁶ The promoter would also have to avoid unconscionable conduct,³⁹⁷ as well as fraudulent schemes and offers.³⁹⁸

When considering all of the complex legislative requirements and provisions discussed in this chapter, the lawful conducting of a promotional competition might seem daunting. However, it is submitted that these requirements are necessary to protect consumers against possible abuse. This abuse can manifest in various situations, such as in competitions where participants have to comply with onerous, unreasonable or costly entry mechanisms and requirements. Often, the marketing material relating to a promotional could lead to consumer abuse as well, especially in circumstances where the material is misleading, deceptive or ambiguous. Accordingly, it is submitted that promotional competitions need to be regulated in the interest of consumers and to hold errant parties accountable, but also in order to preserve the integrity and reputation of marketers and promoters.

Unfortunately, as this chapter has shown, South Africa's current law relating to promotional competitions is not entirely clear and various provisions are difficult to interpret. The interaction between the Lotteries Act and the CPA is problematic in some respects and the situation has been compounded by recent amendments to the Lotteries Act. It is recommended that these problems should be addressed in order to avoid situations where they cause hurdles in enforcement proceedings and to ensure that consumers are protected effectively and properly. The final chapter of this thesis contains recommendations in this regard. However, this is preceded by an examination of the self-regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa.

³⁹⁶ S29. See Van Eeden 2013 118-120; Van Zyl E "Section 29" in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014).

³⁹⁷ S40. See Van Eeden 2013 114-117; Du Plessis J "Section 40" in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014).

³⁹⁸ S42. See Woker T "Section 40" in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014).

CHAPTER 6

SELF-REGULATION OF PROMOTIONAL COMPETITIONS

- 6.1 Introduction
- 6.2 Examples of international and foreign self-regulation
- 6.3 Advertising Standards Authority of South Africa
- 6.4 Wireless Application Service Providers' Association
- 6.5 General
- 6.6 Conclusion

6.1 Introduction

The preceding chapters focussed on the statutory regulation of promotional competitions. However, regulation is not limited to legislation. Consumer protection legislation in particular is often complemented by self-regulation in the form of industry codes.¹ These codes often regulate promotional competitions as well. The purpose of this chapter is therefore to examine the nature of self-regulation and to consider relevant industry codes, especially those codes that regulate promotional competitions. In particular, the benefits and disadvantages of self-regulation will be discussed, as well as some examples of international self-regulation. The focus will then turn to self-regulation on a local level. The practical application of the relevant industry codes will be illustrated by referring to rulings issued by industry authorities. The chapter will conclude with an evaluation of the state of self-regulation in South Africa.

¹ Woker T “Why the need for consumer protection legislation? A look at some of the reasons behind the promulgation of the National Credit Act and the Consumer Protection Act” 2010 *Obiter* 217-231 (“Woker 2010”) 221-223; Melville N & Yeates J “Section 82” in Eiselen S & Naudé T (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (“Melville & Yeates”); De Stadler E *Consumer Law Unlocked* (“De Stadler 2013”) 93-94, 182.

6.2 Self-regulation in general

Self-regulation entails the regulation or governing of an industry by the role players in that industry.² It is a type of “decentred regulation”,³ which involves the notion that governments should not have the sole role in and responsibility for regulation.⁴ This form of regulation is not new and is an extensive source of rules and regulations.⁵ It should not be regarded as “an imperfect substitute for government regulation”, but could be viewed as a form of regulation in its own right.⁶ Self-regulation can relate to a variety of subject matters, such as health, product safety, the environment, marketing, advertising and privacy.⁷

Self-regulation can take on many forms, but broadly one can distinguish between voluntary self-regulation and self-regulation that is backed up by legislation.⁸ It could be regarded as “co-regulation” as well, which could involve regulation which was developed by an industry in order to avoid government regulation, but could also consist of self-regulation which was created as a result of government’s pressure on or directive to an industry.⁹ While some authors explain that self-regulation is often

² Boddewyn JJ “Advertising Self-Regulation: True Purpose and Limits” 1989 *Journal of Advertising* 18:2 19 (“Boddewyn”) 20; Black J “Constitutionalising Self-Regulation” 1996 *Modern Law Review* 59:1 24-55 (“Black 1996”) 25-28; Black J “Decentring Regulation: Understanding the Role of Regulation and Self-Regulation in a ‘Post-Regulatory’ World” 2001 *Current legal problems* 54:1 103-146 (“Black 2001”) 116; Gunningham N & Rees J “Industry Self-Regulation: An Institutional Perspective” 1997 *Law & Policy* 19:4 363 (“Gunningham & Rees”) 364; Ramsay I *Consumer Law and Policy: Text and Materials on Regulating Consumer Markets* (2nd ed) (“Ramsay 2007”) 115-116; Schimmel G *Advertising Law: A Guide to the Code of Advertising Practice* (“Schimmel”) 5; Ogus A “Rethinking Self-Regulation” 1995 *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 15:1 97-108 (“Ogus”); Baldwin R, Cave M & Lodge M *Understanding Regulation: Theory, Strategy, and Practice* (“Baldwin ea 2012”) 136-137. According to Boddewyn, self-regulation can refer to an organisation’s internal regulation or to the regulation of various organisations that form part of an industry, but this discussion will centre on self-regulation of a group of organisations in an industry. (Boddewyn 20)

³ Black 2001 105-112; Black J “Critical Reflections on Regulation” 2002 *Australian Journal of Legal Philosophy* 27:1 1-35 34.

⁴ Black 2001 103-104.

⁵ Black 1996 25.

⁶ Ramsay 2007 116.

⁷ Gunningham & Rees 365.

⁸ Melville & Yeates par 3.

⁹ Black 2001 118. Black mentions that co-regulation may be explained as “regulation in the shadow of the law”. See also Gunningham and Rees 366; and Senden L “Soft Law, Self-Regulation and Co-Regulation in European Law: Where Do They Meet?” 2005 *Electronic Journal of Comparative Law* 9:1 11 <http://www.ejcl.org/91/abs91-3.html> (“Senden”), accessed on 15 August 2015, who cites the Interinstitutional Agreement on better law-making, which was concluded between the European

developed as a result of “soft law” – which can consist of guidelines, directives and communications issued by a government,¹⁰ others regard self-regulation as a form of soft law.¹¹

The binding force of self-regulation can vary. For example, in some instances, the provisions of an industry code might be binding only on the members of a voluntary industry organisation that adopted the code.¹² However, in other circumstances, legislation might make an industry code binding on all members of an industry.¹³ An example of this would be an industry code that has been accredited in terms of the CPA’s provisions.¹⁴

Self-regulation, and industry codes in particular, can have the benefit of amplifying consumer protection legislation and providing specific guidance in a particular industry, especially where the relevant legislation is couched in broad, general terms.¹⁵ An industry code can also foster consumer protection in a particular industry without hampering trade.¹⁶ It is easier to update such a code on a continuous basis, and the involvement of industry experts usually leads to better industry standards, as well as application and enforcement of the relevant code.¹⁷ It is more practical to put in place and enforce industry self-regulation, which is not burdened by the formalities associated with government legislation.¹⁸ Furthermore, self-regulation provides an opportunity for corporations and their critics to collaborate and it can serve as a “global

Parliament, the Council of Europe and the European Commission (2003/C321/01). Par 18 of the aforesaid Agreement defines co-regulation as follows:

“the mechanism whereby a Community legislative act entrusts the attainment of the objectives defined by the legislative authority to parties which are recognised in the field (such as economic operators, the social partners, non-governmental organisations, or associations)”.

¹⁰ Senden 22.

¹¹ Ramsay 2007 115.

¹² Baldwin ea 2012 139; Ogus 100.

¹³ Gunningham & Rees 365-366, citing Huyse L & Parmentier S “Decoding Codes: The Dialogue between Consumers and Suppliers through Codes of Conduct in the European Community” 1990 *Journal of Consumer Policy* 13: 253-272 260; Baldwin ea 2012 139; Ogus 100.

¹⁴ See s82(8) of the CPA.

¹⁵ Melville & Yeates paras 1-2. Those authors remark that the CPA can be criticised for regulating consumer protection on a “high level principles” basis, instead of prescribing specific rules.

¹⁶ Woker 2010 222-223. Self-regulation can also advance norms and morality in an industry. (Gunningham & Rees 366.)

¹⁷ Woker 2010 223; Gunningham & Rees 366.

¹⁸ European Advertising Standards Alliance “International Guide to developing a self-regulatory organisation”, http://www.easa-alliance.org/binarydata.aspx?type=doc/EASA_International_Guide.pdf/download 4-5 (accessed on 27 August 2015).

governance” tool.¹⁹ It can serve as a form of societal and social control.²⁰ Self-regulation might involve lower regulatory costs too.²¹ Furthermore, it may be easier for an industry organisation to obtain compliance with a self-regulatory code, whereas compliance with government regulation might be more difficult to achieve.²² Self-regulation can develop consumers’ trust in an industry and might make an industry more credible.²³ In this regard, Boddewyn explains that advertising self-regulation is often very effective because advertising takes place in the public eye and is therefore subject to public scrutiny and practical sanctions (such as rulings that require the withdrawal of an advertisement or the publishing of corrections).²⁴

However, self-regulation is not without criticism. Many commentators remark that self-regulation can often be flawed due to the involvement of and cosy arrangements between industry role-players.²⁵ Self-regulation can be toothless unless a strong industry body is involved, and clear sanctions need to be created and enforced.²⁶ Woker remarks that organisations often ignore sanctions or resign from industry organisations if they are taken to task (but remarks that the Advertising Standards Authority seems to be successful due to the buy-in of prominent organisations as well as effective penalties).²⁷ Self-regulation is also weakened by inconsistent enforcement.²⁸ In addition, its effect can be questioned if the industry is not transparent and accountable.²⁹ Critics remark that “the industry’s perceived abuses alienate consumers and conflict with the goal of consumer protection”.³⁰ Furthermore, industry codes need to be in touch with society and consumers in order to be relevant.³¹

¹⁹ See Haufler V *A Public Role for the Private Sector: Industry Self-Regulation in a Global Economy* (“Haufler”) 1.

²⁰ See Boddewyn 19; Gunningham & Rees 363.

²¹ Ramsay 2007 116.

²² Ramsay 2007 116.

²³ Labarbera PA “Analyzing and advancing the State of the Art of Advertising Self-Regulation” 1980 *Journal of Advertising Regulation* 9:4 27-38 27.

²⁴ Boddewyn 22.

²⁵ Gunningham & Rees 366-367; Haufler 2; Melville & Yeates par 10. Melville & Yeates point out that the first version of the Industry Code of Conduct for the Automotive Industry was subject to such criticism. (Melville & Yeates par 10 fn 5 and the source cited there.)

²⁶ Woker 2010 222.

²⁷ Woker 2010 222.

²⁸ Melville & Yeates par 12; Gunningham & Rees 370.

²⁹ Gunningham & Rees 370; Haufler 2.

³⁰ Reader TW “Is Self-Regulation the Best Option for the Advertising Industry in the European Union – An Argument for the Harmonization of Advertising Laws through the Continued Use of Directive” 1995 *University Pennsylvania Journal of International Business Law* 16:1 181-215 (“Reader”) 182.

³¹ Boddewyn 20.

Ultimately, the value of self-regulation depends on industry members' compliance with the spirit and letter of the relevant industry codes.³²

In South Africa, section 82 of the Consumer Protection Act³³ ("CPA") provides for the development of industry codes of conduct and the accreditation of industry ombuds. These industry codes are therefore examples of "sanctioned self-regulation".³⁴ Some codes have already been accredited, while others are in progress.³⁵ Once a code has been accredited it becomes binding on all suppliers in the relevant industry, who must adhere to the provisions of the code.³⁶ Failure to comply with the provisions of a code can amount to "prohibited conduct" – which can lead to sanctions.³⁷

6.3 Examples of international self-regulation

There is an ongoing effort to implement advertising self-regulation on an international level.³⁸ The International Advertising Association and the International Chamber of Commerce ("ICC"), in particular, have been playing key roles in this endeavour.³⁹ The ICC's Commission on Marketing and Advertising bears the responsibility for drafting and revising codes for the marketing and advertising industries.⁴⁰ The ICC's first Code

³² Boddewyn 21.

³³ 68 of 2008.

³⁴ Black 2001 118. Black explains that "sanctioned self-regulation" involves a situation where an industry organisation drafts the code and the government then accredits it.

³⁵ The Minister of Trade and Industry has prescribed the Automotive Industry Code of Conduct as well as the Consumer Goods and Services Industry Code of Conduct in terms of the CPA's provisions, and the Motor Industry Ombud of South Africa and the Consumer Goods and Services Ombud have respectively been accredited for alternative dispute resolution purposes. (See Notice No. 817, *Government Gazette* No. 38107, 17 October 2014 and Notice No. R. 271, *Government Gazette* No. 38637, 30 March 2015) A proposed code of conduct and dispute resolution scheme for the advertising industry has also been published. (Notice No. 224, *Government Gazette* No. 36253, 22 March 2013) The Franchise Association of South Africa is also driving a process to establish an ombud and alternative dispute resolution scheme for the franchise industry. ((Bizcommunity 2013 <http://www.bizcommunity.com/Article/196/173/103960.html>.) A draft industry code of conduct has been published in this regard. See Notice No. 33 in *Government Gazette* No. 39631, 29 January 2016.³⁶ S82(8).

³⁷ Melville & Yeates par 6; De Stadler 2013 182.

³⁸ Ginosar A "The regulation of advertising" in Levi-Faur D (ed) *Handbook on the Politics of Regulation* 254 ("Ginosar") 260. Moves to implement international advertising self-regulation started in the 1900s when the Associated Advertising Clubs of the World adopted the Truth in Advertising Resolution in 1911. (Ginosar 260)

³⁹ Ginosar 260.

⁴⁰ International Chamber of Commerce "Commission on Marketing and Advertising" (<http://www.iccwbo.org/about-icc/policy-commissions/marketing-and-advertising/>, accessed on 16 June 2015)

of Advertising was released in 1937.⁴¹ Since then, self-regulatory organisations in numerous countries have modelled their advertising industry codes on the ICC's Code of Advertising.⁴² The Code has been described as the "bible of advertising self-regulation".⁴³ The latest revised version of the ICC Consolidated Code of Advertising and Marketing Communications Practice ("ICC Code") was published in 2011.⁴⁴

The ICC Code is merely a self-regulatory code.⁴⁵ It is not binding on any particular person or organisation and is subordinate to whatever legislation may apply.⁴⁶ The ICC does not publish any rulings relating to the ICC Code either, although it might provide guidance on interpretation of its provisions.⁴⁷ However, the ICC motivates "its adoption and use" on a global basis in order to set "standards of ethical conduct" relating to the "promotion of any kind of goods and services".⁴⁸ As such, a number of organisations apply the ICC Code, for example the Danish Consumer Ombudsman,⁴⁹ the Swedish Advertising Ombudsman⁵⁰ and the German Advertising Standards Authority.⁵¹ A number of countries' self-regulatory organisations have also based their advertising industry codes on the ICC Code, including South Africa, Mexico, India and Canada.⁵²

⁴¹ International Chamber of Commerce "Self-regulation", <http://www.iccwbo.org/Advocacy-Codes-and-Rules/Areas-of-work/Marketing-and-Advertising/Self-regulation/> ("ICC Self-Regulation"), accessed on 15 August 2015

⁴² ICC Self-Regulation unpagged.

⁴³ Boddewyn JJ *Advertising Self-Regulation and Outside Participation: A Multinational Comparison* 3, quoted in Verbruggen P "Case Study Report: Transnational Private Regulation in the Advertising Industry" ("Verbruggen 2011") 5, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2256043 (accessed on 23 August 2015).

⁴⁴ International Chamber of Commerce, Consolidated Code of Advertising and Marketing Communications Practice (ninth revision, 2011) ("ICC Code") i (http://www.codescentre.com/media/2083/660%20consolidated%20icc%20code_2011_final%20with%20covers.pdf, accessed on 16 June 2015)

⁴⁵ In other words, it does not have the status of legislation enacted by a parliament.

⁴⁶ Verbruggen 2011 xiv; ICC Code 2.

⁴⁷ Verbruggen P "Enforcement of transnational private regulation of advertising practices: decentralization, mechanisms and procedural fairness" in Cafaggi F (ed) *Enforcement of Transnational Regulation: Ensuring Compliance in a Global World* ("Verbruggen 2012") 305; ICC Code, art 25.

⁴⁸ ICC Code 3-4.

⁴⁹ Danish Consumer Ombudsman "ICC Codes", <http://www.consumerombudsman.dk/Regulatory-framework/dcoguides/icccodes>, accessed on 15 August 2015.

⁵⁰ Swedish Advertising Ombudsman "About" <http://reklamombudsmannen.org/eng/about>, accessed on 15 August 2015.

⁵¹ German Association of Communications Agencies "Germany: Self-Regulatory Organisations", http://www.gwa.de/fileadmin/media-center/Dokumente/Self_Regulation_in_Germany.pdf, accessed on 15 August 2015.

⁵² International Chamber of Commerce "Marketing and Advertising", <http://www.iccwbo.org/advocacy-codes-and-rules/areas-of-work/marketing-and-advertising/>, accessed on 15 August 2015.

Apart from the “General Provisions on Advertising and Marketing Communication Practice” established by it,⁵³ the ICC Code contains a chapter that is dedicated to sales promotion.⁵⁴ The chapter regulates various forms of sales promotion, such as premium offers, price reductions and vouchers.⁵⁵ The provisions also relate to “prize promotions” in particular. The ICC Code defines a prize promotion as “any skill contest or prize draw used in conjunction with a sales promotion activity”.⁵⁶ Accordingly, the provisions would apply in respect of skill based contests as well as competitions in which the outcome is determined by chance.

The ICC Code sets out a number of general principles in respect of sales promotions.⁵⁷ These provisions are aimed at ensuring fair and honourable conduct, meeting consumer expectations, prompt and efficient administration, transparent terms and conditions, fair conduct and avoiding anything which is “likely to bring sales promotions into disrepute”.⁵⁸ These general principles are followed by some specific principles. If one applies those specific principles to prize promotions, the ICC Code can be understood to require that all offers relating to prize promotions must be clear and free of exaggeration.⁵⁹ The prize promotion must not be marketed in a way which might mislead consumers regarding the “value, nature or the means of participation”.⁶⁰ If consumers are required to purchase a product in order to participate in the prize promotion, the promoter must ensure that the availability of those products is sufficient to meet anticipated demand.⁶¹ The relevant promotional items need to be safe and

⁵³ The General Provisions consist of 26 articles that set out general principles relating to matters such as decency (article 2), honesty (article 3), truthfulness (article 5), data protection and privacy (article 19) and environmental behaviour (article 22).

⁵⁴ Chapter A (pages 16-21 of the ICC Code).

⁵⁵ ICC Code 16.

⁵⁶ ICC Code 16. Although some provisions are aimed at prize promotions specifically, the provisions relate mostly to all forms of sales promotions (which would include prize promotions).

⁵⁷ Art A1.

⁵⁸ See the principles set out in art A1.

⁵⁹ Art A2.

⁶⁰ Art A3.

⁶¹ Art A4. Promoters must be able to prove that they calculated this demand prior to launching the competition. The provisions of s34(5)(a) of the CPA reflect these requirements as well (in the context of promotional offers).

free of hazards.⁶² There are specific provisions that pertain to sales promotion intermediaries as well.⁶³

The ICC Code further deals with the information that must be made known to consumers in relation to prize promotions, and prescribes the minimum details that must be disclosed.⁶⁴ This information must include the competition rules, details about any costs of participation (excluding communication costs at or less than standard rates), restrictions on the number of entries, details regarding prizes, the winner selection procedure, the competition closing date, when and how results will be announced, winners' tax obligations, when prizes must be collected and information about how winner's images or their entries might be used after the competition.⁶⁵

On a country and regional level, one can find numerous examples of advertising self-regulation and industry codes. In the United States, for example, advertising self-regulation can be traced back to the 1800s when industry role-players collaborated in order to oppose misleading and false advertising.⁶⁶ At present, the policies and procedures for advertising industry regulation in the United States are determined by the Advertising Self-Regulatory Council.⁶⁷ The self-regulatory programs are administered by the Council of Better Business Bureaus.⁶⁸ The Better Business Bureau Code of Advertising contains various regulations and principles relating to advertising.⁶⁹ In the context of contests and games of chance or skill, it requires that promoters must "publish clear, complete and concise rules and provide competent impartial judges to determine the winners".⁷⁰ Furthermore, it states that a contest or

⁶² Art A5.

⁶³ An "intermediary" is "any person, company or organisation, other than the promoter, engaged in the implementation of any form of sales promotion". (ICC Code 17) The relevant provisions relate to the information that must be disclosed to intermediaries (art A7), the protection of the interests of intermediaries and their employees (art A8), the timing of deliveries (art A8) and the contractual relationships between intermediaries and their consumers (art A8). Art A9 also sets out intermediaries' obligations in respect of prize promotions.

⁶⁴ Art A6.

⁶⁵ See art A6 for the detailed requirements.

⁶⁶ Ginosar 260.

⁶⁷ <http://www.asrcreviews.org/>, accessed on 16 June 2015.

⁶⁸ <http://www.bbb.org/council/about/council-of-better-business-bureaus/>, accessed on 16 June 2015.

⁶⁹ Better Business Bureau Code of Advertising, <https://www.bbb.org/council/for-businesses/code-of-advertising/#gg1>, accessed on 16 June 2015.

⁷⁰ S33.1.

game will be a lottery if it contains the prize, chance and consideration elements, and that such a game or contest must not be conducted.⁷¹

In Europe, the European Advertising Standards Alliance (“EASA”) promotes self-regulation in the advertising industry on a regional level.⁷² The EASA consists of the self-regulatory organisations that operate in the Alliance’s various member countries in addition to members from the advertising industry.⁷³ The advertising industry in Europe established EASA in order to self-regulate advertising and avoid legislation being passed instead.⁷⁴ EASA does not have its own industry code, and its self-regulatory organisation members typically base their own codes on the ICC Code.⁷⁵ EASA is also a member of the International Chamber of Commerce and is involved in setting the standards contained in the ICC Code.⁷⁶

EASA does not function as an umbrella self-regulatory organisation for Europe,⁷⁷ but functions as “the advertising industry’s single voice on self-regulation”.⁷⁸ It does, however, coordinate complaints received in respect of advertising across European countries’ borders.⁷⁹ A consumer in one country can therefore file a complaint against an advertisement with the self-regulatory organisation in the consumer’s country, and that organisation will then refer the complaint via EASA to the self-regulatory organisation in the country where the media platform that carried the advertisement is based.⁸⁰ EASA carries out advertising monitoring projects and provides advertising clearance advice as well.⁸¹

⁷¹ S33.2. The section mentions that such a contest or game would violate federal or state legislation.

⁷² European Advertising Standards Alliance “What is EASA?” <http://www.easa-alliance.org/About-EASA/Who-What-Why-/page.aspx/110>, accessed on 16 June 2015 (“EASA”). See De Stadler 2013 60.

⁷³ EASA (internet article unpagged); Gray O “Responsible advertising in Europe” 2005 *Young Consumers* 6:4 19-23 (“Gray”) 20. South Africa’s Advertising Standards Authority is a non-European corresponding member of EASA. (European Advertising Standards Alliance, “South Africa” <http://www.easa-alliance.org/South-Africa/page.aspx/153>, accessed on 16 June 2015)

⁷⁴ Verbruggen 2011 xii; Reader 181-182.

⁷⁵ Casey D & Scott C “The Crystallization of Regulatory Norms” 2011 *Journal of Law and Society* 38:1 76-95 93; EASA “Advertising Self-Regulation: The Essentials” http://www.easa-alliance.org/binarydata.aspx?type=doc/ASR_the_essentials.pdf/download (accessed on 24 August 2015) (“EASA Essentials”) 9.

⁷⁶ Verbruggen 2012 306.

⁷⁷ Cunningham A “Advertising Self-Regulation in a Broader Context” 2000 *Journal of Promotion Management* 5:2 61-83 (“Cunningham”) 63.

⁷⁸ EASA Essentials 17.

⁷⁹ Verbruggen 2013 516.

⁸⁰ Cunningham 65-66; EASA Essentials 18.

⁸¹ Verbrugge 2012 310.

One of EASA's aims is to ensure that advertising self-regulation is extended across the European Union.⁸² EASA publishes an overview of self-regulation in Europe and other countries.⁸³ In addition, it issues recommendations and guidelines in respect of self-regulatory codes. Some argue that this creates "a form of delegated regime within the EU", due to the European Commission's involvement in EASA's issuing of guidelines.⁸⁴ EASA has also formulated best practice recommendations relating to the operations of self-regulatory organisations that are members of EASA.⁸⁵ The best practice recommendations relate to matters such as universality, funding, efficient administration, effective codes, the provision of advice and information, efficient complaint handling, adjudication, sanctions, compliance and monitoring as well as awareness.⁸⁶ To an extent, EASA's best practice model assists in achieving increased consistency amongst the various self-regulatory organisations in Europe.⁸⁷ There is a need to eliminate significant differences between the self-regulatory systems in the various European countries, particularly due to the costs caused in having to comply with different systems.⁸⁸

6.4 Self-regulation of advertising in South Africa

Advertising regulation in South Africa consists of a combination of self-regulation, common law and legislation.⁸⁹ The self-regulation component consists mainly of the

⁸² Gray 22; Verbruggen P "Gorillas in the closet? Public and private actors in the enforcement of transnational private regulation" 2013 *Regulation & Governance* 7:4 512-532 ("Verbruggen 2013") 516.

⁸³ The overview is published in the form of the *EASA Blue Book*. (European Advertising Standards Alliance, "Blue Book 6", <http://www.easa-alliance.org/page.aspx/266>, accessed on 16 June 2015; De Stadler 2013 60)

⁸⁴ Scott C "Beyond Taxonomies of Private Authority in Transnational Regulation" 2012 *German Law Journal* 13:12 1329 1335.

⁸⁵ Verbruggen 2011 xiii.

⁸⁶ EASA "The EASA Best Practice Self-Regulatory Model (April 2004)" http://www.easa-alliance.org/binarydata.aspx?type=doc/EN_BestPracticeModel.pdf/download, accessed on 27 August 2015.

⁸⁷ Verbruggen 2012 305.

⁸⁸ Verbruggen 2012 311.

⁸⁹ Vos SW *De gustibus non est disputandum: Regulating offensive advertising in a democratic South Africa* ("Vos") 30. The common law recognises, *inter alia*, personality rights, which includes the right to identity and privacy. [Woker T *Advertising Law in South Africa* 20-34 ("Woker 1999") 80; De Jager C & Smith E *Advertising and the Law* ("De Jager & Smith") 53-54] In an advertising context, this means that an advertiser may not use someone's image or photograph in an advertisement without authorisation. (See, for example, *O'Keefe v Argus Printing and Publishing Co Ltd* 1954 (3) SA 244 (C); *Kumalo v Cycle Lab (Pty) Ltd* (31871/2008) [2011] ZAGPJHC 56 (17 June 2011); *Wells v Atoll Media (Pty) Ltd* [2010] 4 All SA 548 (WCC). See also Cornelius S "Die reg op identiteit en die kommersiële ontginning van die individu se openbare beeld" 2008 *Tydskrif vir die Suid-Afrikaanse Reg* 2008 4 645-668; Neethling J "Die beskerming van die persoonlikheidsreg op identiteit teen kommersiële uitbuiting: *Kumalo v Cycle Lab (Pty) Ltd* 2011-06-17 saaknr 31871/2008 (GSJ); *W v Atoll Media (Pty) Ltd* 2010 4

Code of Advertising Practice (“ASA Code”), which is enforced by the Advertising Standards Authority (“ASA”), and the Code of Conduct of the Wireless Application Service Providers’ Association (the “WASPA Code”). In South Africa, promotional competitions often fall within the field of advertising.⁹⁰ As such, one needs to examine the relevant self-regulatory industry codes, in order to identify and consider those provisions that deal with promotional competitions in particular.

6.4.1 Advertising Standards Authority of South Africa

The ASA was established by role-players in the advertising and marketing industries in order to self-regulate advertising in South Africa and to promote integrity in advertising.⁹¹ The ASA Code is the cornerstone of the ASA’s regulatory functions.⁹² It is founded on the principle that advertising “should be legal, decent, honest and truthful”.⁹³ The ASA is a voluntary association. As such, the ASA Code does not have the effect of generally binding legislation,⁹⁴ but all members of the ASA are bound by the ASA Code.⁹⁵ In addition, the Electronic Communications Act⁹⁶ requires that all

All SA 548 (WKK): regspraak” 2012 *Tydskrif vir die Suid-Afrikaanse Reg* 2 348-355.) The common law also relates to contractual aspects of advertising and matters such as puffery. (Woker 1999 49-67.) Sources of statutory regulation of advertising can be found in the CPA, for example s29, while the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 also regulates matters such as privacy (s14) and freedom of expression (s16).

⁹⁰ The term “advertising” is used in its broad sense here. Technically, promotional competitions resort under sales promotion instead of advertising. However, it seems that advertising can also have a broader meaning, which overlaps with other forms of marketing communication or can even be synonymous with marketing in general. For example, the definition of “advertisement” in the ASA Code includes any communication “which is intended to promote the sale, leasing or use of any goods or services”, and states that “[p]romotional content of display material, menus, labels, and packaging also fall within the definition”. (Par 4.1 of the ASA Code.) See also the definition of “advertisement” in the CPA, which is somewhat similar to the one in the ASA Code. (S1 of the CPA.) The definitions in the CPA and ASA Code encapsulate matters and communication forms that do not fall within marketing studies’ narrow definition of “advertising”, and do not refer to payment or consideration. (See Schimmel 48.) However, since the principal regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa is found in the CPA and ASA Code, this topic will be discussed within the broad meaning of “advertising”, although these competitions are, technically, not advertising but actually sales promotion tools.

⁹¹ ASA “About the ASA”, <http://www.asasa.org.za/about>, accessed on 20 June 2015. For more information about the ASA and its functions see, for example, Van Heerden C “Marketing” in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014) (“Van Heerden ‘Marketing’”) paras 29-34; Brand R *Media Law in South Africa* (“R Brand”) 115-117; Schimmel 1-12; De Jager & Smith 3-21; Woker 1999 20-34; Vos 31-44.

⁹² See ASA “Advertising Code of Practice”, <http://www.asasa.org.za/codes/advertising-code-of-practice>, accessed on 20 June 2015.

