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One of the most difficult, thankless, and frustrating jobs imaginable is that of maintaining and operating an animal shelter. Try as one may, criticism is inevitable!

On the one hand are the critics who rarely understand the nature and purpose of such an operation. It is amazing to learn how many people expect such a facility to be a perpetual haven for every cat and dog that passes through its doors. To destroy an animal which has no hope for adoption is for such persons an act of cruelty and inhumaneness. Rarely do they consider the impossibility of maintaining for a period of months the 80% of those animals that will never be provided a permanent home.

Inevitably they say “Build a larger shelter.” Yet, the cost of enlarging can be no alibi for anything less than quality and a quality program and operation. Like it or not, an animal sheltering program, be it public or private, is in the realm of public purview. We may not like such criticism, and resent those who stand in judgement of us who perform a service on behalf of animals and the community alike but, if we have elected to accept this task, there can be no excuse not to do it well. Especially when that responsibility has been assumed under the name of a humane society or a society for the prevention of cruelty to animals, there can be no alibies for anything less than quality performance.

Recently there have been a number of animal welfare societies whose programs and facilities for sheltering animals have been severely criticized. Many have been found guilty in courts of law for neglect, abuse, and improper management.

ITEM: An animal welfare organization in Texas is accused of cruelty to animals by an employee. The grand jury charged the society with “intentionally and knowingly confining animals in a cruel manner.”

ITEM: A committee of concerned citizens in a California town asks the District Attorney to investigate the local humane society for: “Failure to obtain immediate veterinary care for injured animals and disposal of stray animals before the lapse of 72 hours.”

ITEM: A photograph appears on the front page of a western newspaper depicting an animal shelter worker tossing the dead bodies of euthanized pets into a garbage truck. There is a total lack of sensitivity in the scene. The accompanying headline reads: “Illegal Tactics Charged in Killing of Cats, Dogs.”

ITEM: Executives of a humane society in Ohio are tried and found guilty of cruelty to animals. In his decision, the judge said: “This court is convinced beyond any doubt whatsoever that the defendants, had they been more interested in the care of the animals, could have done many things which would have resulted in more humane treatment for the animals... their outright failure and omission to act in the best interest of the animals constituted a recklessness, a heedless and perversive disregard of the rights of those animals to be painfree...”

ITEM: The state of California has taken a local animal welfare organization to court charging violations of the state’s Business and Professional Code, and violations of the penal code. Specifically, the society has been charged with “depriving animals of necessary sustenance, drink or shelter, subjecting animals to needless suffering; inflicting unnecessary cruelty upon animals” and a dozen other allegations of cruelty to animals.

It is these and similar criticisms that make the task of operating an animal shelter a perilous task.

But there is also another kind of criticism that should not be ignored and dismissed. It is the criticism of those who expect and even demand a quality program and operation. Like it or not, an animal sheltering program, be it public or private, is in the realm of public purview. We may not like such criticism, and resent those who stand in judgement of us who perform a service on behalf of animals and the community alike but, if we have elected to accept this task, there can be no excuse not to do it well. Especially when that responsibility has been assumed under the name of a humane society or a society for the prevention of cruelty to animals, there can be no alibies for anything less than quality performance.
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inhumane? According to Phyllis Wright, Animal Control and Sheltering Specialist, "I’ve seen more cruelty inside some humane societies than I have in many other situations where pets are kept."

When asked why she thought cruelty has found its way into society shelters and operations, Wright said, "it’s a combination of factors. But primarily it’s a matter of too little sensitivity and caring, both on the part of management and sheltering personnel. Unless this basic commitment of caring for animals is paramount, not even the best operated society or the finest training of personnel will insure a program of humane caring."

Often, critics are viewed as "troublemakers" when they demand what is appropriately expected. But consider for a moment the words of the judge in the Ohio case cited earlier. He said, "The dissent was flushed away in a torrent of invective...about how wonderful the society would be if only certain people did not put roadblocks in the way of progress... . The dissenters were out-shouted and out-voted at meetings."

The Next asked Wright to discuss the kinds of questions every animal welfare organization should be asking itself:

**MANAGEMENT**

Is your executive director asked to be the fund raiser, the humane educator, the shelter manager, the public relations person, and the financial expert? Fine, if that’s the job. But the first concern should be the welfare of animals, and unless he or she is attending to that matter first, the other functions are of little significance.