⁹³ ASA Code, Preamble, s1.1.

⁹⁴ This may change if the ASA Code is prescribed and accredited as an industry code in terms of s82 of the CPA. See fn 35 above.

⁹⁵ ASA Code, Preamble, s1.1

⁹⁶ 35 of 2005.

broadcasting licensees must adhere to the ASA Code's provisions.⁹⁷ The ASA Code applies to "the advertiser, the advertising practitioner and the medium involved in publication of the advertiser's message to the public", to the extent that they are bound by the ASA Code.⁹⁸

The ASA Code's provisions cover a broad range of matters related to advertising. It contains some limited provisions relating to competitions as well. If an advertiser advertises a competition, the ASA may require the advertiser to provide substantiation that the competition is legal.⁹⁹ The ASA Code also contains some provisions in respect of fundraising competitions specifically.¹⁰⁰ Furthermore, it requires that, if an advertisement displays the value of a prize, such value must be inclusive of "VAT".¹⁰¹ Presumably, "VAT" refers to "value-added tax" levied under the Value-Added Tax Act.¹⁰² It is submitted that the ASA Code contains this requirement in order for consumers to be informed of the prize's full value. However, it is not quite clear why the ASA considered it necessary to regulate this. It is submitted that the consumer would not have been severely prejudiced if the advertised value was exclusive of value-added tax. Of course, if the consumer was required to purchase goods to a certain value in order to enter the competition, it would have been important to display such value with value-added tax included. In any event, the Value-Added Tax Act provides that prices shall be deemed to include value-added tax,¹⁰³ and a vendor is required to include such tax in advertised prices.¹⁰⁴

⁹⁷ See s55 of the Electronic Communications Act. See Van Heerden "Marketing" par 33. The position was similar under the repealed Independent Broadcasting Act 153 of 1993. (See R Brand 115)

⁹⁸ ASA Code, Preface, par 7.

⁹⁹ ASA Code, Section III 8.1.1. The substantiation must be "in the form of acceptable legal advice". It is submitted that the written opinion of an attorney or advocate will meet this requirement and that the opinion would have to conclude that the competition does not breach the provisions of, *inter alia*, the CPA and the Lotteries Act, 1997.

¹⁰⁰ Fund raising competitions fall outside the scope of this work. However, readers are referred to Section III 8.1.3 of the ASA Code, which provides that an advertisement for a fund raising competition may only be published if the competition is legal, "prizes offered are already available or guaranteed", prizes will be awarded no matter how many entries were received (and the competition will not be cancelled after the advertisement has appeared) and the competition closing date and the date on which winners will be announced are published in a "major regional or national publication".

¹⁰¹ ASA Code, Section III 8.1.2.

¹⁰² 1991.

¹⁰³ S64(1).

¹⁰⁴ S65.

In the context of timeshare advertising, the ASA Codes states that an advertiser may not refer to gifts or awards as “prizes” except if a competition is being run.¹⁰⁵ Furthermore, the ASA’s Food and Beverage Code provides that a competition may not be targeted at minor children, unless the advertising for the competition states that parents or legal guardians must accept the competition offer on behalf of their children.¹⁰⁶ In relation to alcohol advertising, Appendix A to the ASA Code states that competitions aimed at children “may not be linked to any alcohol beverage brand or product through sponsorship”, and advertising should make it clear that persons younger than eighteen years may not participate in competitions that promote alcohol brands or products.¹⁰⁷

Competition organisers often expect winners to participate in promotional activities and require use of their images and photographs in promotional and advertising material. In this regard, the ASA Code states that advertisers may not depict living persons in advertisements without the prior consent of such persons.¹⁰⁸ Accordingly, organisers would have to obtain prior permission from competition winners and participants before using their photographs in any advertising material. However, there are exceptions to this rule. The organiser would not need to obtain consent if the persons are depicted in background shots, provided that the usage is not “defamatory, offensive or humiliating” and the advertisement must be withdrawn if the organiser receives an objection from a person depicted in the advertisement.¹⁰⁹ Consent would also not be required if, in the ASA’s opinion, the depiction “is not inconsistent with the subject’s right to a reasonable degree of privacy and does not constitute an unjustifiable commercial exploitation of the individual’s fame or reputation”.¹¹⁰ Although this might not necessarily be relevant in the context of competitions, one should note that there are exceptions for use of persons’ image in police and official

¹⁰⁵ ASA Code, Appendix F 8.3.

¹⁰⁶ ASA Code, Appendix J 13.4.

¹⁰⁷ ASA Code, Appendix A (Alcohol Advertising – ARA), “Additional Rules Relating to Promotions”, par 1.

¹⁰⁸ ASA Code, Section II 11.1.

¹⁰⁹ ASA Code, Section II 11.2.1.

¹¹⁰ ASA Code, Section II 11.2.4.

notices,¹¹¹ as well as “advertisements for books, films, radio or television programmes, press features and the like”.¹¹²

The ASA does not carry out advertising monitoring and will not, of its own accord, initiate steps against infringers of the ASA Code.¹¹³ If the promoter of a competition does not comply with the ASA Code’s provisions, a consumer or competitor can file a complaint with the ASA.¹¹⁴ It must be kept in mind that the ASA Code regulates advertising only. As such, in the context of promotional competitions, a complaint would typically relate to the content of a competition’s advertising and marketing materials.¹¹⁵ Complaints would not necessarily relate to the actual mechanics of a competition, although the adviser can be required to provide proof that the competition is lawful.¹¹⁶

If a complaint is filed, the alleged infringer will have an opportunity to respond before the complaint will be considered by the ASA’s Directorate, Advertising Standards Committee or Advertising Industry Tribunal.¹¹⁷ If the complaint is upheld, the infringer may be ordered to withdraw the relevant advertising,¹¹⁸ to submit an amended version for pre-clearance,¹¹⁹ or submit all further advertising for pre-clearance for a limited period.¹²⁰ A ruling can involve adverse publicity for the offender too, such as the publication of its name.¹²¹ The ASA can also require the offender to publish the ruling against it.¹²² However, the ASA is not empowered to impose fines or require advertisers to comply with their own advertising.¹²³

The ASA Code is binding only on members of the ASA. However, these members include a wide variety of industry organisations and trade associations.¹²⁴ Accordingly,

¹¹¹ ASA Code, Section II 11.2.3.

¹¹² ASA Code, Section II 11.2.2.

¹¹³ Schimmel *Advertising Law* 19.

¹¹⁴ ASA Code, Procedural Guide, clause 3.1.

¹¹⁵ The rulings discussed in section 6.4.2 below illustrate the type of complaints in this regard.

¹¹⁶ See fn 99 above.

¹¹⁷ ASA Code, Procedural Guide, clauses 8, 9 and 10.

¹¹⁸ ASA Code, Procedural Guide, clause 14.1.

¹¹⁹ ASA Code, Procedural Guide, clause 14.2.

¹²⁰ ASA Code, Procedural Guide, clause 14.3.

¹²¹ ASA Code, Procedural Guide, clause 14.4.

¹²² ASA Code, Procedural Guide, clause 14.5.

¹²³ Schimmel 38.

¹²⁴ See par 3 of the ASA Code’s Preface.

although an individual advertiser might not be an ASA member, the ASA Code will still apply if the relevant advertising is carried by an entity, such as a broadcaster or newspaper that belongs to an association which is an ASA member. If the ASA rules against an advertiser and it fails to comply with the ruling, the ASA can issue a so-called ad alert.¹²⁵ If this is done, no ASA member will carry or publish the offending advertiser's advertising.¹²⁶ If the ASA Code is eventually accredited by the National Consumer Commission in terms of the CPA's provisions, a breach of the ASA Code will also constitute prohibited conduct and an administrative fine could be imposed by the National Consumer Tribunal.¹²⁷

6.4.2 Examples of ASA rulings relating to promotional competitions

On a regular basis, the ASA publishes rulings relating to complaints considered by the ASA's dispute resolution bodies.¹²⁸ From time to time, those complaints relate to advertising involving competitions. Often, the complaints revolve around misleading, dishonest or ambiguous claims in such advertising. For example, in a complaint against a competition conducted by a newspaper,¹²⁹ the ASA Directorate decided that the relevant advertising material was misleading and contravened Section II 4.2.1 of the ASA Code, because the material created the impression that a participant would win a motor vehicle if they held a specific number, while the participant would in fact receive only the *opportunity* to win.¹³⁰ In another matter involving misleading advertising,¹³¹ the advertiser undertook to change its advertising material because the material stated that participants would receive one competition entry for every fax received using the advertiser's service, while the terms and conditions stated that at

¹²⁵ ASA Code, Procedural Code, clause 15.4.

¹²⁶ Schimmel 40.

¹²⁷ De Stadler 58 fn 10. See also fn 35 above.

¹²⁸ Rulings are published on the ASA's website located at www.asasa.org.za.

¹²⁹ *Sowetan BMW Competition / S Zwane / 2014 – 1841 F.*

¹³⁰ *Sowetan BMW Competition* (ruling unpagged). The original advertising material stated: "If you have the lucky number 114, you will receive the BMW1 and be proclaimed the Grand Prize Winner". The material was then amended as follows: "It is you who can become the owner of the brand new BMW1! Check right now: If you have lucky number 114, follow the steps to claim your BMW1". The Directorate held that the original and amended material was misleading, because people who received the lucky number would only become *eligible* to win the prize, and would not in fact win the prize.

¹³¹ *Olympics 2012 Competition / N van der Lingen / 19461* (ruling unpagged).

least twenty faxes would have to be received in order for someone to stand a chance to win a prize.¹³²

Advertisers should also take care to avoid misleading claims in relation to the prizes offered in competitions. For example, in the *Denny Mushrooms Competition*¹³³ the advertiser's product packaging displayed this statement: "WIN R250 000 WORTH OF GROCERY VOUCHERS". The ASA Directorate ruled that the statement was ambiguous and misleading, because it could be interpreted in various ways (for example, one winner could win vouchers to the full value or several winners could win vouchers up to the total value).¹³⁴ In the *Denny Mushrooms* matter, the Directorate referred to the earlier *Sta-Soft / T Marshall*¹³⁵ matter in which the advertising material stated: "Win one of 10 makeovers worth R100 000!". In the latter matter, the Directorate had found that the statement was misleading because it was not clear whether all ten makeovers would be worth R100 000 in aggregate (in other words, R10 000 per makeover) or whether each makeover was worth R100 000.¹³⁶ Generally,

¹³² For other examples of possible misleading advertising in relation to competitions, see *MTN Man United Competition / R Haupt / 17738* (where the advertising material failed to disclose that entrants had to be MTN subscribers); *Federal Mogul Competition / M Kent / 13839* (where a television commercial advertised a competition, but the complainant received a text message which implied that the competition had already closed); *Ster Kinekor Competition / M du Plessis / 8610* (which involved a claim that the value of the prize was inflated); *SMS Competitions / C Pearce / 8539* (complaint regarding advertising which was unclear regarding the costs that would be incurred by entrants); *DSTV Competition / JW Sherwood / 4578* (where the complainant averred that the advertising material failed to disclose that a premium would be charged in respect of text message entries). In all of those matters, the advertisers agreed to withdraw or amend the relevant advertising and, as such, the Directorate did not consider the merits of the complaints.

¹³³ *Denny Mushrooms SMS Competition / E A Van Zyl / 7383*.

¹³⁴ *Denny Mushrooms SMS Competition* (ruling unpagged). The Directorate referred to the competition's terms and conditions, and decided that the advertiser would not be allowed to rectify the confusion by way of the terms and conditions.

¹³⁵ *Sta-Soft / T Marshall / 1683*.

¹³⁶ See also *Racumin / M M Keys / 1834* (ruling unpagged), where the Directorate held that an advertisement for a competition was misleading. The advertisement contained the following statement: "SMS & WIN! • 10 Piece Braai Set • Cheese & Wine Picnic Bag • Backpack Picnic Set". The Directorate ruled that the statement was open to various interpretations. For example, it was not clear whether the winner would win one or more of the items in the advertisement.

advertisers must be able to substantiate advertised prize values.¹³⁷ Prize descriptions must also not be misleading.¹³⁸

The ASA Directorate has ruled that advertising would be misleading if it involves a competition and the advertising material (and product packaging in particular) does not display the competition's closing date. It is submitted that the closing date of a promotional competition should be made known in order to avoid situations where a consumer purchases a product in order to enter a competition conducted in relation to that product, only to discover that the competition has already ended.¹³⁹

Based on previous ASA rulings, it appears that it would be prudent for an advertiser to ensure that product packaging contains sufficient and clear information regarding a competition and how it works.¹⁴⁰ For example, if the competition involves text

¹³⁷ See, for example, *Twinsaver Spoil-Yourself Competition / Kimberly Clark / 4622* (ruling unpagged), where prizes worth R91 million were advertised. (This value might seem very high, but this is the amount that was mentioned in the ruling.) Perhaps because of the high value, the complainant was of the view that the aforesaid claim had to be substantiated. However, the Directorate dismissed the complaint when the advertiser provided supporting documentation and a report from an auditing firm in order to substantiate the claim. See also *Sunday Times Food and Travel Magazine / Mr E Schwentzek / 1044* (ruling unpagged), in which a complaint was partially upheld because the advertiser did not provide substantiation for the advertised prize values, as well as *DSTV Golf / Maureen Tearnay* (6 November 2003), where the Directorate upheld a complaint on the basis that the value of the relevant prize was overstated.

¹³⁸ Often, competition rules would state that prizes may differ from the description in the relevant advertising material. In *CAT Watches / Rajash Seejarim / 1391* (ruling unpagged), a winner complained that the watch that he had won did not correspond with the watches depicted in the relevant television commercial. However, the Directorate dismissed the claim on the basis that the advertisement merely described the prizes as exclusive watches and the commercial only very briefly depicted some watches without creating the impression that those watches would constitute the prizes.

¹³⁹ The ASA Directorate has determined that a competition closing date is a material condition, and has ruled against advertisers who failed to display the closing date on the advertising in issue. See, for example, *Brooks Sweeto / GH Smith / 725* (ruling unpagged) where a competition was advertised on the label of a cool drink bottle, but the closing date was obscured because it was printed on the back of the label. In *Archers / L Nel / 4779* (ruling unpagged), the product label displayed no closing date, but participants were referred to the advertiser's website. The advertiser stated that it did this on purpose so that it could extend or reduce the length of the competition period. The Directorate found that this was misleading and that the confusion caused by the product label could not be cured by way of further information on the website. In *Steers / Mr T Spicer / 184* (ruling unpagged) the Directorate ruled that in-store advertising for a competition was misleading because it referred the public to the advertiser's website without disclosing that persons could enter the competition by way of text messages only. In *Coca Cola Vitamin Water / S Antonellos / 2015-576F* (ruling unpagged), the Directorate ordered the advertiser to withdraw its packaging from the market because it referred to a competition that had ended long ago. In contrast, in *Magnum Competition / P Howard / 2014 – 1261F* (ruling unpagged) the Directorate dismissed a complaint where the complainant purchased a product in order to enter a competition, which had already ended. The ruling was based on the fact that the closing date was clearly displayed on the packaging and that consumers would therefore have been able to verify whether the competition was still open for entry.

¹⁴⁰ See, for example, *City Mageu Competition / Mageu Number One / 1758* (ruling unpagged), where a competitor complained about various issues with the advertiser's packaging, including that it contained

messages entries, advertisers must ensure that the full text message costs are properly disclosed.¹⁴¹ Yet, although a competition closing date might be a material term that should be displayed on product packaging,¹⁴² the ASA Code does not require the full competition terms and conditions to be displayed in advertising material relating to a competition.¹⁴³ Even so, it is submitted that it would be prudent for the advertiser to make full terms and conditions available, since terms and conditions might protect the advertiser in disputes with participants or winners.¹⁴⁴ In general, in view of previous ASA rulings, a promoter should ensure that the contents of a competition advertisement are accurate.¹⁴⁵

6.4.3 Wireless Application Service Providers' Association

Detailed self-regulation of promotional competitions is found in the industry code adopted by the Wireless Application Service Providers' Association ("WASPA") as well. WASPA is a voluntary association which was established to self-regulate mobile-based value added services providers in South Africa.¹⁴⁶ Value-added service providers are persons or entities "that provide services and data through wireless and mobile devices over public networks".¹⁴⁷ WASPA "aims to ensure that consumers receive world-class services and that members operate according to ethical and reasonable business practices".¹⁴⁸ In order to achieve this, WASPA enforces the

no closing date, insufficient details about the prizes and no proper explanation about the way in which the competition would work. However, the Directorate did not consider the merits of the complaint, because the advertiser undertook to withdraw the competition.

¹⁴¹ See the concluding comments of the ASA Directorate in *R1 Million House Competition / Mr B Oldenboom / 1402* (ruling unpagged).

¹⁴² See the rulings in fn 139 above.

¹⁴³ See the ASA Directorate's comments on the second preliminary point raised by the complainant in *Supa Quick / Tiger Wheel & Tyre / 10316* (ruling unpagged).

¹⁴⁴ See, for example, *Sunday Times Food and Travel Magazine / Mr E Schwentzek / 1044* (ruling unpagged), where a winner complained that he was forced to make use of the prize within a certain period. The ASA Directorate dismissed this, on the basis that the relevant advertisement contained a clear condition in this regard and the winner was deemed to have accepted the condition by entering the competition.

¹⁴⁵ The accuracy of an advertisement was the focus in *Sokka Kings / I Butler / 706* (ruling unpagged). In that matter, a television commercial relating to a competition referred to "Tshwane". The complainant argued that the advertisement was misleading, because it made mention of "Tshwane" while the city's name was still "Pretoria". The advertiser undertook not to broadcast the commercial again.

¹⁴⁶ WASPA "About WASPA", <https://waspa.org.za/about/>, accessed on 20 June 2015 ("About WASPA").

¹⁴⁷ WASPA Constitution, s2.

¹⁴⁸ Wireless Application Service Providers' Association Code of Conduct (13.9) ("WASPA Code"), par 1.2.

WASPA Code, which is binding on all WASPA members.¹⁴⁹ WASPA's media monitors conduct daily research in order to verify whether WASPA members are complying with the WASPA Code.¹⁵⁰ WASPA is also a member of the International Audiotex Regulators Network ("IARN").¹⁵¹ IARN is an international organisation that was formed for purposes of sharing information regarding the regulation of phone-paid services.¹⁵²

The WASPA Code contains a section which regulates promotional competitions specifically.¹⁵³ It defines a "promotional competition" as "any competition, game, scheme, arrangement, system, plan or device for distributing prizes as defined in section 36 of the Consumer Protection Act, 2008".¹⁵⁴ In view of the cross-reference to the CPA, it appears that section 18 of the WASPA Code is focussed on chance based competitions.

Under the WASPA Code, the maximum permitted cost of a competition entry is R1.50.¹⁵⁵ This is the same as the limit specified in the CPA Regulations.¹⁵⁶ The WASPA Code also states that "[a]ll valid and correct entries must have the same chance of winning".¹⁵⁷ It is submitted that promoters may therefore not discriminate between competition entries and that promoters should give all entrants the same opportunity to win. Furthermore, a competition must have a closing date (unless it is an instant win competition) and prizes must be allocated within 28 days of that date.¹⁵⁸ For a period of 30 days after the closing date, the promoter must send a reply to further entrants, advising them that the competition has already closed.¹⁵⁹ (It is assumed that the references to "days" imply calendar days. The WASPA Code refers to "days" in

¹⁴⁹ WASPA Code, par 1.5. Previously, WASPA enforced both the WASPA Code as well as the so-called "Ad Rules", which were very detailed. However, WASPA recently consolidated the WASPA Code and the Ad Rules into one document. (Jacobson P "Rewritten WASPA Code better regulates mobiles services in SA" *Web Tech Law* 27 August 2014 <http://webtechlaw.com/2014/08/27/rewritten-waspa-code-better-regulates-mobile-services-sa/>, access on 20 June 2015)

¹⁵⁰ About WASPA (internet article unpagged).

¹⁵¹ About WASPA (internet article unpagged).

¹⁵² International Audiotex Regulators Network, <http://www.iarn.org/> (website unpagged), accessed on 16 August 2015. IARN has also issued a handbook which contains guidelines regarding the regulation of phone-paid services. (See http://www.iarn.org/documents/iarn_handbook.pdf, accessed on 16 August 2015.)

¹⁵³ S18.

¹⁵⁴ S18.1.

¹⁵⁵ S18.2. This limit is the same as the one in reg 11(1) of the Consumer Protection Act Regulations.

¹⁵⁶ See reg 11(1).

¹⁵⁷ S18.3.

¹⁵⁸ Ss18.6 and 18.7.

¹⁵⁹ S18.8.

section 18, while it refers to “business days” in some other sections.) A promoter may also not extend a competition period or fail to award prizes on the basis that insufficient entries were received or that entries were of inadequate quality.¹⁶⁰

An offer which invites the public to enter a promotional competition must at least contain the information prescribed by the WASPA Code. Section 18.4 requires that the offer must state the following:

- (a) the competition to which the offer relates;
- (b) the steps required by a person to participate in the competition;
- (c) the full cost to enter the competition;
- (d) the basis on which the results of the competition will be determined;
- (e) the closing date for the competition;
- (f) how the results of the competition will be made known;
- (g) how a person can obtain a copy of the competition rules; and
- (h) how the successful participant can obtain the prize.

These requirements are very similar to those contained in section 36(5) of the CPA. In previous versions, the WASPA Code required that the advertising material had to include, *inter alia*, “any information which is likely to affect a decision to participate”.¹⁶¹ It is submitted that it would have been difficult to comply with such a requirement, since various factors might influence a participant when they consider whether or not to enter a competition. This could include, for example, the odds of winning or the number of expected participants.

The information listed in section 18.4 of the WASPA Code must be contained in an advertisement relating to the competition or must be provided to entrants before they enter.¹⁶² The WASPA Code also prohibits certain practices in relation to promotional

¹⁶⁰ S18.6.

¹⁶¹ De Stadler E *Consumer Law Unlocked* 69.

¹⁶² S18.5. As an example, the subsection states that a promoter may redirect an entrant to a website that contains the terms and conditions.

competitions.¹⁶³ In addition, promotional competitions that are aimed at children may not involve cash prizes or lengthy or complicated rules.¹⁶⁴

WASPA adjudicates complaints relating to breaches of the WASPA Code on a regular basis.¹⁶⁵ Many complaints pertain to competitions. In some instances, the matters relate to situations where competitions terms and conditions or entry costs were not properly displayed in the relevant marketing material,¹⁶⁶ or where recipients of text messages relating to a competition were not able to opt out from receiving further messages.¹⁶⁷ In other cases, complaints involve matters where competitions were linked to subscription services.¹⁶⁸ Illegal competitions have been the subject of complaints too.¹⁶⁹ There are also examples of other breaches of the WASPA Code in the context of competitions.¹⁷⁰

As opposed to the ASA, WASPA actively monitors the advertising and services of WASPA members in order to determine whether they comply with the provisions of the WASPA Code.¹⁷¹ Anyone, including a member of the public, a competitor or the WASPA media monitor, may file a complaint with WASPA in relation to a WASPA member's breach of the WASPA Code.¹⁷² Complaints are adjudicated by independent adjudicators appointed by WASPA.¹⁷³

¹⁶³ S18.9 states that a promotional competition must not:

- (a) use words such as "win" or "prize" to describe items intended to be offered to all or a substantial majority of the participants;
- (b) exaggerate the chance of winning a prize;
- (c) suggest that winning a prize is a certainty;
- (d) suggest that the party has already won a prize and that by contacting the promoter of the competition, that the entrant will have definitely secured that prize."

¹⁶⁴ S23.3.

¹⁶⁵ WASPA adjudication reports are available online at <https://waspa.org.za/coc/complaint-report-archive/> (accessed on 20 June 2015). Note that many of the complaints were adjudicated under previous versions of the WASPA Code.

¹⁶⁶ For example, *Clickatell* (Complaint no. 8128); *HP Computek* (Compliant no. 11370); *Clickatell* (Complaint no. 8228); *Exactmobile* (Compliant no. 4196).

¹⁶⁷ For example, *Mira Networks* (Complaint no. 4696).

¹⁶⁸ See, for example, *Mobile NOBO (IP) / Tanla Mobile (SP) (0118)* (Compliant no. 15268).

¹⁶⁹ See *Celerity Systems (BulkSMS)* (Complaint no. 7180); *Independent SMS Telecommunications (Pty) Ltd* (Complaint no. 0067).

¹⁷⁰ For example, *Viamedia (SP) Xcite Mobile (IP)* (Compliant no. 12969), where s9.1.6 of the then current version of the WASPA Code was breached because the word "win" was used in a situation where prizes were available to most or all participants (pages 4-5 of the report).

¹⁷¹ WASPA Code, s24.3 and s24.82.

¹⁷² WASPA Code, s24.5.

¹⁷³ WASPA Code, s24.1.

If a WASPA member is found to have contravened the WASPA Code, it could be ordered to remedy the breach or pay a fine.¹⁷⁴ Its WASPA membership could be suspended or terminated as well.¹⁷⁵ Since WASPA members usually provide wireless application services to other businesses (for example, in order to send direct marketing messages), a member can be required to disclose the identity of their customer, to cease providing services to them or to withhold any money due to them.¹⁷⁶ The network operator, over whose network the member's services are provided, could also be advised to take steps, such as terminating or suspending the member's access to a specific number or category of services, withholding funds due to the member, paying such funds to WASPA as a fine or issuing a refund to customers.¹⁷⁷ The WASPA Code extends beyond WASPA members as well, since notices can be issued to non-members too.¹⁷⁸ If a WASPA member allows a non-member to breach the WASPA Code's provisions, such member will be deemed to be in breach of the same provisions.¹⁷⁹ It appears, therefore, that the WASPA Code makes provision for extensive sanctions that could be very effective in practice. Further, in contrast with the ASA Code, the WASPA Code's provisions and sanctions extend beyond mere advertising and address the actual services provided by WASPA members too.

6.5 General

Apart from the provisions of the ASA Code and the WASPA code, promoters need to ensure that they comply with the requirements of any other applicable industry codes. For example, in the context of direct marketing, members of the Direct Marketing Association of Southern Africa must comply with its Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice.¹⁸⁰ In the pharmaceutical industry, organisations who are members of the

¹⁷⁴ WASPA Code, s24.43(a) and (c).

¹⁷⁵ WASPA Code, s24.43(d) and (e).

¹⁷⁶ WASPA Code, s24.43(f) to (h).

¹⁷⁷ WASPA Code, s24.44.

¹⁷⁸ WASPA Code, s24.50 to 24.53.

¹⁷⁹ WASPA Code, s24.53.

¹⁸⁰ The Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice of the Direct Marketing Association of Southern Africa is currently not available on that association's website (www.dmasa.org, accessed on 21 June 2015), but it is attached to the ASA Code as Appendix C. Clause 10.2.1 of the version attached to the ASA Code warns association members that lotteries and contests are "highly regulated by law" and that they should seek professional advice in order to conduct contests and the like.

Marketing Code Authority must heed the requirements of the Authority's Code of Marketing Practice.¹⁸¹

6.6 Conclusion

There appears to be a high level of self-regulation in the marketing and advertising industry in South Africa. This should provide some protection to consumers and offer recourse in situations where promoters follow abusive advertising and marketing practices in general. However, it seems that the provisions relating to promotional competitions are quite limited, particularly when compared to the comprehensive provisions contained in the United Kingdom's CAP Code. In essence, the ASA Code expects promoters merely to ensure that their competitions comply with applicable law and that prize values are displayed as VAT inclusive amounts.¹⁸² Although the provisions relating to promotional competitions are limited, it does appear that the ASA rules on complaints that relate to promotional competitions from time to time. In the relevant matters, the ASA mostly applied the provisions that relate to truthful advertising. Even so, the rulings can serve as useful guidance for promoters.

Self-regulation has the potential to be effective, flexible and continuously developing.¹⁸³ When it comes to promotional competitions, this potential was left untapped in the drafting of the ASA Code. Accordingly, it is submitted that the ASA should consider crafting provisions that can complement and amplify those contained in the CPA.

A different situation is encountered when one considers the WASPA Code. It contains more substantial provisions relating to promotional competitions and regulates matters that are not found in the CPA. For example, it requires that competitions must have closing dates and states that closing dates may not be changed.¹⁸⁴ The WASPA Code also stipulates that prizes must be awarded after the closing date and promoters must

¹⁸¹ The November 2014 version of the Code of Marketing Practice is available online at <http://www.marketingcode.co.za/images/SACodeMarketingPractice.pdf> (accessed on 21 June 2015). It regulates competitions aimed at healthcare professionals and healthcare providers (clause 19.4) as well as competitions that are open to consumers (clause 37.2). The Code prohibits competitions that require entrants purchase health products in order to enter, and promoters may not award health products as prizes. (Clause 37.2)

¹⁸² See ASA Code, Section III 8.1.1 and 8.1.2.

¹⁸³ See page 255 above.

¹⁸⁴ S18.6 of the WASPA Code.

do so within a specific period.¹⁸⁵ Some of the WASPA Code's provisions are simpler and clearer than those contained in the CPA. For example, the CPA prescribes the information that must be disclosed by a promoter as part of an offer to participate in a promotional competition,¹⁸⁶ but the provisions relating to the manner in which such information must be disclosed are not entirely clear.¹⁸⁷ The WASPA Code contains similar provisions, but they have been drafted in a simpler and clearer manner.¹⁸⁸ The WASPA Code regulates the marketing of promotional competitions as well. In essence, the provisions prohibit promoters from giving consumers false impressions regarding their chances of winning.¹⁸⁹ These provisions complement and amplify the similar ones found in the CPA.¹⁹⁰

It is submitted that the efficacy of industry regulation depends on industry members' cooperation with self-regulatory bodies and the effectiveness of industry authorities. The relevant industry codes contain quite extensive sanctions. However, in order for these sanctions to act as deterrents, self-regulatory authorities should monitor promotional competitions and resolve complaints from the public efficiently. It is suggested that industry organisations should review their codes in order to determine whether they regulate promotional competitions adequately. In addition, they should consider taking steps to educate their members about the relevant provisions and warn them against the consequences of non-compliance.

In conclusion, it is submitted that self-regulation plays an important role in the regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa. The public cannot rely on the law and statutory institutions alone to police the industry and ensure that consumers are not abused. Statutory regulation also develops at a slow pace and is not flexible enough to keep track with trends in the marketing and promotions industry. The current level of self-regulation is quite developed in South Africa. However, it might fall short in relation to promotional competitions. Accordingly, self-regulatory organisations must continue to improve their codes and play their part to ensure that their members comply with the law as well as the industry codes when it comes to promotional

¹⁸⁵ S18.6 and s18.7 of the WASPA Code.

¹⁸⁶ See s36(5) of the CPA.

¹⁸⁷ See s36(6) of the CPA.

¹⁸⁸ See s18.4 and s18.5 of the WASPA Code.

¹⁸⁹ See s18.9 of the WASPA Code.

¹⁹⁰ See s36(2) of the CPA.

competitions. Furthermore, they should continue to hold non-complying promoters accountable. In the end, this will grow consumers' trust in the industry and improve the reputation of industry role-players.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 Conclusion
 - 7.2 Recommendations
 - 7.3 Final remarks
 - 7.4 Suggestions for further research
-

7.1 Conclusion

7.1.1 Purpose and process of this research

The aim of this research was to examine how and to what extent promotional competitions are regulated in South Africa. The intention was to contribute to the academic literature in this subject field, in view of the dearth of academic literature in this context in South Africa specifically. The conclusion was reached that South Africa's law relating to promotional competitions is in fact quite evolved and comprehensive. Accordingly, a drastic review or redrafting of the relevant legislation was not proposed. However, it was found that there are some defects and inconsistencies and these need to be addressed in order to make it easier to interpret and apply the law and enforce it properly.

The research process was undertaken by way of the doctrinal method and involved a study and synthesis of the relevant legislation, case law and other materials. Literature from the social sciences was consulted as well. In addition, historical research was undertaken in order to provide an overview of the history of gambling, lotteries and promotional competitions. The relevant laws of New Zealand and Great Britain were surveyed too and compared with the local position. (Great Britain was selected for this purpose because its case law relating to lotteries has been cited by South African courts and can be used to interpret the relevant South African provisions. There are also similarities between South Africa's lotteries legislation and the relevant British legislation. Furthermore, both Great Britain and New Zealand follow common law systems, and New Zealand's legislation relating to sales promotion schemes has had

an influence on British legislation relating to the same subject matter.) This study also involved an analysis of and a commentary on the current regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa, while industry self-regulation was examined too.

7.1.2 Perspectives from the social sciences and other fields

The research commenced, in chapter 2, with an exploration of the relevant terms that are used in respect of this study's subject matter. It was explained that promotional competitions lie within the broader field of gambling.¹ It was found that gambling encompasses lotteries and related activities as well,² although the various activities display different nuances.³ Some persons prefer to use the euphemistic term "gaming" instead of gambling.⁴ Broad and narrow definitions for the term "gambling" were discussed.⁵ It was found that, in essence, gambling involves an activity where participants contribute money or something of value in the hope of receiving a prize or reward, depending on the outcome of an unknown future event.⁶ After definitions in foreign sources were referred to,⁷ the South African position was examined.⁸ While this country's Lotteries and Gambling Board referred to a variety of definitions in its report,⁹ the current National Gambling Act, 2004 does not define "gambling" as a concept. However, it regulates specific "gambling activities".¹⁰

¹ See page 16 above.

² See pages 16-24. Carnelley M "Guarding the Guardians: Non-Judicial and Judicial Control over Unlawful Decisions by the South African Gaming Boards" 2001 *Obiter* 74-101; Christie RH & Bradfield GB *Christie's The Law of Contract in South Africa* (6th ed) 393.

³ NE Wiehahn 1995, 3-4.

⁴ See pages 24-26 above. See, for example, Rose I N *Gambling and the Law* 75.

⁵ See pages 16-24 above. McMillen points out that gambling has shifting meanings. [McMillen J "Understanding Gambling: History, concepts and theories" in McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* ("McMillen") 6.] There are also distinctions between legal and economic definitions of gambling. [Becker T "The German Market for Gambling and Betting" in Spapens T, Littler A and Fijnaut C (eds) *Crime, addiction, and the regulation of gambling* 141 ("Becker") 142.]

⁶ See Collins P *Gambling and the public interest* ("P Collins") 15; McMillen 6-7; Rose I N "The International Law of Remote Wagering" 2007 *John Marshall Law Review* Vol 40 ("Rose 2007") 1161; Rose I N *Gambling and the Law* ("Rose 1986") 75.

⁷ See pages 17-18 above.

⁸ See pages 19-21 above.

⁹ The Main Report on Gambling in South Africa (RP 85/1995) ("LGB Main Report"); Wiehahn NE *Gambling in South Africa – A New Challenge* ("NE Wiehahn 1995") 3-4.

¹⁰ National Gambling Act, 2004, s3.

Thereafter, lotteries were examined. It was pointed out that a lottery contains three essential elements: consideration, lot or chance, and a prize.¹¹ It therefore involves an activity where a person contributes consideration (also known as subscription), and where lot or chance will determine whether the person will win a prize.¹² The definition of the term “lottery” in South Africa’s Lotteries Act¹³ was examined, and it was pointed out that it does not contain a reference to the “contribution” requirement.¹⁴ As such, it appeared as if the Lotteries Act could apply even if an activity did not involve consideration, but it was noted that section 63 of the Lotteries Act excludes from its scope a lottery which does not involve subscription.

The discussion then turned to the play element that underlies gambling, lotteries, promotional competitions and related activities.¹⁵ This element was investigated because it relates to people’s motivation for gambling and participating in competitions, and it informs the relevant policy considerations. It was pointed out that gambling is a form of play,¹⁶ and that play shapes culture.¹⁷ Gambling constitutes a form of human action too.¹⁸ With reference to the work of Roger Caillois, it was indicated that there are various forms of play.¹⁹ In particular, gambling involves agonistic play (competitive activities)²⁰ and aleatory play (chance based activities).²¹ It is important to understand these distinctions because they are also encountered in some forms of gambling regulation.

¹¹ See pages 26-28 above. See, for example, Williams FE *Lotteries, Law and Morals* (“FE Williams 1958”) 69; *R v Cranston* 1914 AD 238; *R v Lew Hoi* 1937 AD 215 220; *Minister of Mineral and Energy Affairs v Lucky Horseshoe (Pty) Ltd* 1994 (2) SA 46 (A) 52.

¹² LGB Main Report 151.

¹³ 57 of 1997 (hereafter the “Lotteries Act”).

¹⁴ See page 27 above.

¹⁵ See pages 29-35. Herman RD *Gamblers and Gaming: Motives, Institutions and Controls* (“Herman 1976”) 1-9; Downes DM, Davies, BP, David ME and Stone P *Gambling, work and leisure: a study across three areas* 11-14; Smith JF & Abt V “Gambling as Play” in Frey JH & Eadington WR (eds) *Gambling: Views from the Social Sciences. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 122 122-132; Reith G *HOMO ALEATOR: A Sociological Study of Gambling in Western* 199-253; Reith G “The Experience of Play” in Cosgrave JF (ed) *The Sociology of Risk and Gambling Reader* 255-287; Ottaway J *The UK National Lottery and Charitable Gambling* (“Ottaway”) 91-127.

¹⁶ Herman 1976 1.

¹⁷ Huizinga J *Homo Ludens: A study of the play-element in culture* 46.

¹⁸ Goffman E *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior* 149-270 149.

¹⁹ Caillois R *Man, Play, and Games* (“Caillois”) 12.

²⁰ Caillois 14

²¹ Caillois 17.

Having discussed the play nature of gambling, the discussion then narrowed down on the policy issues that surround gambling. In order to consider these issues, the reasons why people gamble were first examined.²² Financial gain was identified as one of the most prominent reasons for gambling.²³ Even so, it is not necessarily a profitable activity,²⁴ and may even be wasteful.²⁵ There are psychological reasons for gambling too.²⁶ In particular, gambling is a challenge,²⁷ and stimulates people's problem solving capabilities.²⁸ It allows them to experiment with chance and risk.²⁹ However, it also entertains³⁰ and creates fun.³¹

It was submitted that people's reasons for gambling are relevant in the context of promotional competitions.³² Some people might enter competitions in order to win prizes, particularly money. Others enjoy the challenge and entertainment of participating in them. Widespread advertising for such competitions might stimulate participation as well. Since some people might be highly stimulated or motivated to participate in competitions due to these reasons, it was submitted that they should be regulated in order to protect consumers against abuse, exploitation and irresponsible behaviour. In particular, the regulation should focus on the marketing of such competitions and the prizes that are offered.

²² See pages 35-42 above.

²³ See pages 36-37 above. Brenner R with Brenner GA *Gambling and Speculation: A Theory, a History, and a Future of Some Human Decisions* ("Brenner & Brenner") 19; Binde P "Why people gamble: a model with five motivational dimensions" 2013 *International Gambling Studies* 13:1 81-97; Clotfelter CT & Cook PJ *Selling Hope: State Lotteries in America* ("Clotfelter & Cook") 71; Rule S & Sibanyoni C *The Social Impact of Gambling in South Africa* ("Rule & Sibanyoni") 30-33.

²⁴ Walker, MW "A Sociocognitive Theory of Gambling Involvement" in Eadington WR & Cornelius JA (eds) *Gambling and Commercial Gaming: Essays in Business, Economics, Philosophy and Science* ("Walker 1992") 372. See also Rosecrance J *Gambling without Guilt: the Legitimation of an American Pastime* ("Rosecrance") 63-64.

²⁵ Clotfelter & Cook 119-120; Walker 1992 372.

²⁶ Walker 1992 372. See also Rosecrance 53-58.

²⁷ Walker 1992 373.

²⁸ Frey JH "Gambling: A Sociological Review" in Frey JH & Eadington WR (eds) *Gambling: Views from the Social Sciences. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 107 ("Frey") 110; Moodie GE "Perspective on Gambling" in Eadington WR & Cornelius JA (eds) *Gambling and Commercial Gaming: Essays in Business, Economics, Philosophy and Science* 1992 443-447.

²⁹ Giddens A "Fate, Risk and Security" in Cosgrave JF (ed) *The Sociology of Risk and Gambling Reader* 29.

³⁰ See, for example, LGB Main Report 53; Basham P & Luik J "The Social Benefits of Gambling" March 2011 *Economic Affairs* 13:1 ("Basham & Luik") 9-13.

³¹ Clotfelter & Cook 118-119; Rule & Sibanyoni 30-31.

³² See pages 41-42 above.

The focus then turned to the economic impact of gambling in general. Many countries operate lotteries in order to generate revenue.³³ In view of gambling's economic potential, the Gambling Review Commission recommended that South Africa's National Lottery should continue with its "revenue maximisation mandate".³⁴ Gambling can contribute to community projects too and stimulate the economic growth of a country.³⁵ It may benefit the tourism industry as well.³⁶ It was argued that, similar to the economic impact of gambling, promotional competitions may have an impact on the growth of a business.³⁷ However, from a policy perspective, it was submitted that promotional competitions should remain promotional tools and not become sources of revenue in themselves.³⁸

Even though gambling may have positive effects, its impact on people cannot be ignored. Reference was made to views that gambling is detrimental to people's work ethic and that it causes crime and other ills.³⁹ Gambling can have a negative effect on a gambler's family and other persons around the gambler.⁴⁰ Problem gambling seems to be one of the most prominent issues that surround gambling,⁴¹ although there is no consensus regarding its prevalence and extent.⁴² Yet, on local level, it seems that some South Africans do struggle with problem gambling and that the occurrence may be higher than in Europe.⁴³ Nevertheless, it appeared that not all forms of gambling lead to problem gambling,⁴⁴ and all persons are not necessarily problem gamblers.⁴⁵

³³ Scott C "Lotteries and Gaming: Some Public Policy Issues" in Scott M (ed) *Lotteries, gaming and public policy* 19; Clotfelter & Cook 219-221.

³⁴ 2010 Gambling Review 134, 138.

³⁵ Ligthelm, AA, Mango T & Jonkheid E *Socio-Economic Impact of Legalised Gambling in South Africa* 106; LGB Main Report 60-61.

³⁶ Leiper N "Tourism and Gambling" 1989 *GeoJournal* 19:3 269-275.

³⁷ See page 52 above.

³⁸ See page 52 above.

³⁹ See page 43 above. LGB Main Report 55-55.

⁴⁰ Carnelley 2000 195.

⁴¹ Collins P *Gambling and the public interest* 137; Carnelley M "The Proliferation of Gambling, Problem Gambling and Public Policy" 2000 *Obiter* 192-199 ("Carnelley 2000"); LGB Main Report 55-58; Gambling Review Commission *Review of the South African Gambling Industry and its Regulation* September 2010 ("2010 Gambling Review") 79; Blaszczynski A & Nower L "A pathways model of problem and pathological gambling" *Addiction* 97 487-499.

⁴² P Collins 131-132.

⁴³ 2010 Gambling Review 87-88.

⁴⁴ Walker 1992 394.

⁴⁵ Martinez TM *The Gambling Scene: Why People Gamble* 46.

Some views in respect of gambling were then examined.⁴⁶ It appeared that a popular argument against gambling centred on the claim that it instils in people the belief that they can get “something for nothing”.⁴⁷ Some allege that it gives people false hope and that governments should not rely on it as a revenue generating tool.⁴⁸ It is also criticised on the basis that it might be detrimental to the poor and less fortunate.⁴⁹ Some also out that gambling has a “human costs” element,⁵⁰ and that it causes gambling disorder, financial hardship and family problems. On the other hand, some authors were found to be in favour of the deregulating or liberalising gambling.⁵¹ They argue that the likelihood of harm is overemphasized,⁵² and that gambling does not necessarily lead to addiction or problem gambling.⁵³ Instead, they are of the view that gambling might have positive social or economic effects.⁵⁴

Since regulation is a key theme of this study, the concepts of law, vice and regulation were then explored.⁵⁵ Vice primarily affects the persons who engage in the relevant conduct and is characterised by habit and excess.⁵⁶ It was pointed out that laws are created in order to curb vice.⁵⁷ These laws are often based on morality, but the focus is shifting to harm prevention.⁵⁸ Crimes are committed when the relevant laws are contravened.⁵⁹

⁴⁶ See pages 52-55 above

⁴⁷ See, for example, Kaplan HR “The Social and Economic Impact of State Lotteries” in Frey JH & Eadington WR (eds) *Gambling: Views from the Social Sciences. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 104.

⁴⁸ Kaplan 104-105.

⁴⁹ Frey JH “Gambling: A Sociological Review” in Frey JH & Eadington WR (eds) *Gambling: Views from the Social Sciences. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 111.

⁵⁰ P Collins 34-36.

⁵¹ Basham & Luik 12. See also Littlewood M “Gambling and Regulation: Why there is Nothing to Fear from Liberalisation” March 2011 *Economic Affairs* 34-37 (“Littlewood”).

⁵² Littlewood 34; Basham & Luik 12.

⁵³ Littlewood 36-37.

⁵⁴ Littlewood 37; Basham & Luik 9-12.

⁵⁵ See pages 55-58 above.

⁵⁶ Leitzel J *Regulating Vice: Misguided Prohibitions and Realistic Controls* 4.

⁵⁷ See page 56 above. Dombrink J “Gambling and the Legalisation of Vice: Social movements, public health and public policy in the United States” in McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* 43; P Collins 21; Green SP “Vice Crimes and Preventive Justice” 10 October 2013 *Criminal Law and Philosophy* (published online at <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11572-013-9260-7>, accessed on 5 March 2015) 1.

⁵⁸ Green 10.

⁵⁹ Sutherland EH *Criminology* 11, 18.

While gambling has been prohibited during various eras and in a variety of jurisdictions,⁶⁰ it was found that attitudes toward gambling were shifting.⁶¹ Governments were realising that gambling merely went underground if it was prohibited.⁶² Gambling was losing its vice character, morality was playing a smaller roll and the church's view about gambling was shifting.⁶³ The position in South Africa appeared to be similar, where the focus is shifting from judging gambling on a moral basis to developing its revenue generating potential.⁶⁴ However, the legislature has noted that society and the country's economy should be protected against gambling's negative effects.⁶⁵ Accordingly, the policy is to guard against over-stimulation of the demand for gambling.⁶⁶ Even so, South Africa follows a revenue model in respect of lotteries specifically.⁶⁷

The policy issues regarding promotional competitions were examined as well.⁶⁸ It was submitted that these competitions are not completely harmless – they have gambling roots and marketers could misuse these competitions to consumers' detriment. One of the biggest risks may be that a consumer could suffer financial harm arising from uncontrolled and abusive promotional competitions.⁶⁹ There is also the risk that promotional competitions could serve as "precursors" of gambling and entice

⁶⁰ Dixon D *From prohibition to regulation: bookmaking, anti-gambling, and the law* ("Dixon") 6-7, 9.

⁶¹ See pages 59-61 above. See Dixon in general. See also Eadington WR "Ethical and Policy Considerations in the Spread of Commercial Gambling" in McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* ("Eadington 1996") 243; Rose IN "Gambling and the Law®: The Third Wave of Legal Gambling" 2010 *Villanova Sports & Entertainment Law Journal* 17:2 361 388-385; Rose IN "The Rise and Fall of the Third Wave: Gambling Will be Outlawed in Forty Years" in Eadington WR (ed) *Gambling and Public Policy: International Perspectives*.

⁶² P Collins 2.

⁶³ Dombink 49, 58; Eadington 1996 245; Smith JF "When it's Bad it's Better: Conflicting images of gambling in American culture" in McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* 102.

⁶⁴ Monnye S L "Gambling in South Africa: is online gambling not a component of gambling?" UNLV Gaming Law Journal Vol 3 (Fall 2012) ("Monnye") 221-222; National Gambling Board *The Social Impact of Gambling in South Africa: Qualitative Perspective 2013* 20-22, available online at <http://www.ngb.org.za/SiteResources/documents/Social%20impact%20of%20gambling%20qualitative%20perspective%202013.pdf>, accessed on 19 March 2015).

⁶⁵ Preamble to the National Gambling Act, 2004.

⁶⁶ Preamble to the National Gambling Act, 2004.

⁶⁷ 2010 Gambling Review 9.

⁶⁸ See pages 67-72 above.

⁶⁹ James JS "Regulating the Sweepstakes Industry: Are Consumers Close to Winning?" 2000 *Santa Clara Law Review* 41:2 581-618 ("James"); Unknown *Bank Night and Similar Devices as Illegal Lotteries* 1941 *Yale Law Journal* 50:5 941; Griffiths M "Instant-win products and prize draws: Are these forms of gambling?" 2003 *Journal of Gambling Issues* 9 ("Griffiths 2003"), <http://jgi.camh.net/doi/full/10.4309/jgi.2003.9.5>, accessed on 21 March 2015.

consumers to explore more serious forms of gambling.⁷⁰ In addition, consumers could be abused as a result of misleading, deceptive or fraudulent marketing in relation to promotional competitions.⁷¹ Promotional competitions are also often aimed at vulnerable persons, such as children⁷² and the elderly.⁷³ Furthermore, the internet and new media provide ever growing platforms for competitions, leading to additional issues, such as infringements on consumer privacy.⁷⁴

Yet, despite the abovementioned issues, it was submitted that promotional competitions do not present challenges that cannot be overcome. Consumer abuse can be prevented if the regulation of these competitions protects consumers against abusive and misleading practices and adequate measures are put in place to guard against financial abuse in particular. In this regard, it is submitted that the regulation of these competitions should continue to prohibit promoters from requiring participants to offer consideration or to pay entry fees. However, it is submitted that society has developed to such an extent that people should be able to distinguish between gambling and promotional competitions, even though those activities might share the same roots. This is borne out by the fact that promotional competitions are now the subject of consumer protection law instead of gambling law in South Africa. Perhaps it is telling that members of the public are not protesting against the conducting of promotional competitions, while some of them do protest against the establishment of new casinos. Consequently, it is submitted that promotional competitions should not be subject to legislation which is as strict as gambling law, provided that consumer protection law continues to shield consumers against possible abusive practices that might be associated with promotional competitions.

⁷⁰ Griffiths 2003 unpagued.

⁷¹ James 596.

⁷² Paxman K, Pelton T & Pelton FL "Should corporations be permitted to use promotional contests to manipulate the buying habits of children and youth?" in Pelton T, Reis G & Stewart S (eds) *Connections 2006* 65-76.

⁷³ Cushing C & Tierney J "Regulating the Sweepstakes Industry. Multistate Litigation" undated 6-7, <http://web.law.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/microsites/career-services/Regulating%20the%20Sweepstakes%20Industry.pdf> accessed on 27 March 2015.

⁷⁴ Seligman TJ "Marketing through Online Promotions" April 2004 *The Computer and Internet Lawyer* 21:4 22 24-26.

7.1.3 The consumer protection perspective

It was pointed out that the regulation of promotional competitions had shifted from gambling law to consumer protection law. Accordingly, it was deemed necessary to examine consumer protection law in further detail.⁷⁵ It was found that consumer protection law focuses primarily on the relationship between suppliers and consumers.⁷⁶ In particular, consumer protection law is in place to address the imbalance of power that exists between businesses and consumers, to protect consumers against unfair practices and to provide them with adequate remedies against suppliers.⁷⁷

7.1.4 The marketing context

Promotional competitions were the core focus of this study. In view of this, the marketing context was explored in order to understanding the marketing nature of these schemes. It was explained that marketing consists of activities aimed at attracting customers and clients.⁷⁸ In order to drive marketing, businesses need to employ marketing communication tools.⁷⁹ Sales promotion is one of these tools.⁸⁰ Sales promotion involves a number of activities, including promotional competitions.⁸¹ Promotional competitions were found to be unique components of sales promotion.⁸² They can be of great value to marketers,⁸³ but have some drawbacks too.⁸⁴ However, they can be successful if designed properly.⁸⁵

⁷⁵ See pages 72-76.

⁷⁶ See, for example, De Stadler 2013 1.

⁷⁷ Woker T "Why the need for consumer protection legislation? A look at some of the reasons behind the promulgation of the National Credit Act and the Consumer Protection Act" 2010 *Obiter* 217 230-231; Van Eeden 2013 1.

⁷⁸ See page 77 above. See, for example, American Association of Marketing "Definition of Marketing" <https://www.ama.org/AboutAMA/Pages/Definition-of-Marketing.aspx> (accessed on 20 April 2014).

⁷⁹ See, for example, Koekemoer L *Advertising and sales promotion* ("Koekemoer") 1.

⁸⁰ Koekemoer 4.

⁸¹ See Belch GE & Belch MA *Advertising and Promotion: An integrated marketing communications perspective* 518; Cook G "Sales Promotion" in Du Plessis *ea Integrated marketing communication: A contemporary approach* 192-208; Jethwaney J & Jain S *Advertising management* (2nd ed) (Jethwaney & Jain) Ch 12; Semenik *ea Advertising and promotion: An integrated brand approach* (6th international ed) 537-538; Yeshin T *Sales Promotion* 12.

⁸² Cummins J & Mullin R *Sales Promotion: How to create, implement and integrate campaigns that really work* (3rd ed) 203.

⁸³ Peattie K & Peattie S "Sales Promotion Competitions – A Survey" 1993 *Journal of Marketing Management* 9:3 271 283-285.

⁸⁴ Brown C *The Sales Promotion Handbook* 101-102.

⁸⁵ Brown 102.

7.1.5 The historical background

In Chapter 3, this thesis provided a brief overview of the history of gambling, lotteries and promotional competitions. The overview commenced with a brief history from a global perspective. It was pointed out that people have been gambling since ancient times.⁸⁶ The activity has its roots in religious practices, such as the drawing of lots.⁸⁷ (It turned out that cheating and fraud was present too, even in ancient times.)⁸⁸ Gambling grew in prominence during the rise of the Roman Empire.⁸⁹ Lotteries were popular as well, although they were conducted mostly for amusement and not in the present-day form.⁹⁰ The prevalence of gambling in ancient Rome led to the development of early gambling laws, and the activity was largely outlawed.⁹¹

The lottery in its modern form traces its roots back to the early Renaissance.⁹² Early lotteries of this type were conducted in Italy as well as the Low Countries.⁹³ One of the most famous of the early lotteries was the Queen's Lottery, which was organised in England during the reign of Elizabeth I.⁹⁴ The first rudimentary promotional competitions saw the light at around the same time.⁹⁵ Some traders used lotteries to dispose of merchandise that did not sell well.⁹⁶

⁸⁶ See pages 90-97 above. See, for example, Williams FE 1958 22-23; C l'Estrange Ewen *Lotteries and sweepstakes* ("Ewen") 19-22; Curtin L & Bernardo K *The History of Sweepstakes* ("Curtin & Bernardo") 11-22; Ashton J *A History of English Lotteries* ("Ashton") 2-3; Ezell JS *Fortune's Merry Wheel: The Lottery in America* ("Ezell") 2; Kopp SW & Taylor CR "Games, Contests, Sweepstakes, and Lotteries: Prize Promotion and Public Policy" in Sheth JN (series ed) & Fullerton RA (ed) *Research in Marketing: Explorations in the History of Marketing* 151 ("Kopp & Taylor") 152; Ottaway 27-30; Murray HJR *A History of Board-Games other than Chess* 7-9; Jones JP *Gambling Yesterday and Today* 13-21 ("Jones"); LGB Main Report; Schwartz DG *Roll the Bones: The History of Gambling* ("Schwartz") 6; Brenner & Brenner 1-18.

⁸⁷ Jones 16; Ewen 20.

⁸⁸ Schwartz 6. Loaded dice were discovered in ancient Egyptian tombs (LGB Main Report 26) and early Indian records mention "clogged" dice (Jones 14).

⁸⁹ Jones 19; Schwartz 25.

⁹⁰ Ezell 2; Ashton 3.

⁹¹ Carnelley M & Schrage E "Gambling Regulation: A comparison between the Roman and South African gambling laws" in Hoctor SV & Schwikkard PJ (eds) *The Exemplary Scholar: Essays in Honour of John Milton* ("Carnelley & Schrage"); Schwartz 28; Jones 20; Ewen 21.

⁹² Ezell 2; Ashton 4. According to Brenner and Brenner, Western Europe's first private lottery was conducted in Florence in 1530. (Brenner & Brenner 9)

⁹³ Ezell 2; Ashton 4; Ewen 25-28.

⁹⁴ Dean D "Elizabeth's Lottery: Political Culture and State Formation in Early Modern England" 2011 *The Journal of British Studies* 587 (Dean) 591; Ewen 34-64; Ezell 3-4; Ashton 4-24; Curtin & Bernardo 44-46.

⁹⁵ Ewen 23-24; Ashton 3-4. See also Van Niekerk JP *The Development of the Principles of Insurance Law in the Netherlands from 1500 to 1800* 104.

⁹⁶ Ewen 23-24; Ashton 3-4. See also Van Niekerk JP *The Development of the Principles of Insurance Law in the Netherlands from 1500 to 1800* 104.

The prevalence of sweepstakes and promotional competitions started to increase towards the end of the nineteenth century only.⁹⁷ Initially, these competitions were conducted in the form of gift enterprises, which were schemes arranged by merchants to attract customers and increase sales.⁹⁸ Newspapers made use of promotional competitions for this purpose too, particularly in England.⁹⁹ Their competitions took on various forms, such as missing word competitions¹⁰⁰ and limerick competitions.¹⁰¹ Prize promotions grew in popularity in the United States from the start of the twentieth century.¹⁰² In particular, sweepstakes became very prevalent in that country during the 1950s.¹⁰³

The discussion then turned to the South African history of gambling and related activities.¹⁰⁴ It was found that the first local gambling legislation dated back to 1658.¹⁰⁵ Subsequently, during the 1800s, each of the former South African colonies passed gambling legislation.¹⁰⁶ This was replaced with national gambling legislation, which was adopted in 1965.¹⁰⁷

Over the years, the South African courts have been called upon to interpret the provisions of the various gambling statutes. It was found that these judgements were useful in order to interpret gambling concepts.¹⁰⁸ For example, the judgement in *R v Lew Ho*¹⁰⁹ dealt with the essential elements of a lottery. Some other early judgements related specifically to promotional competitions and the question whether those

⁹⁷ Kopp & Taylor 156.

⁹⁸ Curtin & Bernardo 93.

⁹⁹ Miers D *Regulating Commercial Gambling* 176-184.

¹⁰⁰ Bender 144-145; Ewen 308.

¹⁰¹ Bender 146; Ewen 309-311.

¹⁰² Curtin & Bernardo 107-123; Kopp & Taylor 158-164.

¹⁰³ Curtin & Bernardo 7.

¹⁰⁴ See pages 107-124 above.

¹⁰⁵ Carnelley M "Offences relating to gambling and lotteries" in Milton JRL, Cowling MG and Hooror SV *South African Criminal Law and Procedure Vol III: Statutory Offences* 2nd ed, service number 21, ("Carnelley 2011") 2.

¹⁰⁶ Carnelley 2011 2-3; Lötter S "The odds against gambling" 1994 *South African Journal of Criminal Justice* (7) 189 ("Lötter") 192.

¹⁰⁷ See the Gambling Act, 1965.

¹⁰⁸ See pages 109-113 above.

¹⁰⁹ 1937 AD 215.

competitions constituted lotteries.¹¹⁰ A few judgements related to whether competitions contravened the provisions of the Gambling Act, 1965.¹¹¹

South African gambling law underwent reform towards the end of the 1900s. The process was set in motion by the work of the Commission of Inquiry into Lotteries, Sports Pools, Fundraising Activities and Certain Matters relating to Gambling.¹¹² This was followed up by the Lotteries and Gambling Board's investigations and report.¹¹³ The Lotteries Act, 1997 was promulgated as a result of this process and established South Africa's first National Lottery. The Lotteries Act, 1997 introduced the first provisions that allowed promoters to conduct lawful promotional competitions.¹¹⁴ Those provisions featured in two prominent judgements of the Supreme Court of Appeal, in which the relevant competitions were found to be unlawful.¹¹⁵

7.1.6 Promotional competitions in New Zealand and Great Britain

Chapter 4 consists of a survey of New Zealand and Great Britain's laws that relate to promotional competitions. The discussion commenced with an overview of the development of New Zealand's gambling related laws.¹¹⁶ In New Zealand, gambling is regulated by the Gambling Act¹¹⁷ (the "NZ Gambling Act") as well as the Racing Act.¹¹⁸ Gambling is unlawful in New Zealand, unless it is authorised or exempted by the NZ Gambling Act or the Racing Act.