**THE SHELTER**

Is there enough space for every animal to stand up, sit down, and eat in comfort? Are the old separated from the young? The ill from the well? The big from the small? Has your shelter expanded with the increased work load? Or, are you putting more animals in each cage?

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

Is the Board a working board? Do Board members regularly visit the shelter, talk with the workers, look at the animals, and concern themselves with day to day problems? The Board is responsible to the community for the efficient, humane operation of your shelter.

**EMPLOYEES**

Does money buy concern? Are you paying your shelter employees a fair wage? Are there in-service training programs for employees? Does the shelter manually "get out on the floor" and work with his employees? We must remember that we are caring for living creatures. Working in an animal shelter is a demanding 24 hour a day job.

**BUDGETS**

Is your budget realistically drawn? Is the organization operating with cash receipts only? Is there an endowment fund that is sitting in a bank earning interest and doing nothing for the animals? People who leave money to animal welfare organizations expect it to be used to help the animals. Too often, humane societies put the money away for a rainy day. By doing that, the animals have a rainy day now?

**CARE OF ANIMALS**

Are the animals protected from the elements, including disease carrying insects? Is the shelter clean? Is there a place to put the animals when the runs are hosed down? Or, are the animals housed with the run? Are the workers constantly observing the animals for signs of illness aggressive behavior, and other conditions which might cause an animal to be moved or isolated? Are the animals fed according to weight, size, and condition?

**ANIMAL EXAMINATION**

When an animal comes into your shelter, is it examined immediately to prevent the spread of disease to the other animals? Distemper, "kennel cough," worms, and injuries should be looked for in every animal in the shelter. Obviously, the ill and injured should be separated from the others.

**PLACEMENT**

If it is true that the humane society should protect the animals in the shelter, then it is also true the society should follow up to insure that each animal is living in a decent home. Inquiries should be made before adopted animals leave the shelter. Then, the society should check up later and find out if each animal is licensed, has proper veterinary care, and is sterilized. Humane care cannot stop at the shelter door.

**PUBLIC EDUCATION**

Does your budget include funds for "prevent- ing" cruelty? If you report, do the symptoms, will the disease go away? Are there volunteer or paid humane educators who work with civic groups, the schools, churches, and clubs? Does your newsletter go to all the centers of power in your community? Are the persons in power aware of your problems and the possible solutions?

In the words of Ms. Wright, "Before you go out to prevent cruelty in your community—do it in your own facility. We are accountable for the responsibilities we have taken on. The community expects us to prevent cruelty. The community expects us to care for the animals in our charge in a thoroughly humane manner. There can be no excuse for inhumane conditions in a humane society.

Use this listing. Take a look at your local shelter. It is your shelter—not the society’s. Your charitable, and often your tax dollars via contracts for animal control, support the work of the humane society. Therefore, it is your responsibility to insure that the job is being done humanely.

The Humane Society of the United States, while having no formal ties to local societies nor control over their programs, has instituted an Accreditation Program for local animal welfare organizations and animal control programs. We are pledged to assist any such organization or agency seeking to improve its programs and operations in order to insure quality care for animals. If your society has not applied for accreditation, request your executive director or Board of Directors to enroll in this program now.

In this way, The HSUS shares the responsibility of providing humane care for animals in the shelters throughout the country. We urge you to invite our assistance.

---

R. J. Chenoweth Dies—HSUS Founder, Chairman Emeritus

Robert J. Chenoweth, 73, a founding member and former board chairman of The HSUS died in Kansas City, Missouri, on January 2, 1978. He had devoted his life to the prevention of cruelty to animals.

Bob was elected Chairman of the Board at the organizational meeting of The HSUS Board held on November 22, 1954. He served in this capacity for 15 years and was designated Chairman Emeritus in 1969.

The leadership he gave the fledgling Society in its formative years was largely responsible for turning the organization into the major force it is today. He helped to initiate campaigns against cruelties that were being neglected nationally and could not be handled by local societies. His dedication and untiring efforts helped establish The HSUS as an aggressive, crusading force.

Mr. Chenoweth was also active at the local level, serving as president and board member of his local society, Wayside Waifs, Inc. In private life, Bob Chenoweth was retired from his executive duties for the Business Men’s Assurance Company of America where he had worked for 27 years.