Chance based prize promotions could be regarded as gambling or lotteries under the NZ Gambling Act.¹¹⁹ However, the NZ Gambling Act specifically authorises sales promotion schemes (a synonym for promotional competitions).¹²⁰ The key elements

¹¹⁰ See, for example, *R v Cotterill* 1927 CPD 48; *R v Ellis Brown* 1938 AD 98; *R v Morrison* 1914 TPD 329; *Silberman v Hodkinson* 1927 TPD 562; *R v Bertram Davis* 1915 TPD 155.

¹¹¹ See, for example, *Minister of Mineral and Energy Affairs v Lucky Horseshoe (Pty) Ltd* 1994 (2) SA 46 (A); *S v Pepsi-Cola (Pty) Ltd* 1985 (3) SA 141 (C). See pages 113-115 above.

¹¹² Under chairmanship of Judge Howard.

¹¹³ *Main Report on Gambling in the Republic of South Africa* (RP 85/1995).

¹¹⁴ Lotteries Act, 1997, s54.

¹¹⁵ See *FirstRand Bank v National Lotteries Board* [2008] 3 All SA 121 (SCA); *National Lotteries Board v Bruss NO* [2009] 2 All SA 164 (SCA).

¹¹⁶ See pages 127-129 above.

¹¹⁷ 2003.

¹¹⁸ 2003.

¹¹⁹ See, for example, Bachman E, Knox L and Peacock R "New Zealand" in *International Promotion Marketing Law Book* 192, and the definitions of "lottery" and "gambling" in the NZ Gambling Act.

¹²⁰ See s18 of the NZ Gambling Act.

of a sales promotion schemes are set out in the definition of that term.¹²¹ In essence, such a scheme amounts to gambling which is aimed at the promotion of goods or services, where: (a) participation requires the purchase of goods or services (provided that the price does not exceed “the usual retail price”), (b) the period during which the gambling will take place is defined, (c) participants must not pay consideration in order to participate, and (d) the outcome is determine randomly or wholly by chance, or partly by chance and knowledge or skill.¹²² A promoter would therefore have to ensure that its competition complies with all of those requirements in order for it to be authorised by the NZ Gambling Act.

Apart from complying with the key requirements relating to sales promotion schemes, promoters in New Zealand must ensure that they do not offer prohibited prizes.¹²³ They must disclose the retail value of prizes as well.¹²⁴ In addition, they need to ensure that the competition does not constitute remote interactive gambling (unless the competition is conducted in New Zealand).¹²⁵ The requirements of the Fair Trading Act¹²⁶ and self-regulatory industry codes must also be adhered to.¹²⁷

The discussion then turned to Great Britain’s gambling related law. This commenced with a brief overview of the historical background and included a discussion of a number of British cases, which could serve as useful guidance in determining whether or not a competition constitutes a lottery.¹²⁸ The focus then shifted to a discussion of the current legislation in Great Britain: the National Lottery Act 1993 and the Gambling Act 2005.

¹²¹ NZ Gambling Act, s4.

¹²² Definition of “sales promotion” scheme in s4 of the NZ Gambling Act.

¹²³ S17.

¹²⁴ S17A.

¹²⁵ S4(1) and S4(1)(b)(iv) in particular.

¹²⁶ 1986. In particular, see s17 of the Fair Trading Act.

¹²⁷ For example, the Advertising Standards Authority’s Codes of Advertising.

¹²⁸ See pages 148-157 above. See, for example, *Taylor v Smetten* 11 QBD 207; *Willis v Young and Stenbridge* 1907 1 KB 448; *Witty v World Service, Ltd* 1935 All ER 243 (CD); of *Director of Public Prosecutions v Bradfute and associates, Ltd.* [1967] 1 All ER 112 (QB); *Whitbread & Co Ltd v Bell; Bell v Whitbread & Co Ltd* 1970 All ER 64; *News of the World v Friend* [1973] 1 All ER 422 (HL); *Reader’s Digest Association Ltd v Williams* [1976] 2 All ER 737 (QBD) *Imperial Tobacco Ltd v Attorney-General* [1980] All ER 866 (HL).

In Great Britain, a prize promotion (the equivalent of a promotional competition) will not constitute gambling unless it amounts to gaming,¹²⁹ betting¹³⁰ or participating in a lottery.¹³¹ Consequently, if the promotion does not fall within the ambit of any of these activities, it will not be unlawful.¹³² It might be difficult in some circumstances to determine whether or not a promotion constitutes one of these activities. For example, in some situations it might be unclear whether a promotion is a lottery because participants are required to purchase goods or services. Schedule 2 to the Gambling Act 2005 contains a number of provisions that provide guidance in this regard.

In addition to the requirements of the Gambling Act 2005, promoters need to comply with the provisions of the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008. These Regulations were enacted in order to incorporate the provisions of the European Union's Unfair Commercial Practices Directive¹³³ into British law. Furthermore, promoters need to ensure that their promotions do not contravene the provisions of self-regulatory industry codes.¹³⁴ In this regard, a number of rulings by the Advertising Standards Authority were referred to.¹³⁵ It is submitted that the rulings provide practical examples of situations where prize promotions did not comply with the relevant industry codes. They can serve as warnings to promoters, but can assist them to interpret some of the relevant provisions as well.

It was submitted that the relevant provisions of New Zealand and Great Britain's legislation present examples of the manner in which promotional competitions can be regulated.¹³⁶ It is submitted that the most useful lesson from those countries' legislation lies in the fact that they contain clear provisions which authorise such competitions. The provisions are not overly complex, and provide guidelines that can

¹²⁹ See s6 of the Gambling Act 2005.

¹³⁰ See ss9 to 11 of the Gambling Act 2005.

¹³¹ See s14 of the Gambling Act 2005.

¹³² S339. Crown G, Bray O & Earle R *Advertising Law and Regulation* (2nd ed) ("Crown 2010") 234; Dresden B "United Kingdom" in *International Promotion Marketing Law Book* (2nd ed) ("Dresden 2010") 275.

¹³³ Directive 2005/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2005 concerning unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices in the internal market.

¹³⁴ For example, the Code of Non-Broadcast Advertising, Sales Promotion and Direct Marketing, the PhonepayPlus Code of Practice, and the Direct Marketing Association's Code.

¹³⁵ See pages 177-180 above.

¹³⁶ See pages 181-182 above.

be used in order to determine whether or not the provisions relating to the payment of consideration have been breached.

7.1.7 The current regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa

Chapter 4 contains an analysis of and commentary on the legislation that governs promotional competitions in South Africa at present. The common law relating to lotteries was discussed first and a number of South African cases were referred to.¹³⁷ From these cases, it appeared that the common law required chance, consideration and a prize to be present in order for an arrangement to constitute a lottery.¹³⁸

The discussion then turned to the Lotteries Act.¹³⁹ A lottery has three key elements under the Lotteries Act: (a) game (or the like); (b) prize; and (c) lot or chance.¹⁴⁰ Even though consideration or subscription is one of the elements of a lottery under common law, it was pointed out that the Lotteries Act's definition of "lottery" did not contain a reference to subscription. However, with reference to case law and other authors,¹⁴¹ it was concluded that subscription had to be present in order for an arrangement to constitute a lottery.¹⁴² The role of lot or chance in a lottery was examined, and the guidance found in case law was considered.¹⁴³

If a scheme is found to contain the elements of a lottery, or it contravenes the provisions of section 56, it will be unlawful.¹⁴⁴ However, if the Lotteries Act or any other legislation authorises that scheme, it will not be unlawful.¹⁴⁵ In the past, section 54 of the Lotteries Act provided an exemption for promotional competitions, but those

¹³⁷ See page 185 above.

¹³⁸ Bell, Dewar & Hall *Kelsey Stuart's The Newspaperman's Guide to the Law* (5th ed) 204; Dendy M "Lotteries and the Law" 1989 *Witwatersrand University Student Law Review* 1 43 49-50; Dendy M "Pitfalls of Advertising – II. Lotteries." 1988 *Businessman's Law* 17 77 78; Carnelley 2011 59; *R v Cranston* 1914 AD 238; *R v Lew Hoi* 1937 AD 215 220; *Minister of Mineral and Energy Affairs v Lucky Horseshoe (Pty) Ltd* 1994 (2) SA 46 (A) at 52.

¹³⁹ 57 of 1997.

¹⁴⁰ See the definition of "lottery" in s1 of the Lotteries Act.

¹⁴¹ For example, *FirstRand Bank v National Lotteries Board* [2008] 3 All SA 121 (SCA); *National Lotteries Board v Bruss NO* [2009] 2 All SA 164 (SCA); Carnelley 2011 62; Abdurahman Z "Everybody's done it" 2006 (December) *Without Prejudice* 37-38.

¹⁴² See page 196 above.

¹⁴³ For example, *R v Bertram Davis* 1915 TPD 155; *R v James and Tennant* 1919 TPD 47; *R v Childs* 1924 TPD 155; *R v Fleetwood* 1924 TPD 96; *R v Cotterill* 1927 CPD 48 54; *Royal Baking Powder Co v Crystallisers Ltd* 1928 CPD 448; *R v Colborne* 1932 TPD 264 268; *R v Scandrogolio* 1951 (2) SA 297 (SR) 281; *R v Gondo* 1951 (3) SA 509 (A); *S v Alexander* 1962 (3) SA 649 (A); *S v Midas Novelties (Pty) Ltd* 1966 (1) SA 492 (A).

¹⁴⁴ S56 of the Lotteries Act.

¹⁴⁵ S56.

provisions were repealed by the CPA. The latter now regulates promotional competitions, but it does not expressly authorise such competitions. It was submitted that promotional competitions would still be lawful, in view of the CPA's provisions, but that the uncertain situation had to be clarified.¹⁴⁶

The CPA's provisions that relate to promotional competitions were examined in detail. The provisions were first compared to the provisions of section 54 of the Lotteries Act.¹⁴⁷ It was found that the CPA resolved some of the difficulties that were encountered when promotional competitions were still regulated by the Lotteries Act and that it removed some of the requirements that existed under that statute. It appeared that the CPA provided for improved regulation of promotional competitions.

The circumstances in which the CPA and its promotional competition provisions would apply were then dealt with. It was pointed out that the CPA does not apply in all situations.¹⁴⁸ As such, it was not entirely certain whether an organiser of a promotional competition had to comply with the CPA's provisions if it did not apply to all potential competition participants. The elements of the CPA's definition of "promotional competition" were analysed, and the role of lot or chance was examined. It was submitted that the CPA would only apply if prizes were distributed by way of lot or chance and that one would have to determine whether or not chance is the determining factor in the relevant competition.¹⁴⁹ Further, the CPA's promotional competition provisions applied to promotional competitions that were conducted in the ordinary course of business only.¹⁵⁰ Case law and authors' views in this regard were examined,¹⁵¹ and it was concluded that one had to determine whether or not the competition itself was conducted in the ordinary course of business, even though it might be a once-off competition.¹⁵² The question was not whether the promoter

¹⁴⁶ See page 199-202 above.

¹⁴⁷ See pages 207-210 above.

¹⁴⁸ See page 210-213 above.

¹⁴⁹ In considering the legal position, the author referred to *S v Bryant* 1962 (2) SA 702 (N) and *S v Alexander* 1962 (3) SA 649 (A) and evaluated De Stadler's view (De Stadler 2013 66).

¹⁵⁰ See page 218 above.

¹⁵¹ For example, the court's reasoning in *Amalgamated Banks of South Africa Bpk v De Goede* 1997 (4) SA 66 (SCA).

¹⁵² See page 218 above.

ordinarily conducted promotional competitions. Instead, one had to evaluate the specific competition and the manner in which it was conducted.

The role players in promotional competitions were then identified. It was found that the CPA's definition of "promoter" referred to a variety of persons and entities.¹⁵³ These include not only the actual organiser, but sponsors of the competition as well. In view of this and their potential liability, all involved parties have to ensure that a promotional competition complies with the CPA. The author also examined the CPA's provisions relating to the persons that may not participate in a promotional competition.¹⁵⁴ It appeared that the provisions were inserted in the CPA to ensure the fairness and integrity of the competition.¹⁵⁵ However, the provisions are very wide and will be difficult to apply in practice. Further, it was found that the CPA's regulations in this regard were not congruous with those found in section 36, and that the CPA Regulations seemed to be *ultra vires* to some extent.¹⁵⁶

This was followed by a discussion of the CPA's provisions relating to misleading marketing in the context of promotional competitions. While the purpose of those provisions was clear, it was submitted that some of the provisions were difficult to interpret in practice. For example, it was uncertain whether promoters were prohibited from offering prizes if consumers had to incur cost or expense in order to make use of those prizes.¹⁵⁷ In the context of marketing, the author examined the CPA's requirements pertaining to offers that invite consumers to enter competitions. It appeared to be somewhat unpractical to comply with those requirements, but it was submitted that the requirements could be satisfied by displaying competition terms and conditions on promoters' websites.¹⁵⁸ The discussion then focussed on competition rules in particular.¹⁵⁹ The requirements for such rules were examined and, with reference to case law, the importance of carefully drafting competition rules was

¹⁵³ See pages 221-223 above.

¹⁵⁴ See page 222 above.

¹⁵⁵ See *Smart v The Really Great Brand Company (Pty) Ltd* [2008] 2 All SA 474 (C) 483.

¹⁵⁶ See pages 222-223 above.

¹⁵⁷ See page 225 above.

¹⁵⁸ See pages 238-240 above.

¹⁵⁹ See pages 232-238 above.

pointed out.¹⁶⁰ The legal nature of competition offers was examined, and it was concluded that they would lead to binding agreements if accepted by consumers.¹⁶¹

The study focussed on the CPA's provisions relating to consideration in promotional competitions.¹⁶² It was clear that the CPA prohibited promoters from requiring participants to pay consideration in order to enter promotional competitions.¹⁶³ However, it was unclear whether promoters could require participants to purchase goods or services in order to enter. After analysing the relevant provisions, it was submitted that promoters were not prohibited from requiring participants to purchase goods or services.¹⁶⁴

The CPA's provisions relating to the overseeing of promotional competitions and the retention of documentation and information were considered.¹⁶⁵ It was found that it would be expensive for promoters to comply with the oversight requirements, and that those requirements were impractical, particularly in the case of instant competitions that were conducted on the internet.¹⁶⁶ The information retention requirements were very onerous and some of the provisions were unclear.¹⁶⁷

The various issues identified in the course of the research will be addressed in the recommendations at the end of this chapter.

7.1.8 Self-regulation of promotional competitions

Chapter 5 dealt with the industry codes that regulate promotional competitions. It commenced with a discussion of the role and purpose of self-regulation. Some of the advantages and disadvantages of this form of regulation were examined. The International Chamber of Commerce's Consolidated Code of Advertising and Marketing Communications Practice was referred to as an example of an industry

¹⁶⁰ See page 237 above. *Van de Wetering Engineering v Regent Insurance* (383/2013) [2014] ZASCA 18 (26 March 2014); *Smart v The Really Great Brand Company (Pty) Ltd* [2008] 2 All SA 474 (C).

¹⁶¹ See pages 241-242 above. See *Smart v The Really Great Brand Company (Pty) Ltd* [2008] 2 All SA 474 (C) 484.

¹⁶² See pages 226-229 above.

¹⁶³ See page 227 above. S36(3)(a).

¹⁶⁴ See pages 227-228 above.

¹⁶⁵ See pages 242-244 above.

¹⁶⁶ See page 243 above.

¹⁶⁷ See page 243 above.

code that regulates promotional competitions.¹⁶⁸ Examples of self-regulation in the United States and Europe were mentioned too.¹⁶⁹

The discussion then turned to South Africa. In particular, it focussed on the relevant provisions of the Advertising Standards Authority's Code of Advertising Practice¹⁷⁰ as well as the Wireless Application Service Providers' Association Code.¹⁷¹ The author discussed a number of rulings by these self-regulatory organisations in order to illustrate how the provisions of their codes are applied in practice.¹⁷² It was submitted that those rulings could serve as guidance to promoters of promotional competitions.¹⁷³

7.2 Recommendations

7.2.1 Reinsert the “promotional competition” definition in the Lotteries Act

Before the Lotteries Amendment Act, 2013 took effect, the Lotteries Act contained a definition for “promotional competition”, which referred to a promotional competition as contemplated in section 36 of the CPA. The Lotteries Amendment Act deleted this definition, but it should be reinserted. This is because the term is still used within the text of the Lotteries Act, including section 1 (definitions of “lottery” and “participant”), section 56 and section 57. This should also be done in order for the promotional competitions, as defined in the CPA, to be authorised in the Lotteries Act. Accordingly, it is suggested that the following definition can be reinserted in the Lotteries Act:

'promotional competition' has the meaning set out in section 36 of the Consumer Protection Act, 2008.

7.2.2 Remove redundant provisions from the Lotteries Act

Section 54 of the Lotteries Act was repealed by the CPA. However, there are still a number of references to section 54 within the Lotteries Act. These references are found in section 1 (definition of “participant”), section 10(d), and section 56(b) and (c). The references to section 54 are redundant and should be removed. If it is found that

¹⁶⁸ See pages 257-260 above.

¹⁶⁹ See pages 260-262 above.

¹⁷⁰ See pages 263-270 above.

¹⁷¹ See pages 270-273 above.

¹⁷² See pages 268-270 and 273-273 above.

¹⁷³ See page 275 above.

there is still a need for cross-references in those sections, the relevant sections should cross-refer to section 36 of the CPA instead. For example, section 56 could be amended as follows:

Unless authorised by or under this Act or any other law, no person shall conduct through any newspaper, broadcasting service or any other electronic device, or in connection with any trade or business or the sale of any article to the public-

- (a) any competition or lottery other than one authorised by or under this Act in which prizes are offered for forecasts of the result of either-
 - (i) a future event; or
 - (ii) a past event, the result of which has not yet been ascertained or is not yet generally known;
- (b) any competition other than a promotional competition contemplated in section **[54]36 of the Consumer Protection Act, 2008** in which success does not depend to a substantial degree on skill. **]; or**
- (c) **any promotional competition which is the subject of a declaration contemplated in section 54 (4).]**¹⁷⁴

In order to avoid any doubt, the Regulations regarding Promotional Competitions, 2002 and the Regulations regarding Promotional Competitions, 2003 should be withdrawn as well.¹⁷⁵ (These regulations were issued pursuant to the provisions of the former section 54 of the Lotteries Act. Usually, regulations will no longer be of any force if the empowering statute or provisions have been repealed. However, it would remove all possible confusion if the regulations are withdrawn expressly.)

7.2.3 Authorise promotional competitions in the Lotteries Act

It is unclear whether promotional competitions are specifically authorised and lawful. This is, *inter alia*, due to the fact that sections 56 and 57(1) prohibit the conducting of promotional competitions and other competitions unless they are authorised by the Lotteries Act or any other law. However, the Lotteries Act does not authorise promotional competitions and, although the CPA regulates promotional competitions, it does not expressly authorise them.

In view of this situation, it is recommended that the Lotteries Act should specifically authorise the conducting of promotional competitions as defined in the CPA. It is recommended that the Lotteries Act should refer to promotional competitions *as defined*

¹⁷⁴ In this recommendation and the others that follow below, square brackets indicate text that should be removed and underlined text indicates wording that should be inserted.

¹⁷⁵ See pages 121-122 regarding these regulations.

in the CPA, and not *conducted in compliance with* the CPA's requirements. This is because the CPA might not apply to all promotional competitions, for example if the goods or services being promoted could not reasonably be the subject of a transaction to which the CPA will apply and if the CPA does not apply the promoter would not be required to comply with the CPA's requirements.¹⁷⁶ It is submitted that the intention behind section 36 of the CPA is to allow promoters to conduct promotional competitions to promote their goods and services and to free such competitions from the application of gambling law. Accordingly, if a competition falls within the CPA's definition of "promotional competition", but the CPA does not apply in such a case, the competition must still be authorised. However, it is submitted that section 36 of the CPA defines promotional competitions sufficiently. As such, if a competition meets the requirement of section 36's definition, it would still be lawful if the Lotteries Act authorises competitions that can be categorised as promotional competitions as contemplated in section 36 of the CPA. This would also prevent competitions that are not conducted for the purposes of promoting goods or services from being authorised.

Accordingly, it is recommended that the legislature should consider inserting in the Lotteries Act an explicit authorisation in respect of promotional competitions. This could be done in a manner similar to section 18 of New Zealand's Gambling Act 2003.¹⁷⁷ Since section 54 of the Lotteries Act has been repealed, one could consider inserting the authorising provision as a new section 54 of the Lotteries Act. It is suggested that such a section could read as follows:

A promotional competition, as defined in the Consumer Protection Act, 2008, is authorised by this Act.

7.2.4 Amend provisions relating to competitions with low-value prizes

One must keep in mind that section 36(11) of the CPA allows the Minister of Trade and Industry to determine a threshold for "competitions with low-value prizes". Competitions that do not reach this threshold will be excluded from the CPA's definition of "promotional competition".¹⁷⁸ (A recommendation regarding the current monetary

¹⁷⁶ See s5(1)(b)(i) of the CPA.

¹⁷⁷ S18 of New Zealand's Gambling Act 2003 provides as follows: "A sales promotion scheme is authorised by this Act".

¹⁷⁸ See s36(11)(a).

threshold will be made below.)¹⁷⁹ Accordingly, if the Lotteries Act is amended to specifically authorise promotional competitions as defined in the CPA, this could lead to a situation where a competition with low-value prizes becomes unauthorised (because such a competition would be excluded from the definition of “promotional competition”).

It is submitted that this situation can be avoided. Instead of excluding competitions with low-value prizes from the definition of “promotional competition”, one could rather provide that section 36’s requirements will not apply to a promotional competition in which the value of the prizes is less than the threshold prescribed from time to time. This would thus serve as an exemption instead of an exclusion from the definition of “promotional competition”. It is suggested that this exemption could be inserted by way of a new section 36(12), which could read as follows:

(12) The provisions of section 36 do not apply to a promotional competition unless the value of any prize in that competition exceeds the monetary threshold prescribed in terms of subsection (11).

It will be noted that the proposed section 36(12) refers to a situation where the value of *any prize* exceeds the monetary threshold. This would mean that the requirements of section 36 would become applicable to a competition even if only one prize has a value that exceeds such limit. This would therefore allow promoters to conduct competitions in which a large number of low-value prizes can be awarded.

If the proposed section 36(12) is inserted in the CPA, one would have to amend the wording of section 36(11)(a), which allows the Minister to determine the threshold for “excluding competitions with low-value prizes from the definition of ‘promotional competition’”. The following amended wording is proposed in this regard:¹⁸⁰

- (11) The Minister may prescribe-
- (a) a monetary threshold for the purpose of excluding the operation of the provisions of section 36 in respect of competitions with low- value prizes **[from the definition of 'promotional competition']**, as contemplated in section 36(12);
 - (b) minimum standards and forms for keeping records associated with promotional competitions; and

¹⁷⁹ See page 300 below.

¹⁸⁰ Proposed deletions appear in square brackets and insertions are underlined.

- (c) audit and reporting requirements in respect of promotional competitions.

If a new section 36(12) is inserted and section 36(11)(a) has been amended, one will also need to amend the definition of “promotional competition” in section 36(1)(d). It is suggested that section 36(1)(d)(ii) can then be removed in order for the new definition to read as follows:¹⁸¹

- (d) **'promotional competition'** means any competition, game, scheme, arrangement, system, plan or device for distributing prizes by lot or chance if it is conducted in the ordinary course of business for the purpose of promoting a producer, distributor, supplier, or association of any such persons, or the sale of any goods or services, irrespective of whether a participant is required to demonstrate any skill or ability before being awarded a prize.

7.2.5 Increase the monetary threshold of prizes

In terms of section 36(11)(a) of the CPA, the Minister of Trade and Industry may determine a threshold “for the purpose of excluding competitions with low-value prizes from the definition of ‘promotional competition’”. Currently, this threshold is R1.00. This means that virtually all promotional competitions will be governed by section 36 of the CPA. It is submitted that the intention behind this threshold is to free promoters from section 36’s requirements in circumstances where the prizes have a negligible value and that this exemption serves a valid purpose. However, it is suggested that the R1.00 threshold is too low and that it does not have any practical effect. Consequently, it is recommended that the threshold should be increased to at least R100.

7.2.6 Review section 56 of the Lotteries Act

It needs to be considered whether section 56 should remain in the Lotteries Act. This study pointed out that section 56 mirrors the provisions of section 14(1) of the United Kingdom’s former Lotteries and Amusements Act 1976.¹⁸² The origin of those provisions can be found in competitions that used to be conducted by newspapers.¹⁸³ In Britain, the provisions were created to prohibit competitions which did not necessarily qualify as lotteries – particularly in a time where there was no statutory

¹⁸¹ In order to make it easier to read the amended definition, the wording of section 36(1)(d)(i) has been removed and is not displayed (instead of using square brackets).

¹⁸² See page 191 above.

¹⁸³ See page 191 above.

definition for “lottery”.¹⁸⁴ In the United Kingdom’s 2001 gambling review,¹⁸⁵ the commission found that there was no basis for outlawing prize competitions and that such competitions should not fall under gambling authorities’ jurisdiction.¹⁸⁶ Instead, it was of the view that a statutory definition for the term “lottery” would be helpful in order to create a distinction between lotteries and prize competitions.¹⁸⁷ Subsequent to the said review, the United Kingdom’s Gambling Act 2005 was promulgated. It specifically excludes prize promotions from the scope of the Gambling Act 2005. Section 339 states that “[participating] in a competition or other arrangement under which a person may win a prize is not gambling” unless it constitutes gaming, a lottery, or betting as contemplated in the Gambling Act 2005. Furthermore, the said statute does not contain the provisions found in the United Kingdom’s former Lotteries and Amusements Act 1976, which provisions were very similar to section 56 of South Africa’s Lotteries Act. However, one must bear in mind that promotional competitions are not specifically authorised in the United Kingdom. The Gambling Act 2004 merely records that they do not constitute gambling, as long as they fall outside the scope of betting, wagering and lotteries. Accordingly, a promoter would still have to ensure that its competition does not contain the elements which would cause the competition to be regarded as betting, wagering or a lottery.

Perhaps the door is still open for debating whether section 56 should be repealed and replaced with a provision similar to section 339 of the United Kingdom’s Gambling Act 2005. The concern might be that this will weaken the prohibition on unauthorised lotteries, but section 57(1) already prohibits unauthorised lotteries in general. However, if section 56 is repealed and replaced with a provision similar to section 339 of the Gambling Act 2005, one would have to ensure that the provision only allows promotional competitions to the extent that they are authorised by law, and provided that they do not constitute, gambling or an unauthorised lottery. In this regard, it must be noted that section 339 of the United Kingdom’s Gambling Act 2005 refers to “gaming” and “betting” – terms that are defined in the Gambling Act 2005. South Africa’s National Gambling Act, 2004, does not contain definitions for “gaming”, “betting” or “gambling”, neither does it prohibit gambling in general. As such, the

¹⁸⁴ See fn 48 in chapter 5 above.

¹⁸⁵ Gambling Review Report (Cm 5206) (“Budd Report”).

¹⁸⁶ Par 28.7 of the Budd Report.

¹⁸⁷ Par 28.7 of the Budd Report.

legislature would have to consider creating definitions for those terms and for the more general concept of “gambling”. Ultimately, all of this might lead to significant changes to the structuring of South Africa’s lotteries and gambling legislation. In view of this, it may be best to leave section 56 in the Lotteries Act, provided that it is amended in order to provide a clear exception for promotional competitions as defined in the CPA.

7.2.7 Address the subscription element in the Lotteries Act

The position regarding the subscription element of lotteries needs to be clarified. At present, the Lotteries Act does not state that consideration or subscription is an element of a lottery. However, section 63 provides that the Lotteries Act will not apply to a lottery which does not involve subscription. Therefore, it seems that a scheme will be a lottery if it involves subscription. Accordingly, the Lotteries Act must state whether subscription must be present in order for a scheme to be a lottery. This could be done by inserting a reference to subscription (consideration) in the definition of “lottery” in section 1 of the Lotteries Act, as follows:

‘lottery’ includes –

- (i) any game, scheme, arrangement, system, plan, promotional competition or device for distributing prizes by lot or chance; and
 - (ii) any game, scheme, arrangement, system, plan, competition or device, which the Minister may by notice in the Gazette declare to be a lottery,
- in respect of which there is subscription.¹⁸⁸

The proposed wording makes use of the term “subscription”, which is already defined in the Lotteries Act. It is submitted that the proposed wording also ties into the existing wording of section 63, which states: “Nothing in this Act shall apply in relation to any lottery, sports pool or competition in respect of which there is no subscription”. Having said this, it must be kept in mind that the Lotteries Act’s definition of “subscription” is very wide, perhaps too wide. It is therefore submitted that the scope of the definition should be reduced by removing tickets, coupons, entry forms and other entry materials in order to avoid a situation where such materials are regarded as consideration – which would render many promotional competitions unlawful.

¹⁸⁸ In order to make it easier to read, the definition has been rewritten without indicating the specific amendments.

7.2.8 Application of the CPA to promotional competitions

It is not entirely clear whether a promoter needs to comply with the CPA if the goods or services that are promoted might be the subject of a transaction that will be governed by the CPA. In part, this uncertainty is caused by the wording of section 5(1)(b) of the CPA. It would be useful if the CPA contained wording which clarified this position. If the intention is that the CPA should apply to all promotional competitions, even where the CPA will not apply to a transaction that arises as a result of the promotional competition, one could insert a provision to deal with this in section 36. Such a provision could state that the provisions of section 36 will apply even if a transaction relating to the relevant goods or services might be exempted from the CPA's application by virtue of the provisions of sections 5(2), (3) or (4).

7.2.9 The role of chance in promotional competitions

It appears that there is uncertainty regarding the level of chance that must be involved in a promotional competition before it will be governed by section 36 of the CPA. This might be due to the concluding text of section 36(1): "irrespective of whether a participant is required to demonstrate any skill or ability before being awarded a prize". In order to address this uncertainty, it is recommended that guidance should be provided in this regard. This could be done by inserting clarifying provisions in the CPA. Alternatively, the National Consumer Commission ("NCC") could issue guidelines relating to the conducting of promotional competitions and the chance element in particular.

It would be difficult to describe chance definitively and an attempt at codifying the chance element in the CPA might not be very successful. As such, it might be better if the NCC issues guidelines, which could be updated from time to time. Section 96 of the CPA obliges the NCC to promote "awareness of consumer protection matters", which includes the providing of guidance and "non-binding opinion[s] on the interpretation of any provisions of [the CPA]".¹⁸⁹ A code of practice regarding promotional competitions could even be issued. Section 93 empowers the NCC to develop codes of practice regarding "any [...] matter to better achieve the purposes of

¹⁸⁹ CPA, S96(b)(i).

the Act”.¹⁹⁰ Similar guidance has been issued in New Zealand by the Department of Internal Affairs¹⁹¹ and in Great Britain by the Gambling Commission.¹⁹²

It is submitted that the promotional competition guidelines should explain that a promotional competition will only fall within the ambit of the CPA if chance is the substantial, prevailing, dominant or determining factor in the relevant competition. *Inter alia*, the guidelines should clarify the distinction between skill and chance.¹⁹³ In amplifying the guidelines, one could follow the example of Great Britain’s Gambling Act 2005.¹⁹⁴ It explains that a competition will be based on chance if there is a purported skill requirement, but the requirement will not deter a reasonable number of persons from entering the competition¹⁹⁵ or if it will not exclude a reasonable portion of participants from becoming eligible to receive a prize.¹⁹⁶ In other words, the skill requirement must be challenging enough in order to avoid a situation where most participants can meet the requirement (for example, by answering a very simple general knowledge question). The requirement should be of such a nature that some people might find it too difficult and decide not to enter the competition. In the proposed guidelines, the NCC could echo the British Gambling Commission’s suggestion that competition organisers should conduct some test cases before running a competition in order to establish whether the skill requirement is in fact too easy or simple.¹⁹⁷ The guidelines could list some indicators which can be used to determine whether a competition is based on skill.¹⁹⁸ In its guidance note, the British Gambling Commission mentioned that skill might be required if a competition involves a multiple choice question and sufficient, realistic answers are provided, if “the correct answer is not obviously given close to the question”, if many questions are asked or if a question requires “complex logical” or mathematical ability.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁰ CPA, s93(1)(d).

¹⁹¹ Department of Internal Affairs “Gambling Fact Sheet #9: Sales Promotion Schemes”.

¹⁹² Gambling Commission, December 2009 “Prize competitions and free draws: The requirements of the Gambling Act 2005” (“GC Guidance”).

¹⁹³ See pages 196-198 for a discussion regarding the distinction between chance and skill and the relevant factors to consider.

¹⁹⁴ See Gambling Act 2005, s 14(5). See GC Guidance, par 3.3.

¹⁹⁵ Gambling Act 2005, s14(5)(b).

¹⁹⁶ Gambling Act 2005, s14(5)(a).

¹⁹⁷ GC Guidance, par 3.11.

¹⁹⁸ GC Guidance, par 3.17.

¹⁹⁹ GC Guidance, par 3.17.

The suggested guidelines could explain the role of chance by following the reasoning provided in case law. For instance, the guidelines could state that it is not necessary to exclude all possible chance from a competition.²⁰⁰ A competition will, however, be based on chance if the outcome is determined “substantially by chance, and not by skill”.²⁰¹ For example, a promotional competition will be based on chance if it involves a question that is so easy that most people will be able to provide the correct answer.²⁰² The guidelines should warn promoters that a promotional competition will be evaluated as a whole and that superficial attempts to change a chance based competition into a skill based one will not succeed.²⁰³ For example, a promotional competition will still be based on chance even though the marketing material might refer to a skill requirement.²⁰⁴

Specific examples of chance based competitions could be included in the proposed guidelines too. For instance, a competition’s outcome is determined by chance if participants are required to solve a word puzzle, but all entries are not verified and the prizes are merely awarded to the first entries opened.²⁰⁵ A chance based competition can also not be turned into a skill based one if it involves two phases where the outcome of the first phase is determined by chance and the second phase involves skill.²⁰⁶ However, the result of a competition will be determined by skill if participants have to use their skill in order to determine the outcome of an event,²⁰⁷ if they have to identify geographical places by looking at pictures,²⁰⁸ or if they have to create a caption for a picture.²⁰⁹

7.2.10 Amend provisions that exclude persons from participation

In terms of section 36(3)(b)(ii) of the CPA, a promoter may not award prizes to someone who is:

²⁰⁰ See *R v Livingstone* 1924 TPD 45 51; *R v Bertram Davis* 1915 TPD 155 158.

²⁰¹ *Royal Baking Powder Co v Crystallisers Ltd* 1928 CPD 448 450.

²⁰² *S v Alexander* 1962 (3) SA 649 (A) 651-652.

²⁰³ *Director of Public Prosecutions v Phillips* 1935 1 KB 391 400, quoted in *S v Midas Novelties (Pty) Ltd* 1966 (1) SA 492 (A) at 499.

²⁰⁴ See *R v Colborne* 1932 TPD 264 270-271.

²⁰⁵ See *R v Cotterill* 1927 CPD 48 53-54.

²⁰⁶ See *S v Bryant* 1962 (2) SA 702 (N) 708; *S v Alexander* 1962 (3) SA 649 (A) 652-653.

²⁰⁷ See *R v Livingstone* 1924 TPD 45; *Silberman v Hodkinson* 1927 TPD 562.

²⁰⁸ *Witty v World Service, Ltd* 1935 All ER 243 (CD) 245.

²⁰⁹ See *R v Bertram Davis* 1915 TPD 155.

- (aa) a director, member, partner, employee or agent of, or consultant to the promoter or any other person who directly or indirectly controls or is controlled by, the promoter; or
- (bb) a supplier of goods or services in connection with that competition.

It is submitted that this provision places an unreasonable burden on promoters, because it will be difficult for them to determine whether or not someone is one of the excluded persons mentioned above. As such, it is submitted that the CPA should prohibit consumers from participating if they are excluded by way of section 36(3)(b)(ii), instead of placing the burden on promoters to ensure that prizes are not awarded to such persons. Even so, it is submitted that the list of excluded persons is very wide and that it would be difficult to apply and enforce in practice. The purpose of 36(3)(b)(ii)(bb) is also unclear because it seems to exclude suppliers of goods or services in relation to a promotional competition from participating in the competition. However, persons usually enter competitions and not necessarily suppliers (businesses). Accordingly, it is submitted that the legislature should reconsider the practicality of these provisions. If it is decided that the provisions should remain in the CPA, it is suggested that section 36(3)(b)(ii) should be deleted and replaced with a new provision which prohibits the relevant persons from participating in a promotional competition, instead of obliging a promoter to ensure that the relevant persons do not receive prizes. At the same time, one could resolve the issue relating to the exclusion of suppliers from participating by referring to employees instead. It is suggested that the exclusion could read as follows:

A person may not participate in a promotional competition if they are a director, member, partner, employee or agent of, or consultant to the promoter or a supplier of goods or services in connection with that competition or any other person who directly or indirectly controls or is controlled by, the promoter or a supplier of goods or services in connection with that competition.

There is also a discrepancy between the list of excluded persons in section 36(3)(b)(ii) and regulation 11(6)(j) of the CPA Regulations (which requires that persons involved in the organisation of a competition must depose to an affidavit in which they confirm that the prize winners were not excluded persons). Regulation 11(6)(j) purports to exclude additional persons from participating in a promotional competition and should be amended by removing the additional persons who are not excluded in section 36(3)(b)(ii). Further, it is noted that regulation 11(6)(j) does not refer to supplier of

goods or services. In terms of section 36(3)(b)(ii), such suppliers must be excluded from participation as well. Accordingly, regulation 11(6)(j) should be amended to reflect the exclusion of such suppliers.

Further, it is submitted that the scope of regulation 11(6)(j) is unclear. Must the relevant persons declare that the winners are not “directors, members, partners, employees, agents or consultants of or any other person who directly or indirectly controls or is controlled by the promoter”, or does it extend to “directors, members, partners, employees, agents or consultants of or any other person who directly or indirectly controls or is controlled by” the marketing service providers in respect of the promotional competition as well? Or does the wording mean that the declaration must state that marketing service providers were not prize winners? Accordingly, the wording of regulation 11(6)(j) needs to be clarified and improved. The following wording is proposed:

- (j) declarations by the persons contemplated in paragraph (d) made under oath or affirmation that the prize winners were to their best knowledge not directors, members, partners, employees or agents of, or consultants to the promoter or a supplier of goods or services in connection with the competition or any other person who directly or indirectly controls or is controlled by, the promoter or a supplier of goods or services in connection with the competition.

The typographical error in regulation 11(7) should be amended. The cross-reference to subregulation (7) should in fact be a cross-reference to subregulation (6). The subregulation should therefore be amended as follows:

- (7) A promoter must upon request in writing by the Commission forthwith at his, her or its own expense submit a report based on documents or materials contemplated in subregulation (~~17~~6) to the Commission.²¹⁰

7.2.11 Clarify requirements regarding offers to participate in competitions

Section 36(5) contains requirements relating to offers in terms of which promoters invite consumers to participate in promotional competitions. Section 36(5)(f) requires that such an offer must state:

any person from whom, any place where, and any date and time on or at which-

²¹⁰ The text between square brackets should be deleted and the underlined text should be inserted.

- (i) a person may obtain a copy of the competition rules; and
- (ii) a successful participant may receive any prize.

It is submitted that it may be difficult to include such a statement in the offer, because it might not always be known when and where a prize will be handed over. As such, it is recommended that promoters should be afforded more flexibility so that, if necessary, a promoter can arrange a time and place that will suit the promoter and the winner. If there is a concern that prizes might not in fact be handed over because a date, time and place cannot be agreed upon, the provision could state that the prize must be awarded within a specific time period (which period would need to be reasonable in the circumstances). For example, rule 8.15.1 of the United Kingdom's Code of Non-broadcast Advertising, Sales Promotion and Direct Marketing requires that prizes must normally be handed over within 30 days.

Section 36(6) regulates the manner in which the offer to participate must be published. This could be done:

- (a) directly on any medium through which a person participates in a promotional competition;
- (b) on a document accompanying any medium contemplated in paragraph (a); or
- (c) in any advertisement that-
 - (i) is published during the time and throughout the area in which the promotional competition is conducted; and
 - (ii) draws attention to and is clearly associated with the promotional competition.²¹¹

It is submitted that it will not be practical in all cases to display the offer on the medium through which participants will enter or in accompanying documentation. The competition might be advertised on a very small product – in which event there might not be sufficient space to display all the required information. A text message competition might also be announced on the radio – in which case there is no participation medium or documentation involved. In such situations, the promoter would have to satisfy section 36(5)'s requirements by publishing an advertisement “during the time and throughout the area in which the promotional competition is conducted”.²¹² This requirement is onerous, particularly since advertising space can be quite expensive. In view of the CPA's wide definition of “advertisement”, one might

²¹¹ S36(6).

²¹² S36(6)(c).

argue that the promoter's website could be regarded as an advertisement and that the required details can be displayed on the website.

However, the unclear position is undesirable. Accordingly, it is recommended that the CPA should be amended in order to state that promoters may satisfy the requirements of section 36(5) by displaying the relevant details on their websites. If there is a concern that some part of the population might not have access to the internet, the CPA could require promoters to make an audio version of the relevant information available through a toll-free phone number. The following wording is suggested in this regard:

- (6) The requirements of subsection (5) may be satisfied either-
- (a) directly on any medium through which a person participates in a promotional competition;
 - (b) on a document accompanying any medium contemplated in paragraph (a); **[or]**
 - (c) in any advertisement that-
 - (i) is published during the time and throughout the area in which the promotional competition is conducted; and
 - (ii) draws attention to and is clearly associated with the promotional competition~~[,]~~; or
 - (iii) on a website that is accessible during the course of the promotional competition, provided that, in such an event:
 - (aa) all marketing material relating to the competition must display the address of such website; and
 - (bb) the promoter must make an audio version of the competition rules available, which consumers can access by calling a toll free telephone number.

7.2.12 Clarify the CPA's provisions relating to consideration

Section 36(3)(a) of the CPA states that a promoter may not require participants in a promotional competition to pay any consideration. Section 36(4)(a) is intended to give further guidance in this regard, by stating that a promoter will be regarded as having required consideration if participants have to pay consideration for participating in a competition, accessing the competition or any participation device. Section 36(4)(b) provides that consideration will be regarded as having been required if a participant must purchase any goods or services, and the price for those goods exceed the ordinary price of such goods or services. However, despite section 36(4)(b), there still appears to be doubt regarding whether or not a promoter may require participants to purchase goods or services in the first place. Accordingly, it is recommended that the CPA should state that promoters are allowed to require participants to purchase goods

or services, as long as the price for such goods or services is not inflated. Following the example of the United Kingdom's Gambling Act 2005,²¹³ one could also that the promoters may not require participants to “[pay] for goods or services at a price or rate which reflects the opportunity to participate in an arrangement”.

In terms of the provisions of section 36(3)(a), promoters can require participants to bear “the reasonable costs of posting or otherwise transmitting an entry form or device”. The CPA Regulations state that “the reasonable cost of electronically transmitting an entry [may] not exceed R1.50”.²¹⁴ It is submitted that this monetary limit will become outdated due to inflation and increases in the relevant costs and that it will need to be changed from time to time. As such, the legislature could, for example, create a formula which can be used to determine the maximum limit. The legislature could also be guided by New Zealand's Gambling Act 2003, which refers to a “standard rate” and defines it as follows:

a rate that –

(a) is determined solely by a telecommunications provider or other service provider who is not associated with the sales promotion scheme; and

(b) relates solely to the communication cost incurred in submitting an entry into the promotion and does not reflect cost incurred in participating in the promotion.²¹⁵

Alternatively, it can follow the example in the United Kingdom's Gambling Act 2005, which allows such costs to be charged at the “normal rate”, being “a rate which does not reflect the opportunity to enter a lottery”.²¹⁶

In the context of costs and expenses, it is unclear whether promoters are allowed to require participants to bear costs or expenses in relation to a prize,²¹⁷ for example the costs of a visa or airport transfers in order to make use of flights that were won in a competition. It is submitted that the prohibitions are aimed at preventing promoters from luring consumers in and then surprising them with unexpected costs that have to be borne by them. It is further submitted that the relevant provisions cannot be interpreted to require promoters to bear all possible costs that may be associated with

²¹³ Paragraph 2(c) of Schedule 2.

²¹⁴ Regulation 11(1).

²¹⁵ Gambling Act 2003, s4(2A).

²¹⁶ Schedule 2, paragraph 2(a).

²¹⁷ This is due to the provisions of sections 36(2)(a)(iv) and 36(2)(b)(iii).

the use of prizes. Accordingly, it is recommended that the legislature should make it clear that sections 36(2)(a)(iv) and 36(2)(b)(iii) do not prohibit promoters from offering prizes in circumstances where entrants may be required to bear costs or expenses associated with the claiming or use of such prizes, as long as promoters make it clear that entrants will be liable for the costs. In order to avoid abuse, it may be best to state that such costs and expenses may not be charged by or payable to the promoter.

7.2.13 Clarify the CPA's provisions relating to oversight of competitions

Regulation 11(5) of the CPA Regulations requires a promoter to “ensure that an independent accountant, registered auditor, attorney or advocate oversees and certifies the conducting of the competition and must report this through the promoter's internal audit reporting or other appropriate validation or verification procedures”. It is unclear what “independent” means in relation to the overseeing accountant, auditor, attorney or advocate. For example, may a promoter's internal auditor or accountant, or in-house attorney, oversee the competition? It may be best if such a person is external and not involved with the promoter's business at all. Accordingly, the relevant provisions should be clarified in this regard.

The independent person is required to “oversee [...] the conducting of the competition”.²¹⁸ It is not clear whether this means that the independent person must oversee every step of the way, or whether they must merely supervise the random draw by way of which winners will be identified. Accordingly, it is recommended that the regulations should be clarified in this regard. It is submitted that it should be sufficient if the independent person is present when the winners are determined and if they then determine whether the competition was conducted fairly.

Many promotional competition competitions involve instant competitions, such as scratch card competitions or competitions that are played on the internet. It is submitted that it will be difficult or impossible for an independent person to oversee such competitions, particularly if scratch cards are distributed around the country and scratched at various times and places. Accordingly, it is recommended that the CPA Regulations should not require such competitions to be overseen on a micro level. It may be best to follow De Stadler's suggestion that the independent person should

²¹⁸ Regulation 11(5).

merely consider the mechanics of the competition and certify that competition processes are fair.²¹⁹

The independent person is required to “certify” the conducting of the promotional competition. However, it is not clear what “certify” means. Perhaps it means that the independent person must prepare a certificate or letter in which they state that they oversaw the competition and that it was conducted in a fair manner. Even so, it may be better if the CPA Regulations explain what the certification should entail.

It is submitted that the oversight provisions are onerous and that they lead to unnecessary expenses for promoters. Further research should also be conducted in order to determine whether promoters are in fact complying with this requirement. In any event, it is recommended that the legislature should reconsider this requirement.

7.2.14 Reconsider the document and information retention requirements

It is submitted that the requirements of regulation 11(6) are onerous and impractical. Some of the requirements are unclear as well. For example, who exactly are the “persons responsible for conducting the promotional competition” referred to in regulation 11(6)(d)? Accordingly, it is suggested that the legislature should reconsider and clarify these provisions, and reduce the requirements contained in regulation 11(6).

7.2.15 Amend the provisions regarding publicity

Regulation 11(3) provides as follows:

Any provision in the rules of a promotional competition requiring the prize winner to-

- (a) permit the use of his or her image in marketing material; or
- (b) participate in any marketing activity; or
- (c) be present when the draw is taking place or the winners are announced, without affording him or her the opportunity to decline an invitation to do so or informing him or her of the right to decline such an invitation, is null and void.

This provision was drafted in a clumsy manner. It requires promoters to inform winners of their rights to decline “an invitation”, but the first part of the provision does not refer to any invitation. It is also submitted that the provision will not have much effect in

²¹⁹ See De Stadler 2013 75.

practice, because it merely states that a competition rule which requires winners to permit the use of their images, participate in marketing activity or be present at a prize draw will be void if winners are not afforded the opportunity to decline or informed of their right to do so. Accordingly, a promoter would be able to circumvent the invalidity merely by informing winners of their right to decline. As such, it is recommended that the provision should be redrafted in order to provide that winners have a right to object to the requirements mentioned in regulation 11(3)(a) to (c), and that promoters may not oblige them to comply with such requirements.

Furthermore, regulation 11(3)(a) covers the use of a winner's image only. It is recommended that it should cover use of the winner's name, address and biographical information as well. This would protect the winner's privacy and will complement the protection that will be afforded by the Protection of Personal Information Act²²⁰ once it comes into force.

It is suggested that regulation 11(3) can be replaced with the following wording:

- 11(3) A promoter may not require a winner to-
- (a) permit the use of his or her name, image, address or biographical information in marketing material; or
 - (b) participate in any marketing activity; or
 - (c) be present when the draw is taking place or the winners are announced, and any provision in competition rules which obliges a winner to do so will be invalid.

7.2.16 Clarify section 36(10)

It is difficult to interpret and give practical effect to this provision because it refers to requirements that specifically relate to loyalty programmes. The provision merely cross-references section 35(5) and requires that it must be "read with the changes required by the context". However, it is not clear what changes are required in order to apply section 35(5)'s provisions to promotional competitions. It is assumed that the legislature intended to allow promoters to limit the quantities of products that must be purchased in order for someone to enter a competition, or perhaps to limit the quantity of prizes. However, one can only speculate what was intended with section 36(10).

²²⁰ 4 of 2013.

Accordingly, the legislature should draft a subsection which sets out what the legislature intended to regulate by way of section 36(10). Guidance can be sought in the United Kingdom’s Code of Non-broadcast Advertising, Sales Promotion and Direct Marketing (“CAP Code”). It is suggested that the text of section 36(10) can be substituted with the following wording, which has been based on provisions in the CAP Code:²²¹

- (10) A promoter must not require consumers to purchase goods or services as a precondition to participating in a promotional competition if the availability of such goods or services is limited, unless:
 - (a) the limited availability is made sufficiently clear at each stage for the consumer accurately to assess whether participation is worthwhile; and
 - (b) the promoter ensures relevant timely communication to consumers if the promoter is unable to supply demand for such goods or services because of an unexpectedly high response or some other unanticipated factor outside its control.

7.3 Final remarks

This research involved a study of the regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa. In the course of this process, it was investigated how promotional competitions were regulated in the past and the current regulation was examined. The sociological point of view was considered, including authors’ views in respect of gambling. The time has now arrived to evaluate the current regulation of promotional competitions in South Africa.

As a starting point, one should consider whether promotional competitions need to be regulated. Since these competitions are a form of gambling, it is submitted that they do need to be regulated one way or another. However, it is argued that promotional competitions should not be evaluated on the same basis as gambling – provided that people do not have to make payment or offer consideration in order to participate in such competitions. The potential for abuse can be reduced to a great extent if consideration is not involved in promotional competitions. It is therefore important to regulate the consideration element. However, promotional competitions are also a consumer engagement tool for businesses. As such, they do need to be regulated

²²¹ See paras 8.12 and 8.13 of the CAP Code.

from a consumer perspective as well. It is therefore submitted that the CPA's regulation of these competitions is necessary and befitting.

If one compares South Africa's regulation of promotional competitions to the position in New Zealand and Great Britain, for example, it appears that South Africa's regulation is actually quite comprehensive. In the other countries mentioned above, promotional competitions are merely authorised, provided that they meet the relevant requirements. Those countries do not have comprehensive provisions that regulate the actual conducting of promotional competitions, although such provisions might be found in their self-regulatory industry codes instead. South Africa's provisions, on the other hand, regulate these competitions on a comprehensive basis within the context of a binding legislative framework. The provisions cover matters ranging from the marketing of promotional competitions to the overseeing of such competitions and the retaining of information and documentation after conclusion of the competitions.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the current state of regulation is adequate, if not leaning towards being slightly excessive. For example, the oversight and document retention requirements could be regarded as being too impractical or onerous. It was found that the legislation is not very clear either, and that a number of errors and uncertainties need to be addressed.

Having said the above, one could still enquire whether anything is lacking in the current regulation. It could perhaps be argued that promoters could abuse consumers by luring them into competitions, without disclosing the odds of winning or without actually awarding prizes. However, it can be difficult to calculate the odds of winning and consumers might not be able to interpret those odds. It could perhaps be argued that consumers have become used to promotional competitions, and that they should be capable of deciding whether or not they should participate – as long as the promotional material is not misleading, deceptive or fraudulent. The legislation requires promoters to keep details regarding their promotional competitions too, including the names of winners. As such, one should be able to establish whether prizes were awarded in a competition. However, only the National Consumer Commission is provided with the opportunity to request such reports. There may be a need for greater transparency. This could be achieved by requiring promoters to publish competition results (for example, on their websites), and by giving the public the right to require promoters to

furnish them with copies of competition reports. Yet, such provisions could be open to abuse by consumers and might be too onerous for promoters. In order to prevent abuse, one should also consider creating provisions that regulate the changing of closing dates, as well as the suspension or termination of competitions.

It is submitted that the NCC should play a more pro-active role. This could include investigations into the conducting of competitions as well as the requesting of competition reports. Further, it would be useful if the NCC issued guidelines and interpretation notes to clarify the problematic provisions of the relevant legislation.

In the end, the regulation of promotional competitions can only be effective if the relevant legislation is enforced effectively and consistently. This would ensure that consumers receive redress. Proper enforcement would also deter promoters from evading the law. The National Consumer Tribunal is empowered to impose administrative fines,²²² and the imposition of such fines would send a clear message to delinquent promoters and would motivate all promoters to ensure that their promotional competitions comply with the law.

7.4 Suggestions for further research

A number of topics remain open for further investigation and study. For example, further research can be conducted into the prevalence and efficacy of promotional competitions as marketing tools in South Africa. Such research would fall within the field of marketing studies, but would complement and inform further legal analysis of the topic.

While extensive sociological and socio-economic research has been conducted internationally in respect of gambling, and to a more limited extent in respect of promotional competitions, it is submitted that such research should be conducted in respect of promotional competitions in South Africa as well. It is suggested that researchers should investigate the impact of promotional competitions on South Africans and obtain the public's views and attitudes in respect of these competitions. It would be useful to examine whether or not participation in such competitions stirs the "gambling urge". It is submitted that research is also required in order to establish whether promoters use promotional competitions in an abusive manner and whether

²²² See s112 of the CPA.

some competitions lead to consumer detriment. Consumer complaints relating to promotional competitions could serve as a useful starting point for such research.²²³

It may be beneficial to conduct research on a regional level. It is submitted that there is scope for studying promotional competitions in other African countries, and to compare the sociological and legal positions as well as the marketing context in those countries with the situation in South Africa.

It is recommended that further historical research can be conducted in South Africa in relation to this topic, and that the history of promotional competitions in South Africa can be documented. Researchers could collect examples of promotional competitions and the related marketing material and preserve them for future reference. They could interview persons that have been involved in the running of such competitions in the past, and analyse how this field may have changed. Such persons could share their practical experience in the structuring and managing of these competitions as well.

Further research could be conducted from a consumer protection law perspective. For example, one could investigate the consumer privacy aspects of promotional competitions in further detail as well as the responsible marketing context. The enforcement of the relevant legislation in respect of these competitions could receive further attention too.

The primary focus of this research was on chance based promotional competitions. It is submitted that skill based contests, which fall outside the scope of the CPA, should receive attention as well. The running of such competitions in South Africa should be examined. It needs to be considered whether there is a need to regulate such competitions and, if so, how this should be done.

²²³ For example, in the United States, the Federal Trade Commission releases consumer complaint statistics on an annual basis. Complaints relating to prizes, sweepstakes and lotteries are regularly amongst the top ten complaint categories. See Federal Trade Commission 27 February 2015 “Identity Theft Tops FTC’s Consumer Complaint Categories Again in 2014” <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2015/02/identity-theft-tops-ftcs-consumer-complaint-categories-again-2014>, accessed on 5 September 2015.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS AND CHAPTERS IN BOOKS

Description	Citation
A	
Aasved M <i>The Sociology of Gambling</i> (Charles C Thomas Publisher Ltd, Springfield, Illinois 2003)	<i>Aasved</i>
Abbott M “The Impact of Gaming on the Community” in Scott M (ed) <i>Lotteries, gaming and public policy</i> (Institute of Policy Studies, Wellington 1992)	<i>Abbott</i>
Alshuler AA & Gómez-Ibáñez JA, with Howitt AM <i>Regulation for Revenue: The Political Economy of Land Use Exactions</i> (Brookings Institution Press, Washington DC and Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1993)	
American Psychiatric Association <i>Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders</i> (5 th ed) (American Psychiatric Association, Arlington 2013)	
Anyukhina I “Russia” in <i>International Promotion Marketing Law Book</i> (2 nd ed) (PMA Educational Foundation, New York 2010)	<i>Anyukhina</i>
Ashton J <i>A History of English Lotteries</i> (The Leadenhall Press, London 1893; published online be Forgotten Books at www.forgottenbooks.org)	<i>Ashton</i>
Ashworth A & Zedner L <i>Preventive Justice</i> (Oxford University Press, Oxford 2014)	
B	
Bachman E, Knox L and Peacock R “New Zealand” in <i>International Promotion Marketing Law Book</i> 2 nd ed (PMA Educational Foundation, New York 2010)	<i>Bachman ea</i>
Baldwin R, Cave M & Lodge M <i>Understanding Regulation: Theory, Strategy, and Practice</i> (Oxford University Press, Oxford 2012)	<i>Baldwin ea</i>

- Becker T “The German Market for Gambling and Betting” in Spapens T, Littler A and Fijnaut C (eds) *Crime, addiction, and the regulation of gambling* (Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Leiden 2008)
- Beckmann J *History of Ancient Institutions in Two Volumes* (G. and W.B. Whittaker, London 1823, accessed through Google Books.)
- Béjot M “France” in *International Promotion Marketing Law Book 2nd ed* (PMA Educational Foundation, New York 2010)
- Belch EB & Belch MA *Advertising and promotion: An integrated marketing communications perspective*. (McGraw Hill/Irwin, New York 2012) *Belch & Belch*
- Bell, Dewar & Hall *Kelsey Stuart’s The Newspaperman’s Guide to the Law* (5th ed) (Butterworths, Durban 1990) *Bell Dewar*
- Boddewyn JJ *Advertising Self-Regulation and Outside Participation: A Multinational Comparison* (Quorum Books, Westport 1988)
- Brand H (with Carnelley M) *Gambling Laws of South Africa Vol 2* (revision service 2, 4 & 5) (Juta, Cape Town 2004) *Brand*
- Brand R *Media Law in South Africa* (Kluwer Law International, Alphen aan den Rijn 2011) *R Brand*
- Brenner R with Brenner GA *Gambling and Speculation: A theory, a History, and a Future of Some Human Decisions* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1990) *Brenner & Brenner*
- Brenner AB, Lipeb M & Servet J-M “Gambling in Cameroon and Senegal” in McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* 167 *Brenner ea*
- Brown C *The Sales Promotion Handbook* (Kogan Page, London 1993) *Brown*
- Burnham JC *Bad Habits: Drinking, Smoking, Taking Drugs, Gambling, Sexual Misbehavior, and Swearing in American History* (New York University Press, New York 1993) *Burnham*
- C**
- CCH *Sales and Marketing Law in New Zealand* (CCH New Zealand, Auckland 2007) *CCH*
- Caillois R *Man, Play, and Games* (translated by Barash M) (The Free Press of Glencoe, New York 1961) *Caillois*