The humane movement has suffered a great loss with Mr. Chenoweth’s death. The Society he helped found, however, will continue its effective work for animals in the great tradition he helped to establish.
The Ohio Story

A million votes against the steel jaw trap—a beginning

On the face of it, Ohio might seem like an unlikely state in which to initiate a referendum to ban the steel jaw trap. It is one of the largest trapping states in the Union, with more than 1.3 million animals trapped for fur each year. But previous efforts to get the trap banned by the state legislature had failed, and the alternative was to take the issue to the people.

Polls taken in some Ohio cities before the campaign showed as much as 74.9% of the population favored a ban on the steel jaw trap. Yet, when the votes were counted, the ban had been defeated by almost two to one. The question of why the referendum failed after a seemingly positive start is important to anyone who hopes to work through the political system for animal welfare.

The campaign began when Ohio citizens, concerned with the cruelties of the steel jaw trap, formed the Ohio Committee for Humane Trapping. The OCHT is headed by Sandy Rowland, who has long been an activist in animal welfare issues in Ohio. They drafted an amendment to the state constitution, obtained over 400,000 signatures on petitions to qualify for the 1977 ballot, and began their statewide campaign.

Various national organizations, including The Humane Society of the United States, endorsed the campaign and lent their support. Dr. Michael Fox, Director of the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems and Guy Hodge, Director of Research and Data Services, went to Ohio during the closing days of the campaign. They appeared on local television and radio programs and at public meetings to explain the issues involved in the referendum. I assisted the OCHT in the last two weeks of the campaign.

Conducting an initiative campaign such as this is the equivalent of running a gubernatorial or senatorial campaign without benefit of political party backing. In a state as large and populous as Ohio, the costs in money and manpower are tremendous. The OCHT had already spent a great deal of money circulating petitions to qualify for the ballot, and funds for the campaign were in short supply. Most animal welfare groups, such as HSUS, are tax exempt and by law are severely restricted in the financial aid they can give in support of an issue in the course of a political campaign. The pro-trapping forces were well funded and more than willing to spend lavishly on media campaigns that misled the public and muddled the issue.

Rabies and rats were the by-words of the pro-trapping fraternity. Their ads claimed that the abolition of leghold traps would prevent the homeowner from ridding his house of rats and mice. This was completely untrue, since the rat trap was not at issue in this campaign. It is not a leghold trap.

The claim that banning the leghold trap would cause a tremendous upsurge in rabies among wild animals was difficult to refute because of the emotional impact of the word “rabies.” In truth, there is no proof that trapping curtails the spread of rabies in wildlife. (See story, p. 25)

The opposition, which was partially funded by trappers, furtraders, a farmers’ organization, and sportsmen’s groups, spent about four times as much on media advertising as the anti-trapping forces. Their ads, I recall, ran like this: a woman with a small child pleads to other parents to vote no on Issue 2 and not take chances on rabies. Another ad showed a rat jumping out of a kitchen cupboard, with the message that a “no” vote on Issue 2 was a vote on no rats.

One ad even said “rats can give you rabies,” despite the fact that no human case of rabies has ever been traced to a rat in the U.S. Most states no longer routinely test rats for rabies because they so rarely have the disease.

(These misleading ads have had some unfortunate repercussions since the election. Someone in Toledo set a leghold trap around his house thinking he could catch a rat in it. Instead, he caught a kitten which faces possible amputation of the affected limb.)

Some public officials worked to advance the opposition’s case. Dr. John Ackerman, Ohio Public Health Director, and Dale Haney, head of the Division of Wildlife, appeared in pro-trapping television and radio ads. This conduct seemed so outrageous and inappropriate that an attempt was made to get an injunction against these ads. Unfortunately, it was turned down.

After the pro-trapping forces cited the endorsement of the Ohio Veterinary Medical Association, the OVMA found it necessary to issue a statement postulating that their views had been misunderstood. Similarly, the opposition claimed endorsement by the U.S. Center for Disease Control, when in fact the Center had taken no position on the referendum campaign. But the damage had been done. False claims such as these which have been widely aired on the mass media are extremely difficult to refute when time and money are short.