- Cabot AN (ed) *Casino Gaming – Policy, Economics and Regulation* (UNLV International Gaming Institute, Las Vegas 1996)
- Carnelley M “Gambling, Gaming and Lotteries” in Joubert WA (founding editor) *The Law of South Africa* 2nd ed 10:2 (LexisNexis Butterworths, Durban 2005) *Carnelley 2005*
- Carnelley M “Offences relating to gambling and lotteries” in Milton JRL, Cowling MG and Hoctor SV *South African Criminal Law and Procedure Vol III: Statutory Offences* (2nd ed, service number 21, 2011) (original chapter by Milton JRL) (Juta, Cape Town 1988) *Carnelley 2011*
- Carnelley M & Schrage E “Gambling Regulation: A comparison between the Roman and South African gambling laws” in Hoctor SV & Schwikkard PJ (eds) *The Exemplary Scholar: Essays in Honour of John Milton* (Juta, Cape Town 2007) 252 *Carnelley & Schrage*
- Cassidy R, Pisac A & Loussouarn C *Qualitative Research in Gambling* (Routledge, Abingdon 2013)
- Christie RH (with McFarlane V) *The Law of Contract in South Africa* (5th ed) (LexisNexis Butterworths, Durban 2006) *Christie 2006*
- Christie RH & Bradfield GB *Christie’s The Law of Contract in South Africa* (6th ed) (LexisNexis, Durban 2011) *Christie*
- Clotfelter CT and Cook PJ *Selling Hope: State Lotteries in America* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts) *Clotfelter & Cook*
- Circus P *Promotional Marketing Law: A Practical Guide* (6th ed) (Bloomsbury Professional, Haywards Heath, West Sussex 2011) *Circus*
- Collins AF “The Pathological Gambler and the Government of Gambling” in Cosgrave JF (ed) *The Sociology of Risk and Gambling Reader* 380 *AF Collins*
- Collins P *Gambling and the public interest* (Praeger, Westport, Connecticut 2003) *P Collins*
- Cook G “Sales Promotion” in Du Plessis *ea Integrated marketing communication: A contemporary approach* (3rd ed) (Van Schaik, Pretoria 2010) *G Cook*
- Cosgrave JF (ed) *The Sociology of Risk and Gambling Reader* (Routledge, New York 2006)
- Taylor D & Cronjé F *101 Questions and Answers About the Protection of Personal Information Act* (Juta, Claremont 2014)
- Crown G, Bray O & Earle R *Advertising Law and Regulation* (2nd ed) (Bloomsbury Professional, Haywards Heath 2010) *Crown 2010*

- Cummins J & Mullin R *Sales Promotion: How to create, implement and integrate campaigns that really work* (3rd ed) (Kogan Page, London 2012) *Cummins & Mullin*
- Curtin L and Bernardo K *The History of Sweepstakes* (Sweepstakes News Key Biscayne, Florida) *Curtin & Bernardo*
- D**
- De Jager C & Smith E *Advertising and the Law* (Butterworths, Durban 1995)
- De Stadler E *Consumer Law Unlocked* (Siber Ink, Cape Town 2013) *De Stadler 2013*
- De Stadler E “Section 5” in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014) *De Stadler 2014*
- De Stadler E & Esselaar P *A Guide to the Protection of Personal Information Act* (Juta, Claremont 2015) *De Stadler & Esselaar*
- Du Plessis F in Du Plessis *ea Integrated marketing communication: A contemporary approach* (3rd ed) (Van Schaik, Pretoria 2010)
- Du Plessis J “Section 40” in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014)
- Du Plessis L *Re-Interpretation of Statutes* (Butterworths, Durban 2002)
- Devereux EC *Gambling and the Social Structure: A sociological study of lotteries and horse racing in contemporary America* (Arno Press, New York 1980) *Devereux*
- Dixon D *From prohibition to regulation: bookmaking, anti-gambling, and the law.* (Clarendon Press, Oxford 1991). *Dixon*
- Dresden B “United Kingdom” in *International Promotion Marketing Law Book* 2nd ed (PMA Educational Foundation New York 2010) *Dresden 2010*
- Dombrink J “Gambling and the Legalisation of Vice: Social movements, public health and public policy in the United States” in McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* 43 *Dombrink*
- Downes DM, Davies, BP, David ME and Stone P *Gambling, work and leisure: a study across three areas.* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London 1976) *Downes ea*
- Drzazga J *Wheels of Fortune* (Charles C Thomas, Springfield 1963) *Drzazga*

Dudley SE & Brito J *Regulation: A Primer* (2nd ed) (Mercatus Center at George Mason University, Arlington 2012) *Dudley & Brito*

E

Eadington WR & Cornelius JA (eds) *Gambling and Public Policy: International Perspectives* (Institute for the Study of Gambling and Commercial Gaming, University of Nevada, Reno 1991)

Eadington WR & Cornelius JA (eds) *Gambling and Commercial Gaming: Essays in Business, Economics, Philosophy and Science* (University of Nevada, Reno 1992) *Eadington & Cornelius 1992*

Eadington WR "Ethical and Policy Considerations in the Spread of Commercial Gambling" in McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* 243 *Eadington 1996*

Eadington WR "Understanding Gambling" in Eadington WR and Cornelius JA (eds) *Gambling: Public Policies and the Social Sciences* 3-9 (University of Nevada, Reno 1997) *Eadington & Cornelius 1997*

Eadington WR and Cornelius JA (eds) *Gambling: Public Policies and the Social Sciences* (University of Nevada, Reno 1997)

Eiselen S & Naudé T "Introduction and Overview of the Consumer Protection Act" in Naudé T & Eiselen S (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (original service 2014) (Juta & Company, Claremont 2014) *Eiselen & Naudé*

Eiselen S "Section 121" in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014)

Ewen C L'Estrange *Lotteries and sweepstakes: An Historical, Legal, and Ethical Survey of their Introduction, Suppression, and Re-Establishment in the British Isles* (Benjamin Blom, New York (1932) *Ewen*

Ezell JS *Fortune's Merry Wheel: The Lottery in America* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1960) *Ezell*

F

Falkner G *ea Complying with Europe: EU Harmonisation and Soft Law in the Member States* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2005)

Ferentzy P & Turner NE “The History of Gambling and Its Intersection with Technology, Religion, Medical Science, and Metaphors” in *The History of Problem Gambling: Temperance, Substance Abuse, Medicine, and Metaphors* (Springer, New York 2013) *Ferentzy & Turner*

Frey JH & Eadington WR (eds) *Gambling: Views from the Social Sciences. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* (Sage Publications, Beverly Hills 1984)

Frey JH “Gambling: A Sociological Review” in Frey JH & Eadington WR (eds) *Gambling: Views from the Social Sciences. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* (Sage Publications, Beverly Hills 1984) 107 *Frey*

G

Geis G *Not the Law’s Business: An examination of homosexuality, abortion, prostitution, narcotics, and gambling in the United States* (Schocken Books, New York 1979) *Geis*

Gibson C & Hull G *Everyone’s Guide to the Consumer Protection Act* (Zebra Press, Cape Town 2013) *Gibson & Hull*

Giddens A “Fate, Risk and Security” in Cosgrave JF (ed) *The Sociology of Risk and Gambling Reader* 29

Ginosar A “The regulation of advertising” in Levi-Faur D (ed) *Handbook on the Politics of Regulation* (Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham 2011) *Ginosar*

Goffman E *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior* (Doubleday Anchor, Garden City, New York 1967) *Goffman 1967*

Grant D *On a Roll: A History of Gambling and Lotteries in New Zealand* *Grant*

H

Halsbury’s Laws of England 5th ed, Vol 67 and 68 (LexisNexis, London 2008) *Halsbury’s*

Hart HLA *Law, Liberty, and Morality* (Stanford University Press, Stanford 1963)

Haufler V *A Public Role for the Private Sector: Industry Self-Regulation in a Global Economy* (Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington DC 2001) *Haufler*

- Haugen DM *Legalized Gambling* (Facts On File, New York 2006) *Haugen*
- Herman RD *Gamblers and gambling: Motives: Institutions, and Controls* (Lexington Books, Lexington, Massachusetts 1976) *Herman 1976*
- Howells GG *European fair trading law: the unfair commercial practices directive* (Ashgate Publishing, Aldershot 2006)
- Huizinga, J *Homo Ludens. A study of the play-element in culture* (Routledge & Kegan Paul Limited, London 1949) *Huizinga*
- Hunt A *Governing Morals: A Social History of Moral Regulation* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1999)
- Hutchison D & Pretorius C-J (eds) *Kontraktereg in Suid-Afrika* (Oxford University Press, Cape Town 2010) *Hutchison & Pretorius*

J

- Jethwaney J & Jain S *Advertising management* (2nd ed) (Oxford University Press, New Delhi 2012) *Jethwaney*
- Jones JP *Gambling Yesterday and Today* (David & Charles, Newton Abbot, Devon 1973) *Jones*

K

- Kandel DB (ed) *Stages and Pathways of Drug Involvement: Examining the Gateway Hypothesis* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2002)
- Kandel DB “Examining the Gateway Hypothesis: Stages and Pathways of Drug Involvement” in Kandel DB (ed) *Stages and Pathways of Drug Involvement: Examining the Gateway Hypothesis* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2002)
- Kaplan HR “The Social and Economic Impact of State Lotteries” in Frey JH & Eadington WR (eds) *Gambling: Views from the Social Sciences. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* (Sage Publications, Beverly Hills 1984) 91 *Kaplan*
- Koekemoer L (ed) *Advertising and sales promotion* (Juta, Cape Town 2014) *Koekemoer*
- Kolah A *Essential Law for Marketers* (Kogan Page, London 2013) *Kolah*

Kopp SW & Taylor CR “Games, Contests, Sweepstakes, and Lotteries: Prize Promotion and Public Policy” in Sheth JN (series ed) & Fullerton RA (ed) *Research in Marketing: Explorations in the History of Marketing* 151 (JAI Press, London 1994: Supplement 6) *Kopp & Taylor*

Kotler P *Marketing management* (10th ed) (Prentice Hall, New Jersey 2000)

Krinsky C “Introduction: The Moral Panic Concept” in Krinsky C (ed) *The Ashgate Research Companion to Moral Panics* (Ashgate, Surrey 2013) 1-5

Krinsky C (ed) *The Ashgate Research Companion to Moral Panics* (Ashgate, Surrey 2013)

Kusyszyn I “The Psychology of Gambling” in Frey JH & Eadington WR (eds) *Gambling: Views from the Social Sciences. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* (Sage Publications, Beverly Hills 1984) 133

L

Lane W, Hoffe D, Dison D & Tatham C *Kelsey Stuart’s The Newspaperman’s Guide to the Law* (4th ed) (Butterworths, Durban 1986) *Lane ea*

LeGuay P “Australia” in *International Promotion Marketing Law Book* (2nd ed) (PMA Educational Foundation, New York 2010) *LeGuay*

Leggett T *Rainbow Vice: The Drugs and Sex Industries in the New South Africa* (David Philip - New Africa Books, Claremont 2001)

Lehman E “China” in *International Promotion Marketing Law Book* (2nd ed) (PMA Educational Foundation, New York 2010) *Lehman*

Leitzel J *Regulating Vice: Misguided Prohibitions and Realistic Controls* (Cambridge University Press, New York 2008) *Leitzel*

Lesieur H “Compulsive Gambling” in Riconda A (ed) *Gambling* (The HW Wilson Company, New York 1995) *Lesieur*

Lesieur HR and Custer RL “Pathological Gambling: Roots, Phases & Treatment” in Frey JH & Eadington WR (eds) *Gambling: Views from the Social Sciences. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* (Sage Publications, Beverly Hills 1984) 146

Levi-Faur D (ed) *Handbook on the Politics of Regulation* (Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham 2011)

Ligthelm, AA, Mango T & Jonkheid E *Socio-Economic Impact of Legalised Gambling in South Africa* (National Gambling Board, Pretoria 2005) *Ligthelm ea*

Ligthelm AA & Mabaso LT *Economic Impact of Legalised Gambling in South Africa* (National Gambling Board, Pretoria 2003)

M

McGowan RA *The Gambling Debate* (Greenwood Press, Westport Connecticut 2008)

McGurrin MC "Treatment of Pathological Gambling" in Riconda A *Gambling* (The HW Wilson Company, New York 1995) 174

McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* (Routledge, London 1996)

McMillen J "Understanding Gambling: History, concepts and theories" in McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* (Routledge, London 1996) *McMillen*

Macleod J *Consumer Sales Law* (2nd ed) (Routledge-Cavendish, Abingdon 2007) *Macleod*

Martinez TM *The Gambling Scene: Why People Gamble* (Charles C Thomas, Springfield 1983) *Martinez*

Melville N (with Gordon F and Burt C) *Consumer Protection Act Made Easy* (Book of Life Publications Pretoria 2010) *Melville*

Melville N & Yeates J "Section 82" in Eiselen S & Naudé T (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (original service 2014) (Juta & Company, Claremont 2014) *Melville & Yeates*

Merkin RM "Prize competitions – the lottery of legality" 1981 *Lloyd's Maritime and Commercial Law* 66-82 *Merkin*

Miers D & Page A *Legislation* (Sweet & Maxwell, London 1982)

Miers D "Regulating Great Britain's National Lottery" in Eadington WR and Cornelius JA (eds) *Gambling: Public Policies and the Social Sciences* 483 (University of Nevada, Reno 1997) *Miers 1997*

Miers D *Regulating Commercial Gambling: Past, Present, and Future* (Oxford University Press, Oxford 2004) *Miers 2004*

Mill JS *On Liberty* (2nd ed) (John W Parker and Son, London 1859) available online at http://books.google.co.za/books/about/On_Liberty.html?id=3xARAAAAYAAJ&redir_esc=y

- Monkcom SP (ed) *Smith and Monkcom's The Law of Betting, Gaming and Lotteries* (2nd ed) (Butterworths, London 2001)
- Monkcom SP ea Smith & Monkcom: *The Law of Gambling* (3rd ed) Monkcom (Tottel, Haywards Heath 2009)
- Moody GE "Perspectives on Gambling" in Eadington WR & Cornelius JA (eds) *Gambling and Commercial Gaming: Essays in Business, Economics, Philosophy and Science* (Institute for the Study of Gambling and Commercial Gaming, Reno 1992) Moody 1992
- Moody GE "The Roots, Significance, Value and legislation of Gambling" 1995 *Journal of Gambling Studies* 11:1 35 Moody 1995
- Munting R *An economic and social history of gambling in Britain and the USA* (Manchester University Press, Manchester 1996) Munting
- Murray HJR *A History of Board-Games other than Chess* (Hacker Art Books, New York 1978) Murray

N

- Naudé T & Eiselen S (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (original service 2014) (Juta & Company, Claremont 2014)
- Newman O *Gambling: Hazard and Reward* (The Athlone Press, University of London, London 1972) Newman
- Newmark DL "Covert Religious Aspects of Gambling" in Eadington WR & Cornelius JA (eds) *Gambling and Commercial Gaming: Essays in Business, Economics, Philosophy and Science* (Institute for the Study of Gambling and Commercial Gaming, Reno 1992) Newmark

O

- Opperman I & Lake R *Understanding the Consumer Protection Act (CPA)* (Juta Law, Cape Town 2012) Opperman & Lake
- Ogus A "Rethinking Self-Regulation" 1995 *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 15:1 97-108 Ogus
- Orford J ea *Gambling and problem gambling in Britain* (Brunner-Routledge, Hove, East Sussex 2003) Orford 2003
- Orford J *An Unsafe Bet? The Dangerous Rise of Gambling and the Debate We Should Be Having* (John Wiley & Sons, Chichester 2011)

Orkin M *Can you win?: the real odds for casino gambling, sports betting, and lotteries* (W.H. Freeman and Company New York 1991) Orkin

P

Paxman K, Pelton T & Pelton FL “Should corporations be permitted to use promotional contests to manipulate the buying habits of children and youth?” in Pelton T, Reis G & Stewart S (eds) *Connections 2006* (Faculty of Education, University of Victoria, Victoria 2006, available online at <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download;jsessionid=D6AEFCB8CD0A1549113A91EB24129E78?doi=10.1.1.90.7530&rep=rep1&type=pdf>, accessed on 25 March 2015) 65-76

Pelton T, Reis G & Stewart S (eds) *Connections 2006* (Faculty of Education, University of Victoria, Victoria 2006, available online at <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download;jsessionid=D6AEFCB8CD0A1549113A91EB24129E78?doi=10.1.1.90.7530&rep=rep1&type=pdf>, accessed on 25 March 2015)

Popkin J “Tricks of the Trade” in Riconda A (ed) *Gambling* (The HW Wilson Company, New York 1995) 71

R

Ramsay I *Consumer Law and Policy: Text and Materials on Regulating Consumer Markets* (2nd ed) (Hart Publishing, Oxford 2007) Ramsay 2007

Ramsay I *Consumer Law and Policy: Text and Materials on Regulating Consumer Markets* (3rd ed) (Hart Publishing, Oxford 2012) Ramsay 2012

Rassuli KM ea (eds) *Marketing History: Marketing's Greatest Empirical Experiment: Proceedings of the 7th Conference on Historical Research in Marketing and Marketing Thought* (Michigan, Michigan State University Board of Trustees 1995)

Reith G *The Age of Chance: Gambling in western culture* (Routledge, London 1999) Reith 1999

Reith G “The Experience of Play” in Cosgrave JF (ed) *The Sociology of Risk and Gambling Reader* 255-287 Reith 2006

Reith G “The Culture of Gambling in Great Britain: Legislative and Social Change” in Spapens T, Littler A and Fijnaut C (eds) *Crime, addiction, and the regulation of gambling* (Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Leiden 2008) *Reith 2008*

RM *The Sociology of Criminal Law* (Butterworths, Toronto 1979)

Riconda A (ed) *Gambling* (The HW Wilson Company, New York 1995)

Rose IN *Gambling and the Law* (Gambling Times Inc, Hollywood 1986) *Rose 1986*

Rose IN “The Rise and Fall of the Third Wave: Gambling Will be Outlawed in Forty Years” in Eadington (ed) *Gambling and Public Policy: International Perspectives* (Institute for the Study of Gambling and Commercial Gaming, University of Nevada, Reno 1991)

Rosecrance J *Gambling without Guilt: the Legitimation of an American Pastime* (Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, Pacific Grove California 1988) *Rosecrance*

Rule S & Sibanyoni C *The Social Impact of Gambling in South Africa* (Human Sciences Research Council, Pretoria 2000) *Rule & Sibanyoni*

S

Sallaz J *The labor of luck: casino capitalism in the United States and South Africa* (University of California Press, Berkeley 2009) *Sallaz*

Schalken TM *Casino en illegaliteit: Over de mogelijkheden tot bestrijding van het illegal casino-circuit* (Gouda Quint BV, Arnhem 1990) *Schalken*

Schimmel G *Advertising Law: A Guide to the Code of Advertising Practice* (Juta & Co, Claremont 2014) *Schimmel*

Schwartz DG *Roll the Bones: The History of Gambling* (Gotham Books, New York 2006) *Schwartz*

Scott C (ed) *Lotteries, gaming and public policy* (Institute of Policy Studies, Wellington 1992)

Scott C “Lotteries and Gaming: Some Public Policy Issues” in Scott M (ed) *Lotteries, gaming and public policy* (Institute of Policy Studies, Wellington 1992) *Scott*

- Selby W “Social Evil or Social Good? Lotteries and state regulation in Australia and the United States” in McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* 65 Selby
- Semenik ea *Advertising and promotions: An integrated brand approach* (6th, international edition) (South-Western Cengage Learning, Australia 2012) Semenik
- Solonsch M “An Analysis of Skill in Gambling” in Eadington WR & Cornelius JA (eds) *Gambling and Commercial Gaming: Essays in Business, Economics, Philosophy and Science* 477 Solonsch
- Shakespeare W *The Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*
- Sharrock RD 2010 *South African Mercantile Law Journal* 22:3 295-325 302
- Sheth JN (series ed) & Fullerton RA (ed) *Research in Marketing: Explorations in the History of Marketing* 151 (JAI Press, London 1994: Supplement 6)
- Shimp TA *Integrated marketing communication in advertising and promotion* (international ed) (South-Western Cengage Learning, Australia 2010) Shimp
- Shuibhne NN and Gormley LW (eds) *From Single Market to Economic Union; Essay in Memory of John A Usher* (Oxford University Press, Oxford 2012)
- Silverman SN “An historical review and modern assessment of the marketing mix” in Rassuli KM ea (eds) “Proceedings of the 7th conference on historical research in marketing and marketing thought” 25-35
- Smith JF “When it’s Bad it’s Better: Conflicting images of gambling in American culture” in McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* Smith JF
- Smith JF & Abt V “Gambling as Play” in Frey JH & Eadington WR (eds) *Gambling: Views from the Social Sciences. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* (Sage Publications, Beverly Hills 1984) 122 Smith & Abt
- Snyman CR *Criminal Law* (4th ed) (LexisNexis, Durban 2002)
- Spapens T, Littler A and Fijnaut C (eds) *Crime, addiction, and the regulation of gambling* (Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Leiden 2008)

- Spapens T “Regulating Illegal Gambling Markets: The Case of Illegal Casinos in the Netherlands” in Spapens T, Littler A and Fijnaut C (eds) *Crime, addiction, and the regulation of gambling* (Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, Leiden 2008) *Spapens*
- Speight WL “Gambling in South Africa” 1958 *Commercial Law Reporter* 229 *Speight*
- Stoop PN “Section 22” in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014)
- Stuart KM *The Newspaperman’s Guide to the Law* (3rd ed) (Butterworth & Co, Durban 1982) *Stuart*
- Sutherland EH *Criminology* (JB Lippincott, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 1924) *Sutherland*
- T**
- Tennant S-L *The National Credit Act and Consumer Protection Act: A Guide for Credit Providers and Suppliers* (Juta, Cape Town 2011) *Tennant*
- Thomas JL *Lotteries, Frauds and Obscenity in the Mails* (EW Stephens, Columbia, Missouri 1900; published online in 2013 by www.forgottenbooks.org)
- Thompson WN *Legalized gambling: a reference handbook* (2nd ed) (ABC-CLIO, Santa Barbara 1997) *Thompson*
- Thorpe EO *The Mathematics of Gambling* (Gambling Times Incorporate / Lyle Stuart, Secaucus, New Jersey 1984)
- Tillman R & Kirkpatrick CA *Promotion: Persuasive Communication in Marketing* (Richard D. Irwin Inc., Homewood 1968) *Tillman & Kirkpatrick*
- Tomasic R “The Sociology of Legislation” in Tomasic R (ed) *Legislation and Society in Australia* 19
- Tomasic R (ed) *Legislation and Society in Australia* (The Law Foundation of New South Wales/George Allen & Unwin, Sydney 1979)
- Twain M *The Complete Short Stories of Mark Twain* (Digireads.com Publishing, Stilwell 2008)
- V**
- Van Eeden E *A Guide to the Consumer Protection Act* (LexisNexis Durban 2009) *Van Eeden 2009*

- Van Eeden E *Consumer Protection Law in South Africa* (LexisNexis Durban 2013) *Van Eeden 2013*
- Van Heerden C “Section 36” in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014) *Van Heerden “Section 36”*
- Van Heerden C “The Regulation of Marketing under the CPA” in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014) *Van Heerden “Marketing”*
- Van Niekerk JP *The Development of the Principles of Insurance Law in the Netherlands from 1500 to 1800* (Juta & Co, Kenwyn 1998) *Van Niekerk*
- Van Wyk I “‘Tata Ma Chance’: On Contingency and the Lottery in Post-Apartheid South Africa” 2012 *Africa* 82:1 41
- Van Wyk I “Bad luck, slippery money and the South African lottery” in Cassidy R, Pisac A & Loussouarn C *Qualitative Research in Gambling* (Routledge, Abingdon 2013)
- Van Zyl E & De Stadler E “Section 11” in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014)
- Van Zyl E “Section 29” in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014).
- Vatz RE & Weinberg LS “Refuting the Myths of Compulsive Gambling” in Riconda A (ed) *Gambling* (The HW Wilson Company, New York 1995) *Vatz & Weinberg*

W

- Walker MB “A Sociocognitive Theory of Gambling Involvement” in Eadington WR & Cornelius JA (eds) *Gambling and Commercial Gaming: Essays in Business, Economics, Philosophy and Science* (Institute for the Study of Gambling and Commercial Gaming, Reno 1992) 371 *Walker 1992*
- Walker M “The Medicalisation of Gambling as an ‘Addiction’” in McMillen J (ed) *Gambling Cultures: Studies in history and interpretation* 223 *Walker 1996*

- Weatherill S “Maximum versus Minimum Harmonization: Choosing between Unity and Diversity in the Search for the Soul of the Internal Market” in Shuibhne NN and Gormley LW (eds) *From Single Market to Economic Union; Essay in Memory of John A Usher* (Oxford University Press, Oxford 2012) *Weatherill 2012*
- Weatherill S *EU Consumer Law and Policy* (Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham 2013)
- Whitehead AN *The Dialogues of Alfred North Whitehead* (recorded by Price L) (Little, Brown and Company, Boston 1954)
- Wiehahn NE *Gambling in South Africa – A New Challenge* (University of Pretoria – Prestige Lecture Series No. 2, Pretoria 1995) *NE Wiehahn 1995*
- Wiehahn NE *The Complete Wiehahn report on gambling in South Africa* (Beta Printers, Pretoria 1995)
- Williams FE *Flexible-Participation Lotteries: A Treatise on Flexible-Participation Prize-Drawings, Chance Games and other Sales Promotion Enterprises, operated for a Consideration; including "Bank Night," "Catalina Night," "Country-Store Night," "Jubilee Night," Bader's Cafeteria Drawing, the Denver Shoe Store Drawing, Newspaper Circulation Drawings, Filling Station Drawings, "Customers' Pay Day," and the like; together with their Historical Background, the Underlying Principles of Law and Construction Involved, and the Reasons for Anti-Lottery Legislation* (Thomas Law Book Company, St Louis 1938) *FE Williams 1938*
- Williams FE *Lotteries, Laws & Morals* (Vantage Press, New York 1958) *FE Williams 1958*
- Woker T *Advertising Law in South Africa* (Juta & Co, Kenwyn 1999) *Woker 1999*
- Woker T “Section 40” in Naudé & Eiselen (eds) *Commentary on the Consumer Protection Act* (Original Service 2014)

Y

- Yeshin T *Sales Promotion* (Thomson, London 2006) *Yeshin*

REPORTS

Description	Citation
New Zealand	
Report of the Royal Commission to Inquire into and Report upon Gaming and Racing Matters in New Zealand (H-23) 1948	<i>Finlay Report</i>
South Africa	
Gambling Review Commission <i>Review of the South African Gambling Industry and its Regulation</i> September 2010 http://pmg-assets.s3-website-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/docs/130320review_0.pdf (last accessed 7 March 2015)	<i>2010 Gambling Review</i>
Main Report on Gambling in the Republic of South Africa (RP 85/1995)	<i>LGB Main Report</i>
Report of the Commission of Inquiry into Lotteries, Sports Pools, Fund-Raising Activities and certain matters relating to Gambling (RP 80/1993)	<i>Howard Report</i>
United Kingdom	
Gambling Review Report (Cm 5206) (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 2001)	<i>Budd Report</i>
Report of the Interdepartmental Working Party on Lotteries (Cmnd. 5506) (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1975)	
Report of the Royal Commission on Betting, Lotteries and Gaming 1949-1951 (Cmd. 8190) (His Majesty's Stationery Office, London 1951)	
Royal Commission on Gambling: Final Report. (Cmnd. 7200) (London, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1978)	<i>1978 Commission Report</i>

THESES

Description	Citation
Barnard J <i>The Influence of the Consumer Protection Act 68 of 2008 on the Common Law of Sale</i> (LLD thesis, University of Pretoria 2013)	<i>Barnard</i>

- Louw E *The Plain Language Movement and Legal Reform in the South African Law of Contract* (LLM thesis, University of Johannesburg 2010) Louw E
- Ottaway J *The UK National Lottery and Charitable Gambling* (Doctor of Philosophy thesis, London School of Economics and Political Science, London University) Ottaway
- Reith G *HOMO ALEATOR: A Sociological Study of Gambling in Western Society* (Doctor of Philosophy theses, University of Glasgow 1996) Reith 1996
- Stoop PN *The Concept 'Fairness' in the Regulation of Contracts under the Consumer Protection Act 68 of 2008* (LLD thesis, University of South Africa 2012) Stoop 2012
- Vos SW *De gustibus non est disputandum: Regulating offensive advertising in a democratic South Africa* (LLD thesis, University of Pretoria 2011)

JOURNAL ARTICLES

- | Description | Citation |
|---|----------------------|
| A | |
| Abdurahman Z "Everybody's done it" 2006 (December) <i>Without Prejudice</i> 37-38 | Abdurahman |
| Adams P "The history of gambling in New Zealand" 2004 <i>Journal of Gambling Studies</i> Issue 12 (available online at http://jgi.camh.net/doi/full/10.4309/jgi.2004.12.2) (accessed 31 January 2015) | Adams |
| Aguiar A "It can be dangerous to take a bet on the Lotteries Act" 2008 (February) <i>Without Prejudice</i> 44-45 | Aguiar |
| Au N & Perry Hobson JS "Gambling on the Internet: A Threat to Tourism?" 1997 <i>Journal of Travel Research</i> 35:4 77-81 | Au & Perry
Hobson |
| B | |
| Basham P & Luik J "The Social Benefits of Gambling" March 2011 <i>Economic Affairs</i> 13:1 9-13 | Basham & Luik |
| Binde P "Gambling and religion: Histories of concord and conflict" 2007 <i>Journal of Gambling Issues</i> 20 145-165 | |

- Binde P “Why people gamble: a model with five motivational dimensions” 2013 *International Gambling Studies* 13:1 81-97
- Black J “Constitutionalising Self-Regulation” 1996 *Modern Law Black 1996 Review* 59:1 24-55
- Black J “Critical Reflections on Regulation” 2002 *Australian Black 2002 Journal of Legal Philosophy* 27:1 1-35
- Black J “Decentring Regulation: Understanding the Role of Regulation and Self-Regulation in a ‘Post-Regulatory’ World” 2001 *Current legal problems* 54:1 103-146.
- Blanche EE “Lotteries Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow” 1950 *Blanche Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 269 71
- Blaszczynski A & Nower L “A pathways model of problem and pathological gambling” *Addiction* 97 487-499 *Blaszczynski & Nower*
- Boddewyn JJ “Advertising Self-Regulation: True Purpose and Limits” 1989 *Journal of Advertising* 18:2 19 *Boddewyn*
- Borden N “The concept of the marketing mix” *Journal of Advertising Research* (1984) 24:4 7-12
- Burchell B “The CPA and Leases” 2011 (November) *Without Prejudice* 38-39
- Burns RP “On the Foundations and Nature of Morality” 2008 *Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy* 31:1 7-21
- C**
- Cabot AN & Csoka LV “The Games People Play: Is it Time for a New Legal Approach to Prize Games?” 2004 *Nevada Law Cabot & Csoka Journal* 4:2 197-261
- Cafaggi F (ed) *Enforcement of Transnational Regulation: Ensuring Compliance in a Global World* (Edward Elgar, Cheltenham 2012)
- Cabot AN, Light GJ & Rutledge KF “Economic Value, Equal Dignity and the Future of Sweepstakes” 2010 *UNLV Gaming Law Cabot ea Journal* 1:1 1-38
- Carnelley M “Inter-party enforcement of legal gambling debts. *Sea Point Racing CC v Wilkinson* [1999] 2 All SA 626 D” 1999(1) *Obiter* 218-223

- Carnelley M “The Proliferation of Gambling, Problem Gambling and Public Policy” 2000 *Obiter* 192-199 *Carnelley 2000*
- Carnelley M “Guarding the Guardians: Non-Judicial and Judicial Control over Unlawful Decisions by the South African Gaming Boards” 2001 *Obiter* 74-101 *Carnelley Obiter 2001*
- Carnelley M “Enforcement of lawfully incurred gambling debts” 2001(5) *De Rebus* 57
- Carnelley M “Post-Constitutional Legal Developments in the South African Gambling Law through Judicial Precedent” 2001 *Stellenbosch Law Review* 1 131-154 *Carnelley Stell LR*
- Carnelley M “A Précis of the South African Gambling Industry” 2001 *Gaming Law Review* 5:1 3
- Carnelley M “Interactive Gambling A South African Comparative Perspective Part I – Universal Legal Challenges” 2001 *Obiter* 273-299
- Carnelley M “Interactive Gambling: A South African Comparative Perspective Part II – Regulatory Frameworks in Selected Jurisdictions” 2002 *Obiter* 23:2 1-26
- Carnelley M “Gambling Law Developments in South Africa: The Summer of 2004/2005” 2005 *Gaming Law Review* 9:4 318
- Carnelley M “Tata ‘ma millions? The enforceability of a gambling debt between the lottery operator and the ticket-holder; and the enforceability of a partnership agreement to share lottery winnings already paid to one of the partners” 2006 (1) *Obiter* 358-368
- Carnelley M “The role of public policy in the non-enforcement of foreign judgments arising from gambling debts in South African courts: A comparative overview” 2007 *Journal for Juridical Science* 32:2 1-17
- Carnelley M “South African Interactive (Internet) Gambling Regulation – The 2006 Developments” 2007 *Speculum Juris* 2 258-265
- Carnelley M “‘Gambling law’ (Recent Cases)” 2010 3 *South African Journal of Criminal Justice* 439-453 *Carnelley 2010*
- Carnelley M “Betting on Dog Racing. The Next Legalised Gambling Opportunity in South Africa? A Cautionary Note from the Regulation of Greyhound Racing in Britain” 2010 *UNLV Gaming Law Journal* 1:1 73

Casey D & Scott C “The Crystallization of Regulatory Norms” 2011 *Journal of Law and Society* 38:1 76-95 93

Cohen P “Beyond the Obvious – The Economic Role of the Gambling Regulator” 2014 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 18:2 173-182

Coleman M “A Terrible Danger to the Morals of the Country: The Irish Hospitals' Sweepstake in Great Britain 1930-87” 2005 *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy. Section C: Archaeology, Celtic Studies, History, Linguistics, Literature* 105c:5 197 *Coleman*

Collins P ea “Addressing Problem Gambling: South Africa’s National Responsible Gambling Programme” 2011 *South African Medical Journal* 101:10 722-723

Cornelius S “Die reg op identiteit en die kommersiële ontginning van die individu se openbare beeld” 2008 *Tydskrif vir die Suid-Afrikaanse Reg* 2008 4 645-668

Cosgrave JF “Goffman Revisited: Action and Character in the Era of Legalized Gambling” 2008 *International Journal of Criminology and Sociological Theory* 1:1 80-96

Cunningham A “Advertising Self-Regulation in a Broader Context” 2000 *Journal of Promotion Management* 5:2 61-83

D

Du Preez ML “The Consumer Protection Bill: A few preliminary comments” 2009 *South African Law Journal* 58-83 *Du Preez*

Dean D “Elizabeth’s Lottery: Political Culture and State Formation in Early Modern England” 2011 *The Journal of British Studies* 587-611 *Dean*

Dendy M “Pitfalls of Advertising – II. Lotteries.” 1987 *Dendy II Businessman’s Law* 17 77

Dendy M “Pitfalls of Advertising – III. More about lotteries.” 1988 *Dendy III Businessman’s Law* 17 101

Dendy M “Pitfalls of Advertising – IV. Competitions.” 1988 *Dendy IV Businessman’s Law* 17 157

Dendy M “Lotteries and the Law” 1989 *Witwatersrand University Student Law Review* 1 43 *Dendy 1989*

Dickerson M “Internal and External Determinants of Persistent Gambling: Problems in Generalising From One Form of Gambling to Another” 1993 *Journal of Gambling Studies* 9:3 225-245 *Dickerson*

Dowrick, FE “The Irish Sweep and Irish Law” 1953 *The American Journal of Comparative Law* 2:4 505 *Dowrick*

F

Faris SB “Changing Public Policy and the Evolution of Roman Civil and Criminal Law on Gambling” 2012 *UNLV Gaming Law Journal* 3:2 199 *Faris*

Fuller RC “Morals and Criminal Law” 1942 *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 32:6 624-630

G

Gainsbury S & Wood R “Internet gambling policy in critical comparative perspective: the effectiveness of existing regulatory frameworks” 2011 *International Gambling Studies* 11:3 309-323 320.

Gerner-Beuerle C “United in Diversity: maximum versus minimum harmonization in EU securities regulation” 2012 *Capital Markets Law Journal* 7:3 317 *Gerner-Beuerle*

Giddens A “Fate, Risk and Security” in Cosgrave JF (ed) *The Sociology of Risk and Gambling Reader* 29 42-44

Gouws M “A Consumer’s Right to Disclosure and Information: Comments on the Plain Language Provisions of the Consumer Protection Act” 2010 *South African Mercantile Law Journal* 22:1 79

Govinden K “One step forward, two steps back” December 2014 *Without Prejudice* 14:11 35-36

Graglia LA “Government Promotion of Moral Issues: Gambling, Smoking, and Advertising” 2008 *Harvard Journal of Law and Policy* 31:1 69 *Graglia*

Gray O “Responsible advertising in Europe” 2005 *Young Consumers* 6:4 19-23 (“Gray”) 20 *Gray*

Griffiths M “Interactive television quizzes as gambling: A cause for concern?” 2007 *Journal of Gambling Issues* Issue 20 269-276 *Griffiths 2008*

- Griffiths M Mark Griffiths “Instant-win products and prize draws: Are these forms of gambling?” 2003 *Journal of Gambling Issues* 9 (<http://jgi.camh.net/doi/full/10.4309/jgi.2003.9.5>, accessed on 21 March 2015) *Griffiths 2003*
- Green SP “Vice Crimes and Preventive Justice” 10 October 2013 *Criminal Law and Philosophy*, published online at <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11572-013-9260-7> (accessed on 5 March 2015) *Green*
- Gundlach, GT “The American Marketing Association's 2004 definition of marketing: Perspectives on its implications for scholarship and the role and responsibility of marketing in society” 2007 *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* 26:2 243-250
- Gundlach, GT & Wilkie, WL “The American Marketing Association's new definition of marketing: Perspective and commentary on the 2007 revision” 2009 *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* 28:2, 259-264
- Gunningham N & Rees J “Industry Self-Regulation: An Institutional Perspective” 1997 *Law & Policy* 19:4 363 *Gunningham & Rees*
- H**
- Hawthorne L “Public policy: the origin of a general clause in the South African law of contract” 2013 *Fundamina* 19:2 300-320 *Hawthorne*
- Heubeck S “Measuring Skill in Games: A Critical Review of Methodologies” 2008 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 12:3 231
- Howells GG “The Rise of European Consumer Law – Whither National Consumer Law?” 2006 *Sydney Law Review* 28 63 *Howells*
- Hutto J “What is Everybody Doing About it? A Foreign Jurisdictional Analysis of Internet Gaming Regulation” 2005 *Gaming Law Review* 9:1 26-34
- Huyse L & Parmentier S “Decoding Codes: The Dialogue between Consumers and Suppliers through Codes of Conduct in the European Community” 1990 *Journal of Consumer Policy* 13: 253-272
- J**
- Jacobs W, Stoop PN & Van Niekerk R “Fundamental Consumer Rights under the Consumer Protection Act 68 of 2008: A Critical *Jacobs ea*

Overview and Analysis” 2010 13:3 *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal* 302-406

James JS “Regulating the Sweepstakes Industry: Are Consumers Close to Winning?” 2000 *Santa Clara Law Review* 41:2 581-618 *James*

K

Kandel D “Stages in Adolescent Involvement in Drug Use” 1975 *Science* 190:4217 912-914

Kingdon E & Jakhoet I “Is it ... or isn't it?” 2009 (February) *Without Prejudice* 9:1 34-35 *Kingdon & Jakhoet*

Kingma S “Gambling and the Risk Society: The Liberalisation and Legitimation Crisis of Gambling in the Netherlands” 2004 *International Gambling Studies* 4:1 47-67

Kingma SF “The liberalization and (re)regulation of Dutch gambling markets: National consequences of the changing European context” 2008 *Regulation and Governance* 2 445-458 *Kingma*

Köhler H “‘Congratulations, you have won!’ New standards apply to announcements of wins: A discussion of *Purely Creative and others*” 2013 *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice* 8:5 399

L

Labarbera PA “Analyzing and advancing the State of the Art of Advertising Self-Regulation” 1980 *Journal of Advertising* 9:4 27-38

Lam LW, Chan KW, Fong D & Lo F “Does the look matter? The impact of casino servicescape on gaming customer satisfaction, intention to revisit, and desire to stay” 2011 *International Journal of Hospitality Management* 30 558-567

Lanciani R “Gambling and Cheating in Ancient Rome” 1892 *The North American Review* 155:428 97 *Lanciani*

Lawson R “Prize competitions in the new gambling regime” 2005 *New Law Journal* 155:7179 872 *Lawson 2005*

Lawson R “Game Over” 4 May 2007 *Solicitor's Journal* 151:17 *Lawson 2007a*
<http://www.solicitorsjournal.com/employment/discrimination/game-over> (accessed on 2 May 2015)

- Lawson R “When some prizes are more equal than others” 14 September 2007 *Solicitor’s Journal* 151:34 *Lawson 2007b*
<http://www.solicitorsjournal.com/commercial/company/when-some-prizes-are-more-equal-others> (accessed on 3 May 2015)
- Leiper N “Tourism and Gambling” 1989 *GeoJournal* 19:3 269-275 *Leiper*
- Littlewood M “Gambling and Regulation: Why there is Nothing to Fear from Liberalisation” March 2011 *Economic Affairs* 34-37
- Lord TH & Miller LC “Playing the Game by the Rules: A Practical Guide to Sweepstakes and Contest Promotions” *Franchise Law Journal* (29:1) 3 *Lord & Miller*
- Lötter S “The odds against gambling” 1994 *South African Journal of Criminal Justice* (7) 189-199 *Lötter*
- Louw J “When a gamble is not a gamble: the *Pepsi-Cola* case” 1987 (February) *De Rebus* 65-68, 72 *Louw 1987*
- Louw J “Distortion of the law: A comment on the SCA judgment in *FirstRand Bank Ltd v National Lotteries Board* 2008 (4) SA 548 (SCA)” 2012 (August) *De Rebus* 59-60 *Louw 2012*

M

- McAllister I “Public opinion towards gambling and gambling regulation in Australia” 2014 *International Gambling Studies* 14:1 146-160
- McGowan R “Casinos or No Casinos: What Are the Relevant Considerations?” 2012 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 16:1&2 27-42 *McGowan*
- MacKenzie J “Wave good-bye to those lekker competitions” 2003 (3:1) *Without Prejudice* 12-13 *MacKenzie*
- Mayer K, Johnson L, Hu C and Chen S “Gaming customer satisfaction: An exploratory study” 1998 *Journal of Travel Research* 37 178-183
- Mayer KJ & Johnson L “A Customer-based Assessment of Casino Atmospherics” *UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal* 7:1 21-31
- Melamdowitz H “MAMA – they’re making eyes at me” 2007 (August) *Without Prejudice* 16-18 *Melamdowitz*

- Mikesell JL & Zorn CK “State Lotteries as Fiscal Savior or Fiscal Fraud: A Look at the Evidence” 1986 *Public Administration Review* 46:4 311-320 *Mikesell & Zorn*
- Miers D “The Gambling Review Report: Redefining the Social and Economic Regulation of Commercial Gambling” 2003 *The Modern Law Review* 66:4 604 *Miers 2003*
- Miers D “From Constraint to Competition: 50 Years of Change in British Gambling Policy” 2011 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 15:3 93 *Miers 2011*
- Miller KC “How Should the Past Inform the Future? Reviewing Regulating Internet Gaming: Challenges and Opportunities” 2014 *UNLV Gaming Law Journal* 5:1 49-79
- Miller LC & Lord TH “Playing the Game by the Rules: A Practical Guide to Sweepstakes and Contest Promotions” *Franchise Law Journal* 3-9 *Miller & Lord*
- Mncwango S “The complex rules for promotional competitions” 2013 (April) *Without Prejudice* 13:3 82 *Mncwango*
- Monnye SL “Gambling in South Africa: is online gambling not a component of gambling?” 2012 (Fall) *UNLV Gaming Law Journal* 221 *Monnye*
- Monty S “The money or the box – getting competition rules straight” 2012 (May) *Without Prejudice* 57-58 *Monty*
- Mupangavanhu Y “An analysis of the dispute settlement mechanism under the Consumer Protection Act 68 of 2008” (2012) 15:5 *PELJ* 320-346 *Mupangavanhu*
- Murphy S “Towards Deregulation ... and Beyond: The Demise of the Gaming Board and the Gambling Bill 2005” 2013 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 17:6 413 *Murphy 2013*

N

- Naudé T “Unfair Contract Terms Legislation: The Implications of Why We Need it for its Formulation and Application” 2006 *Stellenbosch Law Review* 17:3 361 373-374
- Naudé T “The Use of Black and Grey Lists in Unfair Contract Terms Legislation in Comparative Perspective” 2007 *South African Law Journal* 124:1 128

Naudé T “The Consumer’s Right to Safe, Good Quality Goods and the Implied Warranty of Quality Under Sections 55 and 56 of the Consumer Protection Act 68 of 2008” 2011 *South African Mercantile Law Journal* 23:3 336 *Naudé 2011*

Neethling J “Die beskerming van die persoonlikheidsreg op identiteit teen kommersiële uitbuiting: *Kumalo v Cycle Lab (Pty) Ltd* 2011-06-17 saaknr 31871/2008 (GSJ); *W v Atoll Media (Pty) Ltd* 2010 4 All SA 548 (WKK): regspraak” 2012 *Tydskrif vir die Suid-Afrikaanse Reg* 2 348-355

Nyman JA, Welte JW & Dowd BE “Something for nothing: A model of gambling behaviour” 2008 *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 37 2492-2504

O

Ogus A “Rethinking Self-Regulation” 1995 *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 15:1 97-108 *Ogus*

Orbach B “What is Regulation?” 2012 *Yale Journal on Regulation Online* 30:1 (available online at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2143385) *Orbach*

Owens MD “If you can’t tweet ‘em, join ‘em: The New Media, Hybrid Games, and Gambling Law” 2010 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 14:9 669-672

MD “If it isn’t Gambling, How Far Should Gaming Regulation Go?: Quasi-gambling, ‘Freemium,’ and State Control” 2013 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 17:7 506-510 *Owens 2013*

P

Peattie K & Peattie S “Sales Promotion – Playing to Win?” 1993 *Journal of Marketing Management* 9:3 255-269 *Peattie & Peattie 1993a*

Peattie K & Peattie S “Sales Promotion Competitions – A Survey” 1993 *Journal of Marketing Management* 9:3 271-286 *Peattie & Peattie 1993b*

Peattie K, Peattie S & Emafo EB “Promotional Competitions as a Strategic Marketing Weapon” 1997 13:8 *Journal of Marketing Management* 13 777-789 *Peattie & Emafo*

Peattie S “Applying sales promotion competitions to nonprofit contexts” 2003 *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 8:4 349-362 *Peattie 2003*

Peterson F & Kesselman-Turkel J “Through the looking glass”
Advertising Age 3 May 1982 M-10

R

Raghubir P, Inman JJ & Grande H “The three faces of consumer promotions” 2004 *California Management Review* 46:23-42

Raylu N & Oei TPS “Pathological gambling: A comprehensive review” 2002 *Clinical Psychology Review* 22 1009-1061 *Raylu & Oei*

Raven J “The Abolition of the English State Lotteries” 1991 *The Historical Journal* 371-389

Reader TW “Is Self-Regulation the Best Option for the Advertising Industry in the European Union – An Argument for the Harmonization of Advertising Laws through the Continued Use of Directive” 1995 *University Pennsylvania Journal of International Business Law* 16:1 181-215 181-182

Rodrigues C “The gaming spider spins its web: gaming law” 2008 *Without Prejudice* 8:9 24-25

Rose IN “*The International Law of Remote Wagering*” 2007 *John Marshall Law Review* Vol 40 1159 *Rose 2007*

Rose IN “Gambling and the Law®: The Third Wave of Legal Gambling” 2010 *Villanova Sports & Entertainment Law Journal* 17:2 361

Rose IN “The Danger of Not Caring About Gambling” 2011 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 15:10 589-590 *Rose 2011*

Rose IN “Why Gaming Lawyers Are Important” 2011 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 15:7-8 419-421

Rose IN “How Insurance Became (Mostly) Not Gambling” 2014 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 18:9 (“Rose 2014”) 864-872 *Rose 2014*

Rose IN “The Dangers of Under-Regulating Gambling” 2015 *Gaming Law Review and Economics* 19:1 4-5

Rousseau GG & Venter DJL “Measuring Consumer Attitudes Towards Gambling” 2002 *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology* 28:2 87-92

S

- Scott C “Beyond Taxonomies of Private Authority in Transnational Regulation” 2012 *German Law Journal* 13:12 1329 1335
- Seligman TJ “Marketing through Online Promotions” April 2004 *Seligman The Computer and Internet Lawyer* 21:4 22-26
- Senden L “Soft Law, Self-Regulation and Co-Regulation in European Law: Where Do They Meet?” 2005 *Electronic Journal of Comparative Law* 9:1 11 <http://www.ejcl.org/91/abs91-3.html> (accessed on 15 August 2015) *Senden*
- Skolnick JH “The Social Transformation of Vice” 1988 *Law and Contemporary Problems* 51:1 9-29 *Skolnick*
- Snail S “Online Gambling in South Africa” 2007 *Juta’s Business Law* 15:3 114-121 *Snail*
- Sprott, DE, Hardesty DM & Miyazaki AD “Disclosure of Odds Information: An experimental Investigation of Odds Format and Numeric Complexity” 1998 *Journal of Public Policy and Marketing* 17:1 11-12
- Strachan D “Promotional competitions under the CPA” 2010 (December) *Without Prejudice* 34-35 *Strachan*
- Stevens M & Young M “Who Plays What? Participation Profiles in Chance Versus Skill-based Gambling” 2010 *Journal of Gambling Studies* Vol 26 89-103 *Stevens & Young*
- Stoop PN & Chürr C “Unpacking the right to plain and understandable language in the Consumer Protection Act 68 of 2008” 2013 *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal* 16:5 514

T

- Taylor CR & Kopp SW “Games, Contests, and Sweepstakes Run Afoul: A State of Legal Disorder” 1991 *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing* 10:1 199-213 *Taylor & Kopp 1991*
- Taylor N “Promotional competitions – let the promoter beware” 2011 (April) *Without Prejudice* 17-20 *N Taylor*
- Thomas R “The quirks of the law” *Advertising Age* 3 May 1982 M-11 *Thomas*
- Thompson WN “Why They Say ‘No’ (Casi-‘No’): Countries that Reject Legalized Casino Gambling” 2012 *UNLV Gaming Law Journal* 16:3 195-230

Tyawa B “Regulating Gaming in the New South Africa” 2012
UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal 16:1 93-96

U

Unknown “Lotteries” 1933 *Bulletin of the Business Historical Society* 7:4 1

V

Vanyukov ea “Common liability to addiction and ‘gateway hypothesis’: Theoretical, empirical and evolutionary perspective” 2012 *Drug and alcohol dependence* 123 Supplement 1, S3-17, <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3600369/> (accessed on 21 March 2015)

Verbruggen P “Enforcement of transnational private regulation of advertising practices: decentralization, mechanisms and procedural fairness” in Cafaggi F (ed) *Enforcement of Transnational Regulation: Ensuring Compliance in a Global World* Verbruggen 2012

Verbruggen P “Gorillas in the closet? Public and private actors in the enforcement of transnational private regulation” 2013 *Regulation & Governance* 7:4 512-532 (“Verbruggen 2013”) 516 Verbruggen 2013

W

Waksman S “Selling the Nightingale: P.T. Barnum, Jenny Lind, and the management of the American crowd” 2011 *Arts Marketing: An International Journal* 1:2 108 Waksman

Weatherill S “Harmonisation: How Much, How Little?” 2005 *European Business Law Review* 16:3 533 Weatherill 2005

Weinstock J, Massura CE & Petry NM “Professional and Pathological Gamblers: Similarities and Differences” 2013 *Journal of Gambling Studies* 29 205-216 Weinstock ea

Welte JW, Barnes, GM, Wieczorek WF, Tidwell MO & Parker JC “Risk factors for pathological gambling” 2004 *Addictive Behaviors* 29 323-335 Welte ea

Wessman MB “Is ‘Contract’ the Name of the Game? Promotional Games as Test Cases for Contract Theory” 1992 *Arizona Law Review* 34:4 635

- Whitebread CH “‘Us’ and ‘Them’ and the Nature of Moral Regulation” *Southern California Law Review* 74 361-370 *Whitebread*
- Wiehahn P “To be or not to be: the legality of gambling in South Africa” *Codicillus* XXXVII (2) 39-44 *P Wiehahn*
- Woker T “Why the need for consumer protection legislation? A look at some of the reasons behind the promulgation of the National Credit Act and the Consumer Protection Act” 2010 *Obiter* 217-231 *Woker 2010*
- Wong Y-L R, Leung YKT & Lau CWD “Behind the allure of gambling: A qualitative exploration of the existential yearning of Chinese me with problem gambling in Hong Kong” 2009 *International Gambling Studies* 9:3 189-205

Y

- Young C “So you think it’s easy to run a competition. Think Again” 2006 (May) *Without Prejudice* 42-43 *Young*
- Young J “Moral Panic: Its Origins in Resistance, Ressentiment and the Translation of Fantasy into Reality” 2009 *British Journal of Criminology* 49 4-16
- Yovovich, B G “Sweeps and games stake out new claims” *Advertising Age* 3 May 1982 M-7 *Yovovich*

WEBSITES

Description

Citation

A

Advertising Self-Regulatory Council (United States)
<http://www.ascreviews.org/>, accessed on 16 June 2015

Advertising Standards Authority (New Zealand) www.asa.co.nz
(accessed on 28 March 2015)

Advertising Standards Authority (New Zealand) “Advertising Codes of Practice 2014” [http://www.asa.co.nz/pdfs/ASA%20CoP%202014%20\(Web\).pdf](http://www.asa.co.nz/pdfs/ASA%20CoP%202014%20(Web).pdf) (accessed on 28 March 2015)

Advertising Standards Authority of South Africa “About the ASA”,
<http://www.asasa.org.za/about> (accessed on 20 June 2015)

Advertising Standards Authority of South Africa “Advertising Code of Practice”, <http://www.asasa.org.za/codes/advertising-code-of-practice> (accessed on 20 June 2015)

Altini N “Dti relaxes stance on promotional competitions via SMS” *Altini* (27 January 2012) <http://themediainline.co.za/2012/01/dti-relaxes-stance-promotional-competitions-via-sms/> (accessed on 30 May 2015)

Australasian Gambling Council “Chapter 16: A Brief History of Gambling in New Zealand” (available online at https://www.austgamingcouncil.org.au/system/files/AGCPublications/AGC_DB_2013-14_CHP_16.pdf) (accessed 31 January 2015) *AGC Ch 16*

American Association of Marketing. “Definition of marketing”. <https://www.ama.org/AboutAMA/Pages/Definition-of-Marketing.aspx> (accessed on 20 April 2014)

American Psychiatric Association.

“DSM 5 Fact Sheet. Substance-Related and Addictive Disorders” <http://www.psychiatry.org/dsm5> (accessed on 24 May 2014)

American Sociological Association “What is Sociology?” <http://www.asanet.org/about/sociology.cfm> (accessed on 25 July 2015)

B

Baldwin Son & Carey “Beyond advertising – keeping your sales promotion within the law” 23 April 2010 *Baldwin* <http://baldwins.com/beyond-advertising-keeping-your-sales-promotion-within-the-law/> (accessed on 24 February 2015)

Baitsewe R “Plain Language: More than just ‘plain’ words” June 2012 *Consumer Law Review* https://jutralaw.co.za/newsletter/newsletter/consumer-law-database_jun-2012-1-1-1-1-1-1/ (accessed on 17 July 2015)

Bowal P & Brunet A “Canadian Regulation of Contests, Prizes and Games” *LawNow* 5 September 2014 <http://www.lawnow.org/canadian-regulation-contests-prizes-games/> (accessed on 31 May 2015)

Brand Activation Association “BAA’s 37th Marketing Law Conference – Walking the Line: Between Innovation and Regulation” <https://www.baalink.org/conference/show/id/BAALAW-NOV15> (accessed on 24 July 2015)

C

Cambridge Business English Dictionary. Definition of “marketing”.
<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/business-english/marketing?q=marketing> (accessed on 20 April 2014)

Cambridge Dictionaries Online “Vice”
<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/british/vice> (last accessed on 7 March 2015)

Central Intelligence Agency *The World Factbook* “New Zealand” *CIA Factbook NZ*
(20 June 2014) (<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/nz.html>) (accessed on 31 January 2015)

Central Intelligence Agency *The World Factbook* “United Kingdom” *CIA Factbook UK*
10 April 2015 <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/uk.html> (accessed on 18 April 2015)

Commerce Commission New Zealand “What is the Fair Trading Act ... and how does it affect me?”
<http://www.comcom.govt.nz/fair-trading/fair-trading-act-fact-sheets/what-is-the-fair-trading-act/> (accessed on 25 February 2015)

Commerce Commission New Zealand “Special offers and competitions” August 2010 *FTA Competitions Fact Sheet*
<http://www.comcom.govt.nz/dmsdocument/1105> (accessed on 25 February 2015)

Committee of Advertising Practice www.cap.org.uk (accessed on 11 July 2015)

Committee of Advertising Practice “Help note: Promotions with prizes” August 2013 *CAP Help Note*
https://www.cap.org.uk/~/_media/Files/CAP/Help%20notes%20new/PromotionsWithPrizesHelpNote.ashx (accessed on 11 July 2015)

Council of Better Business Bureaus
(<http://www.bbb.org/council/about/council-of-better-business-bureaus/>, accessed on 16 June 2015)

Cushing C & Tierney J “Regulating the Sweepstakes Industry. Multistate Litigation.” undated *Cushing & Tierney*
<http://web.law.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/microsites/career-services/Regulating%20the%20Sweepstakes%20Industry.pdf> (accessed on 27 March 2015)

D

DMA “SA Marketers hit the jackpot with Amendment to the Lotteries Bill” *Bizcommunity.com* 15 November 2001 (<http://www.bizcommunity.com/Article/196/14/366.html>, accessed on 23 May 2015)

Danish Consumer Ombudsman “ICC Codes”, <http://www.consumerombudsman.dk/Regulatory-framework/dcoguides/icccodes> (accessed on 15 August 2015)

Department of Internal Affairs “Gaming Act Review” (https://www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.nsf/wpg_URL/Legislative-Reviews-Gaming-Act-Review-Index?OpenDocument) (accessed on 1 February 2015)

Department of Internal Affairs. “Gambling Act 2003” *Gambling Act* (https://www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.NSF/wpg_URL/Services-Casino-and-Non-Casino-Gaming-Gambling-Act-2003?OpenDocument) (accessed on 1 February 2015)

Department of Internal Affairs “Prize Competition Game Rules” (http://www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.nsf/wpg_URL/Services-Casino-and-Non-Casino-Gaming-Prize-Competition-Game-Rules) accessed on 28 March 2015

Department of Internal Affairs “Gambling Fact Sheet #1: Gambling Regulation in New Zealand” (undated) *Fact Sheet 1* ([https://www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.nsf/Files/GamblingFactSheets-Feb2013/\\$file/FactSheet1-Feb2013.pdf](https://www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.nsf/Files/GamblingFactSheets-Feb2013/$file/FactSheet1-Feb2013.pdf) (accessed on 16 February 2015))

Department of Internal Affairs (New Zealand) “Fact Sheet 9: Sales Promotion Schemes” (undated) *Fact Sheet 9* (<http://bit.ly/1euc6Ff> (accessed on 26 February 2014))

Department of Internal Affairs “Gambling Fact Sheet #28: Casinos” *Fact Sheet 28* ([http://www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.nsf/Files/GamblingFactSheets-Feb2013/\\$file/FactSheet28-Feb2013.pdf](http://www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.nsf/Files/GamblingFactSheets-Feb2013/$file/FactSheet28-Feb2013.pdf) (accessed on 21 February 2015))

Department of Internal Affairs “Gambling Fact Sheet #40: Spot Prize Competitions” *Fact Sheet 40* ([http://www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.nsf/Files/Gambling-Fact-Sheets/\\$file/Gambling-Fact-Sheet-40-Spot-Prize-Competitions-9-July-2014.pdf](http://www.dia.govt.nz/diawebsite.nsf/Files/Gambling-Fact-Sheets/$file/Gambling-Fact-Sheet-40-Spot-Prize-Competitions-9-July-2014.pdf) (accessed on 24 February 2015))

Department of Trade and Industry *Presentation to the Portfolio Committee on Trade and Industry on the Lotteries Amendment Bill* 23 July 2013, https://www.thedti.gov.za/parliament/2013/Lotteries_Bill_23July2013.pdf (accessed on 20 May 2015)

De Stadler, E “What is the Consumer Law Review” in Juta’s *De Stadler 2012 Consumer Law Review* newsletter (February 2012)

<http://jutalaw.co.za/newsletter/newsletter/consumer-law-review-january-2012-1/> (accessed on 11 January 2015)

Dictionary.com Unabridged. Definition of "fun and games". (Random House).

<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/fun%20and%20games> (accessed on 12 April 2014)

Direct Marketing Association of Southern Africa, www.dmasa.org (accessed on 21 June 2015)

Dodd S “Irish Sweepstake scandal remains a lesson to us all” *Independent.ie* (7 December 2003)

<http://www.independent.ie/opinion/analysis/irish-sweepstake-scandal-remains-a-lesson-to-us-all-26237690.html> (accessed on 24 January 2015)

Dresden B “The Gambling Act 2005: What does it mean for promotional marketing in practice?” <http://www.gala-marketlaw.com.previewdns.com/joomla4/pdf/GamblingActDec05.pdf> (accessed on 30 April 2015)

Dresden 2015

E

Encyclopaedia Britannica “Irish Sweepstakes” <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/294177/Irish-Sweepstakes> (accessed on 24 January 2015)

Britannica, Irish Sweepstakes

Encyclopaedia Britannica <http://global.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/615557/United-Kingdom> (accessed on 18 April 2015)

Britannica, United Kingdom

European Advertising Standards Alliance “Advertising Self-Regulation: The Essentials” http://www.easa-alliance.org/binarydata.aspx?type=doc/ASR_the_essentials.pdf/download (accessed on 24 August 2015)

EASA Essentials

European Advertising Standards Alliance, “Blue Book 6”, <http://www.easa-alliance.org/page.aspx/266>, accessed on 16 June 2015

EASA “The EASA Best Practice Self-Regulatory Model (April 2004)” http://www.easa-alliance.org/binarydata.aspx?type=doc/EN_BestPracticeModel.pdf/download (accessed on 27 August 2015)

European Advertising Standards Alliance “International Guide to developing a self-regulatory organisation”, http://www.easa-alliance.org/binarydata.aspx?type=doc/EASA_International_Guide.pdf/download (accessed on 27 August 2015)

European Advertising Standards Alliance, “South Africa” <http://www.easa-alliance.org/South-Africa/page.aspx/153>, accessed on 16 June 2015

European Advertising Standards Alliance “What is EASA?” (<http://www.easa-alliance.org/About-EASA/Who-What-Why-/page.aspx/110>, accessed on 16 June 2015)

F

Federal Communications Commission “Broadcasting Contest, Lotteries, and Solicitation of Funds” <http://www.fcc.gov/guides/broadcasting-contests-lotteries-and-solicitation-funds> (accessed on 28 February 2015)

Federal Trade Commission 27 February 2015 “Identity Theft Tops FTC’s Consumer Complaint Categories Again in 2014” <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/press-releases/2015/02/identity-theft-tops-ftcs-consumer-complaint-categories-again-2014> (accessed on 5 September 2015)

Fitzgerald J, Cavanaugh N & Bhiro R “CPR for the 4Ps: Breathing new life into the marketing mix” <http://alumni.keiseruniversity.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/CPR-for-the-4Ps-IABE.pdf> (accessed on 23 April 2014)

FitzGerald S “Bradfute Revisited” 38-41 Autumn 1996 *Newsletter of the Society for the Study of Gambling* No. 28 38-41 *FitzGerald 1996* <http://www.societystudygambling.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/SSG-newsletter28.pdf> (accessed on 29 April 2015)

FitzGerald S “Government gamble” 22 July 2005 *Solicitor’s Journal* 149:29 *FitzGerald 2005* <http://www.solicitorsjournal.com/public/local-government/government-gamble>, accessed on 3 May 2015

FitzGerald S 12 November 2014 “Case Law Update for the Institute of Licencing” (sic) <http://www.instituteoflicensing.org/Public/National%20Events/NTE%202014/Presentations/D3%20S1%20-%20Susanna%20FitzGerald%20-%20Case%20Law%20Update.pdf> (accessed on 2 May 2015)

G

German Association of Communications Agencies “Germany: Self-Regulatory Organisations”, http://www.gwa.de/fileadmin/media-center/Dokumente/Self_Regulation_in_Germany.pdf (accessed on 15 August 2015)

H

Hartley A “Illegal SMS competitions under the spotlight” IOL News 7 February 2006 (<http://www.iol.co.za/news/south-africa/illegal-sms-competitions-under-the-spotlight-1.265656>, accessed on 23 May 2015)

Her Majesty’s Government “Transposition Guidance: How to implement European Directives effectively” April 2013 8, https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/229763/bis-13-775-transposition-guidance-how-to-implement-european-directives-effectively-revised.pdf (accessed on 11 July 2015)

Honey E & Mare A “Promotional competitions in terms of the CPA” (10 August 2011) *Honey & Mare* <http://www.bowman.co.za/News-Blog/Blog/promotional-competitions-in-terms-of-CPA> (accessed on 30 May 2015)

Humphreys B, Nyman J & Ruseski J *The Effect of Gambling on Health: Evidence from Canada* Working Paper No. 2011-18, available online at <http://uofa.ualberta.ca/-/media/arts/departments-institutes-and-centres/economics/wps/WP2011-18-Humphreys-Ruseski.pdf>

Hurley M & Smedley R “Win! Win! Win!” 10 March 2010 *Hurley & Smedley* <http://www.anthoniharper.co.nz/cms/uploads/FJP-N-410-1%20Win%20Win%20Win%20-%20Newsletter.pdf> (accessed on 23 February 2015) (No longer available online, but copy on file with the author hereof.)

I

International Audiotex Regulators Network, <http://www.iarn.org> (accessed on 16 August 2015)

International Audiotex Regulators Network Handbook, http://www.iarn.org/documents/iarn_handbook.pdf (accessed on 16 August 2015)

International Chamber of Commerce “Commission on Marketing and Advertising” (<http://www.iccwbo.org/about-icc/policy-commissions/marketing-and-advertising/> (accessed on 16 June 2015))

International Chamber of Commerce “Marketing and Advertising”, <http://www.iccwbo.org/advocacy-codes-and-rules/areas-of-work/marketing-and-advertising/> (accessed on 15 August 2015)

International Chamber of Commerce “Self-regulation”, *ICC Self-Regulation*, <http://www.iccwbo.org/Advocacy-Codes-and-Rules/Areas-of-work/Marketing-and-Advertising/Self-regulation/>, accessed on 15 August 2015.

J

Jacobson P “Rewritten WASPA Code better regulates mobiles services in SA” *Web Tech Law* 27 August 2014 <http://webtechlaw.com/2014/08/27/rewritten-waspa-code-better-regulates-mobile-services-sa/> (accessed on 20 June 2015)

K

Khalianyane L “Woman spends big to win car” 30 October 2013 *IOL News* <http://www.iol.co.za/news/south-africa/eastern-cape/woman-spends-big-to-win-car-1.1599723> (accessed on 21 March 2015)

Kingdon E “Competition regulations change under the Consumer Protection Act” (<http://www.polity.org.za/article/competition-regulations-change-under-the-consumer-protection-act-2011-01-10>, accessed on 24 May 2015) *Kingdon 2011*

Krige J “Promotional Competitions 101” 24 December 2013 *Krige* <http://www.golegal.co.za/legislation/promotional-competitions-101> (accessed on 16 May 2015)

L

Lawson R “Everyone a winner?” 7 January 2005 *Solicitors Journal* Vol 149 *Lawson 2005* <http://www.solicitorsjournal.com/public/local-government/everyone-winner> (accessed on 30 April 2005)

Loos MBM “Full harmonisation as a regulatory concept and its consequences for the national legal orders. The example of the Consumer rights directive” July 2010 *Centre for the Study of* *Loos*

European Contract Law Working Paper Series No. 2010/03
http://www.researchgate.net/publication/228245729_Full_Harmonisation_as_a_Regulatory_Concept_and_its_Consequences_for_the_National_Legal_Orders_The_Example_of_the_Consumer_Rights_Directive, accessed on 11 July 2015

Louw J “The positive side of how section 54 of the Lotteries Act, 1997 affects consumer competitions” (30 June 2003) *Louw 2003*
<http://bit.ly/MOuJxE> (accessed on 23 February 2014)

Louw J “Consumer Protection Act 2008 and Promotional Competitions. Promotional Competitions – The End of the Line: Lawful No Longer” (Internet article accessed on 23 February 2014, but no longer available online. Article on file with author.) *Louw End of the Line*

M

Marketing Association of New Zealand “Submission to Ministry of Consumer Affairs on Consumer Law Reform - Discussion Paper”
http://www.consumeraffairs.govt.nz/pdf-library/consumer-law-reform-submissions-pdfs/nz-marketing-association.pdf/at_download/file (accessed on 28 March 2015)

Marketing Code Authority “Code of Marketing Practice”
<http://www.marketingcode.co.za/images/SACodeMarketingPractice.pdf> (accessed on 21 June 2015)

Merriam-Webster. Definition of “marketing”. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/marketing> (accessed on 20 April 2014)

Michalsons “Promotional competitions – a checklist to comply with the CPA” 5 April 2014 <http://www.michalsons.co.za/promotional-competitions/2432> (accessed on 23 May 2015)

Miller V “Making EU law into UK law” House of Commons Library, Standard Note SN/IA/5419 22 October 2014 *Miller 2014*
<http://www.parliament.uk/briefing-papers/SN05419.pdf> (accessed on 4 May 2015)

Mudzuli K “R8bn Menlyn casino faces challenges” 17 October 2014 *IOL News* <http://www.iol.co.za/business/companies/r8bn-menlyn-casino-faces-challenges-1.1766514> (accessed on 24 July 2015)

Mudzuli K “Menlyn casino gets go ahead” 12 December 2014 *IOL News* <http://www.iol.co.za/news/crime-courts/menlyn-casino-gets-go-ahead-1.1795044> (accessed on 24 July 2015)

N

National Gambling Board “Research” <http://www.ngb.org.za/organisational-areas/research.aspx> (accessed on 27 July 2015)

National Gambling Board *The Social Impact of Gambling in South Africa: Qualitative Perspective 2013*
<http://www.ngb.org.za/SiteResources/documents/Social%20impact%20of%20gambling%20qualitative%20perspective%202013.pdf> (accessed on 19 March 2015)

National Lotteries Commission “Promotional Competitions”
<http://www.nlcsa.org.za/promotional-competitions/> (accessed on 15 July 2015)

National Responsible Gambling Programme “History, Structure and Function of the NGRP” *NRGP*
<http://www.responsiblegambling.co.za/content/?37> (last accessed on 21 February 2015)

New Zealand Herald, The “Judge calls bluff on online gambling site” 10 July 2010
http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10657874 (accessed on 23 February 2015)

New Zealand Herald, The “Court settles wrangle over definition of gambling” 26 April 2012
http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10801678 (accessed on 23 February 2015)

Nightingale S ea “Internet gambling – But not as you know it”
<http://www.buddlefindlay.com/legal-update-on-ICT-aug-2011> (accessed on 23 February 2015)

O

Oxford Dictionaries. “Game” Oxford University Press.
<http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/game>, accessed on May 09, 2015

Oxford Dictionaries. “Scheme” Oxford University Press.
<http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/scheme>, accessed on 9 May 2015

P

Parliamentary Monitoring Group “Lotteries Amendment Bill, 2001” Presentation <http://pmg-assets.s3-website-eu-west->

1.amazonaws.com/docs/2001/appendices/011017Lottery.htm
(accessed on 31 January 2015)

Parliamentary Monitoring Group, Minutes of Trade and Industry
Portfolio Committee, 17 October 2001 (<http://pmg-assets.s3-website-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/docs/2001/minutes/011017pctrade.htm>, accessed on 23 May 2015)

Parliamentary Monitoring Group, Minutes of Trade and Industry
Portfolio Committee, 26 October 2001 (<http://pmg-assets.s3-website-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/docs/2001/minutes/011026pctrade.htm>, accessed on 23 May 2015)

PhonepayPlus “Service-Specific Guidance Note: Competitions and other games with prizes” undated *PP Guidance Note*
<http://code.phonepayplus.org.uk/pdf/guidance-notes/competitions-and-other-games-with-prizes.pdf> (accessed on 12 July 2015)

R

Reilly C & Smith N, National Centre for Responsible Gambling
“The Evolving Definition of Pathological Gambling”
http://www.ncrg.org/sites/default/files/uploads/docs/white_papers/ncrg_wpdsm5_may2013.pdf (accessed on 24 May 2014)

Rose IN “Gambling and the Law” www.gamblingandthelaw.com
(accessed on 28 February 2015)

S

SAPA “Illegal gambling costs SA millions” *Business Report* 20
February 2015 (<http://www.iol.co.za/business/news/illegal-gambling-costs-sa-millions-1.1821553#.VPd-e3kcRMs>, accessed on 4 March 2015)

Shera R “Judge Harvey Goes Web 2.0”
<http://www.lojo.co.nz/updates-article/Judge-Harvey-Goes-Web-20>
(accessed on 23 February 2015)

Simpson Grierson “Online Gambling – Can You or Can’t You” *Simpson Grierson*
April 2001
<http://www.findlaw.com/12international/countries/nz/articles/440.html> (accessed on 23 February 2015)

Swedish Advertising Ombudsman (Reklamombudsmannen)
“About” <http://reklamombudsmannen.org/eng/about> (accessed on 15 August 2015)

U

UNLV Gaming Law Journal: Gambling Disorder and the Law
Symposium Issue
http://law.unlv.edu/sites/default/files/glj_call_for_abstracts.pdf
(accessed on 21 May 2014)

Unknown “FASA to handle alternative dispute resolutions for franchise sector” *Bizcommunity.com* 27 November 2013
<http://www.bizcommunity.com/Article/196/173/103960.html>,
accessed on 16 June 2015

Unknown “Vodacom switches from ‘play’ to ‘pay’” 25 February 2008 IOL News <http://www.iol.co.za/news/south-africa/vodacom-switches-from-play-to-pay-1.390727#.VRHi3HkcRMs> (accessed on 25 March 2015)

V

Verbruggen P “Case Study Report: Transnational Private Regulation in the Advertising Industry”, available online at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2256043 (accessed on 23 August 2015) *Verbruggen 2011*

W

Walker MB “Irrational Thinking Among Slot Machines Players” 1992 *Journal of Gambling Studies* 8:3 245 *Walker Irrational Thinking*

Wilson J “History” *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand* (30 April 2014) <http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/history> (accessed on 31 January 2015)

Wilson V “The Legality of Text Competitions under the Gambling Act” 29 September 2004 <http://www.internationallawoffice.com/newsletters/detail.aspx?g=b540e029-0910-4d1c-bfca-0ff183aadcc6&redir=1> (accessed on 25 February 2015) *Wilson*

Wireless Application Service Providers’ Association “About WASPA” <https://waspa.org.za/about/> (accessed on 20 June 2015)

NEWSPAPER AND MAGAZINE ARTICLES

Description	Citation
Koenderman T “The Last Word ...” <i>Financial Mail</i> 3 December 1999 80	
Koenderman T “Don’t bet on it” <i>Finweek</i> 4 March 2010 50-51	<i>Koenderman 2010</i>
Loxton L “Erwin to place curbs on promotional competitions” <i>The Star</i> 19 September 1997 1	
Pather S “Lottery Act moves are welcomed” <i>Citizen</i> 18 October 2001 4	
Temkin S “Marketers up in arms over changes to Lotteries Act” <i>Business Day</i> 17 June 2003 1	

DISCUSSION PAPERS AND GREEN PAPERS

Description	Citation
New Zealand	
Department of Internal Affairs Policy Unit <i>Gaming – A New Direction for New Zealand: Department of Internal Affairs Policy Proposals</i> (Department of Internal Affairs, Wellington 1996)	
Department of Internal Affairs <i>Gaming Reform in New Zealand: Towards a new legislative framework</i> (Department of Internal Affairs, Wellington 2001)	<i>NZ Gaming Reform Paper</i>
South Africa	
Draft Green Paper on the Consumer Policy Framework 09/04 (Notice 1957 of 2004 in <i>Government Gazette</i> No. 26774, 9 September 2004)	<i>Consumer Policy Green Paper</i>
Department of Trade and Industry <i>Lotteries Policy Review: A discussion document</i> August 2012 (http://www.icnl.org/research/library/files/South%20Africa/Lotteriespolicy.pdf , accessed on 20 May 2015)	

DRAFT LEGISLATION AND CODES

Description	Citation
Consumer Protection Bill, 2006	<i>CPB 2006</i>
Consumer Protection Bill, 2008 [B19D-2008]	<i>CPB 2008</i>
Proposed Industry Code for the Advertising Industry (Notice No. 224, <i>Government Gazette</i> No. 36253, 22 March 2013)	
Proposed Industry Code for the Franchise Industry of South Africa (Notice No. 33 of 2016, <i>Government Gazette</i> No. 39631, 29 January 2016)	

EXPLANATORY NOTES, MEMORANDA AND NOTICES

Description	Citation
South Africa	
Memorandum on the Objects of the Lotteries Amendment Bill, 2013	
GN 294, <i>Government Gazette</i> No. 34181, 1 April 2011	
No. R. 25, 2014 <i>Government Gazette</i> No. 37544, 11 April 2014.	
No. 33 of 2016, <i>Government Gazette</i> No. 39631, 29 January 2016.	
United Kingdom	
Explanatory Notes relating to the Gambling Act 2015	GA Explanatory Notes 2015

LEGISLATION

Country

Citation

European Union

Directive 2005/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2005 concerning unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices in the internal

UCP Directive

Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 concerning misleading and comparative advertising (2006/114/EC)

Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union

New Zealand

Casino Control Act 1990

Gaming Act, 1908

Gaming Amendment Act 1949

Gaming and Lotteries Act 1977

Gambling Act 2003

NZ Gambling Act 2003

Gambling Amendment Act 2015

Gambling (Non-gambling Activities) Regulations 2013

Gambling (Prohibited Property) Regulations 2005

Racing Act 2003

South Africa

Act 3 of 1902 (Natal)

Lotteries Prohibition Act 9 of 1889 (Cape)

Companies Act 71 of 2008

Competition Act, 1998

Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act 2002 of 1993

Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996

Consumer Affairs (Unfair Business Practices) Act, 1988

Consumer Protection Act 68 of 2008 *CPA*

Consumer Protection Act Regulations (GN R293, *CPA Regulations*
Government Gazette 34180 of 1 April 2011)

Electronic Communications Act 36 of 2005

Electronic Communications and Transactions Act 25 of 2002

Gambling Act 51 of 1965

Independent Broadcasting Authority Act 153 of 1993

Law against the Holding of Lotteries 7 of 1890 (Transvaal)

Law for the Discouragement of Gambling 25 of 1878 (Natal)

Lotteries Act 57 of 1997 *Lotteries Act, 1997*

Lotteries Amendment Act 10 of 2000

Lotteries Amendment Act 46 of 2001

Lotteries Amendment Act 32 of 2013

Lotteries and Gambling Board Act 210 of 1993 *Lotteries & Gambling Board Act*

Post Office Act 44 of 1958

Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act 12 of 2004

Protection of Personal Information Act 4 of 2013

Public Service Amendment Act 30 of 2007

National Gambling Act 33 of 1996

National Gambling Act 7 of 2004

National Gambling Amendment Act, 2008

Protection of Personal Information Act, 2013

Regulations Regarding Promotional Competitions, 2002 (Published under GN R 798 in *Government Gazette* No. 23501 of 7 June 2002)

Regulations Regarding Promotional Competitions, 2003 (Published under GN R672 in *Government Gazette* No. 24874 of 16 May 2003) *PC Regulations*

Trade Coupons Act 18 of 1935

Trade Practices Act 76 of 1976

Value-Added Tax Act, 1991

Wet Over Loterijen en Sweepstakes (Chapter CXLIII of the Orange Free State Law Book)

Wet Tegen Hazardspelen 6 van 1889

United Kingdom

Betting and Lotteries Act 1934

Betting and Gaming Act 1960

Betting, Gaming and Lotteries Act 1963

Business Protection from Misleading Marketing Regulations *BP Regulations*

Communications Act 2003

Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations *CPUT Regulations*

European Communities Act 1972

Gambling Act 2005

Lotteries Act 1823

Lotteries and Amusements Act 1976

National Lottery etc. Act 1993

Unlawful Games Act 1541

United States of America

Deceptive Mail Prevention and Enforcement Act of 1999 (39 USC 3001)

EUROPEAN UNION: TREATY, DIRECTIVES AND OTHER DOCUMENTS

European Union

Directive 2005/29/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 May 2005 concerning unfair business-to-consumer commercial practices in the internal *UCP Directive*

Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2006 concerning misleading and comparative advertising (2006/114/EC)

Interinstitutional agreement on better law-making (2003/C 321/01)

Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union

INDUSTRY CODES AND CONSTITUTIONS

Description	Citation
-------------	----------

International

<p>International Chamber of Commerce, Consolidated Code of Advertising and Marketing Communications Practice (ninth revision, 2011)</p> <p>http://www.codescentre.com/media/2083/660%20consolidated%20icc%20code_2011_final%20with%20covers.pdf, accessed on 16 June 2015</p>	<p><i>ICC Code</i></p>
--	------------------------

New Zealand

Advertising Codes of Practice 2014 (Advertising Standards Authority)

Code for Advertising Food (Advertising Standards Authority)

Code for Advertising Gaming and Gambling (Advertising Standards Authority)

Code for Advertising to Children (Advertising Standards Authority)

Code for Advertising and Promotion of Alcohol (Advertising Standards Authority)

South Africa

Code of Advertising Practice of the Advertising Standards Authority of South Africa *ASA Code*

Code of Conduct of the Consumer Goods and Services Industry Code of Conduct (Notice No. R. 271, *Government Gazette* No. 38637, 30 March 2015)

Code of Conduct of the Wireless Application Service Providers' Association (Version 13.9) *WASPA Code*

Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice of the Direct Marketing Association of Southern Africa

Code of Marketing Practice (Marketing Code Authority)

General by-laws of the Newspaper Press Union of South Africa

South African Automotive Industry Code of Conduct (Notice No. 817, *Government Gazette* No. 38107, 17 October 2014)

Wireless Application Service Providers' Association Constitution

United Kingdom

Direct Marketing Association's Code

PhonepayPlus Code of Practice

United Kingdom Code of Non-Broadcast Advertising, Sales Promotion and Direct Marketing *CAP Code*

United States of America

Better Business Bureau Code of Advertising

TABLE OF CASES

Australia

Trade Practices Commission v Calderton Corp Pty Ltd (1994) ATPR 41-306

Canada

Richard v Time Inc. and Time Consumer Marketing Inc. [2012] 1 R.C.S. 265; 2012 SCC 8 (CanLII)

Speers v Reader's Digest Association (Canada) ULC 2010 ONSC 6366 (CanLII)

European Union

Purely Creative Ltd and others v Office of Fair Trading [2012] EUECJ C-428/11

New Zealand

Commerce Commission v Probitas Ltd and Ewan Malcolm Campbell CRN 05079500275-82 (District Court, Tauranga, 26 March 2007)

Commerce Commission v Progressive Enterprises Ltd DC Manukau CRI-2007-092-6035, 14 April 2008

Commerce Commission v Progressive Enterprises Ltd [2010] NZCA 374

Department of Internal Affairs v TV Works Ltd CR 08004505568-620 (District Court, Auckland, 23 June 2010)

Department of Internal Affairs v TV Works Ltd CRI 2010-404-256 [2010] NZHC 2024 (17 November 2010)

TV Works Ltd v Department of Internal Affairs [2012] NZCA 160; NZAR 534 (26 April 2012)

South Africa

Amalgamated Banks of South Africa Bpk v De Goede 1997 (4) SA 66 (SCA)

Amalgamated Beverage Industries Natal (Pty) Ltd v City Council of the City of Durban [1994] 2 All SA 222 (A)

Boardman v Minister van Finansies 1984 (1) SA 259 (T)

Casino Enterprises (Pty) Ltd v Gauteng Gambling Board and Others 2011 (6) SA 614 (SCA)

Chief Constable, Durban v Stuart (1909) 30 NLR 58

Crawley v Rex 1909 TS 1105

Davis v Cape Times Ltd 1915 WLD 82

Dodd v Hadley 1905 TS 439

FirstRand Bank v National Lotteries Board [2008] 3 All SA 121 (SCA)

Gibson v Van der Walt 1952 (1) SA 262 (A)

Kumalo v Cycle Lab (Pty) Ltd (31871/2008) [2011] ZAGPJHC 56 (17 June 2011)

Minister of Justice and Energy Affairs v Lucky Horseshoe (Pty) Ltd 1994 (2) SA 46 (A)

National Lotteries Board v Bruss NO [2007] ZAGPHC 268

National Lotteries Board v Bruss NO [2009] 2 All SA 164 (SCA)

National Lotteries Board v FirstRand Bank Ltd [2006] ZAGPHC 106

O'Keefe v Argus Printing and Publishing Co Ltd 1954 (3) SA 244 (C)

R v Bertram Davis 1915 TPD 155

R v Colborne and another 1932 TPD 264

R v Cotterill 1927 CPD 48

R v Cranston 1914 AD 238

R v Ellis Brown Ltd 1938 AD 98

R v Fleetwood 1924 TPD 96

R v Gondo 1951 (3) SA 509 (A)

R v James and Tennant 1919 TPD 47

R v Jones 1925 AD 117

R v Lew Hoi and other 1937 AD 215

R v Livingstone 1924 TPD 45

R v Morrison 1914 TPD 329

R v Scandrogolio 1951 (2) SA 297 (SR)

Royal Baking Powder Co v Crystallisers Ltd 1928 CPD 448

S v Alexander 1962 (3) SA 649 (A)

S v Bryant and another 1962 (2) SA 702 (N)

S v Mbatha 2012 (2) SACR 551 (KZP)

S v Mbonambi 1986 (3) SA 839 (N)

S v Midas Novelties (Pty) Ltd and another 1966 (1) SA 492 (A)

S v Pepsi-Cola 1985 (3) SA 141 (C)

Salisbury Bottling Co (Pvt) Ltd v Central African Bottling Co (Pvt) Ltd 1958 (1) SA 750 (FC)

Silberman v Hodkinson 1927 TPD 562.

Smart v The Really Great Brand Company (Pty) Ltd [2008] 2 All SA 474 (C)

Steyn v LSA Motors Limited 1994 (1) SA 49 (A)

Van de Wetering Engineering v Regent Insurance (383/2013) [2014] ZASCA 18
(26 March 2014)

Wells v Atoll Media (Pty) Ltd [2010] 4 All SA 548 (WCC)

United Kingdom

Atkinson v Murrell [1972] 2 All ER 31

Barclay v Pearson [1893] 2 Ch 154

Barnes v Strathern 1929 SLT 37

Carlill v Carbolic Smoke Ball Co [1893] 1 QB 256

Commissioners for Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs v IFX Investment Company Ltd and others [2014] UKUT 0398 (TCC)

Director of Public Prosecutions v Bradfute and Associates, Ltd. [1967] 1 All ER 112
(QB)

Director of Public Prosecutions v Phillips and another 1935 1 KB 391

Director of Public Prosecutions v Regional Pools Promotions [1964] 2 QB 244

Hall & McWilliam 20 Cox CC 33

Imperial Tobacco Ltd v Attorney-General [1979] 2 All ER 592 (CA)

Imperial Tobacco Ltd v Attorney-General [1980] 1 All ER 866 (HL)

Minty v Sylvester (1915) 84 LJKB 1982

News of the World Ltd v Friend [1973] 1 All ER 422 (HL)

Reader's Digest Association Ltd v Williams [1976] 3 All ER 737 (QBD)

Santongeli v Neilson 1900 3 F. 10

Scott v Director of Public Prosecutions 1914 2 KB 868

Taylor v Smetten 11 QBD 207

Whitbread & Co Ltd v Bell; Bell v Whitbread & Co Ltd 1970 All ER 64

Willis v Young & Stenbridge 1907 1 KB 448

Witty v World Service, Ltd. 1935 All ER 243 (CD)

United States of America

Edward F. Sweet v Washington Hesing case no. 23241, US Circuit Court for the Northern District of Illinois

Federal Communications Commission v. American Broadcasting Co., Inc 347 U.S. 284 (1954)

Yellowstone Kit v State 88 Ala. 196, 7 So. 338 (1890)

TABLE OF RULINGS AND ADJUDICATION REPORTS

South Africa

Advertising Standards Authority of South Africa

Archers / L Nel / 4779

Brooks Sweeto / GH Smith / 725

CAT Watches / Rajash Seejarim / 1391

City Mageu Competition / Mageu Number One / 1758

Denny Mushrooms SMS Competition / E A Van Zyl / 7383

DSTV Competition / JW Sherwood / 4578

DSTV Golf / Maureen Tiarney (6 November 2003)

Federal Mogul Competition / M Kent / 13839

Magnum Competition / P Howard / 2014 – 1261F

MTN Man United Competition / R Haupt / 17738

Olympics 2012 Competition / N van der Lingen / 19461

R1 Million House Competition / Mr B Oldenboom / 1402

SMS Competitions / C Pearce / 8539

Sokka Kings / I Butler / 706

Sowetan BMW Competition / S Zwane / 2014 – 1841 F

Sta-Soft / T Marshall / 1683

Steers / Mr T Spicer / 184

Ster Kinekor Competition / M du Plessis / 8610

Sunday Times Food and Travel Magazine / Mr E Schwentzek / 1044

Supa Quick / Tiger Wheel & Tyre / 10316

Twinsaver Spoil-Yourself Competition / Kimberly Clark / 4622

Wireless Application Services Providers' Association

Celerity Systems (BulkSMS) (Complaint no. 7180)

Clickatell (Complaint no. 8128)

Clickatell (Complaint no. 8228)

Exactmobile (Compliant no. 4196)

HP Computek (Compliant no. 11370)

Independent SMS Telecommunications (Pty) Ltd (Complaint no. 0067)

Mira Networks (Complaint no. 4696)

Mobile NOBO (IP) / Tanla Mobile (SP) (0118) (Compliant no. 15268)

Viamedia (SP) Xcite Mobile (IP) (Compliant no. 12969)

United Kingdom

Advertising Standards Authority

24.7 Tradesmen (Glasgow) Ltd 16 July 2014 (Complaint Ref. A14-264899)

British Midland Regional Ltd 20 August 2014 (Complaint Ref. A14-268463)

HarrisonCole 22 October 2014 (Complaint Ref. A14-275452)

News Group Newspapers Ltd 12 June 2013 (Complaint Ref. A13-224093)

PepsiCo International Ltd 21 November 2012 (Complaint Ref. A12-196585)

Radge Media Ltd 23 November 2011 (Complaint Ref. A11-168900)

Red Bull Company Ltd 27 February 2013 (Complaint Ref. A12-213426)

Sony Computer Entertainment UK Ltd 13 May 2015 (Complaint Ref. A15-290175)

Trinity Mirror plc 28 November 2012 (Complaint Ref. A12-203883)