A good example of this is the case of the “rabid raccoon.” Less than a week before the election, much publicity was generated by the story of a rabid raccoon to which had exposed twenty-three people to the disease, and caused them to undergo post-exposure rabies treatment. It seemed to be a case of wildlife rabies. The OCHT brought in a doctor to examine the evidence. He found that the animal was a pet racoon, not a free-roaming wild animal. At his insistence the Center had contracted the disease as a result of a too large dose of rabies vaccine. The incident was in no way connected with wildlife rabies. Despite the coverage this news received, many people only remembered the first part of the story.

Both Dr. Fox and Guy Hodge focused on correcting these erroneous assumptions during their visits to Ohio. At one press conference, Dr. Fox stated, “The reason I came to Ohio was to discuss the issue at hand, and the issue is cruelty. The issue is not disease. I read in Ohio newspapers that there is a Rubella outbreak. The last case of human rabies in Ohio was in 1958. Let’s get our priorities straight.”

OCHT’s election day strategy called for volunteers to pass out literature at various targeted polls in the major cities. In Columbus, about 160 people were recruited to work on election day. It was heartening to see so many people willing to take the time to do what they could to help Issue 2 pass. Retired persons, housewives, children and working people dedicated their efforts to end the cruelty of the steel jaw trap.

Their efforts at the polls that day were seriously handicapped by continuous harassment from the opposition. Ohio election law states very clearly that political activity at the polls must take place 100 feet away from the polls. American flags are placed at this distance to serve as a boundary. Some of the election judges and police appeared to be ignorant of the law. They tried to seriously impede our pollworkers or absolutely prohibit their activities. Reportedly, two teen-age boys drove from poll to poll with a CB radio calling the location of our workers to someone, possibly the police. Back at the office, OCHT staff spent a good part of the day on the phone explaining the law to election officials and police departments.

When the votes were counted, it was clear that a heavy voter turnout in the rural areas had been instrumental in the defeat of Issue 2. Although the majority of voters in the large cities had favored the leghold ban, they had not voted in sufficient numbers to outweigh the negative rural vote.

On election evening as I sat with the others watching the disappointing returns come in, we all agreed on what had happened. The opposition to Issue 2 had waged one of the most misleading and emotional campaigns I have witnessed. Their costly media blitz had focused the...
First Municipal Shelter Accredited

The Fairfax County Department of Animal Control in the Virginia suburb of Washington, D.C. is the nation’s first municipal shelter to receive HSUS Accreditation.

The County, with the aid and encouragement of shelter director Richard Amity and his staff, has passed ordinances which protect animals as well as people. These regulations cover cat and dog kennels, riding stables, and pet shops, and also give animal control wardens the authority to investigate animal cruelty cases.

Recently, federal funds (CETA) have been used to employ two persons to conduct public education and information programs at the shelter and in local schools. Director Amity recognizes the need to educate and inform the public in order to solve the pet overpopulation problem and prevent cruelty.

To the people adopting animals at the shelter are required to sign a contract promising to have their new pets sterilized. This municipal shelter is making the community more responsible pet owners through legislation, education, and pet sterilization programs.

Animal Warden Jill Clark and Chief Warden John Smith plan the day’s activities.

Meanwhile at the front office, Marrie Welling (left) and Maeta Davidson check in a new arrival at the shelter.

Animals in the Classroom

Your recent published letter from Kathie Thomas was extremely important to me, as it she eloquently spoke of her disgust and dismay at the prospect of dissecting a frozen cat in biology class.

Kathie, 25 years ago I could have gone to college as a biology major had it not been for my feelings about dissecting cats, animals which I truly love and have always kept as warm living pets. I went on to study the history of art, instead, but have never lost my interest in the biological sciences, and just after college embarked on an active campaign of my own to protect animals of all kinds from abuse.

Visits to section are not allowed in our Maine high schools, and I was able to assist in keeping the law intact to cover vertebrates, including even turtles. I trust that your kind heart and well-defined sense of indignation at animal cruelty will guide and direct you to positive action on behalf of animals’ rights to health and safety. Go to it!

Mrs. Prentiss Knietz
Paris, Maine

Hunting

This is in response to the letter from Mike Moutoux (Fall 1977 HSUS News). Mike loves life, but a part of that love is the realization that all life ends in death. Because of his perceptive insight, he can justify his hunting and trapping, since the animals will die anyway and death is part of nature. I can’t quite make the connection between loving life and the desire to voluntarily and violently destroy life. What gives anyone the right to take another’s life? . . . is it because death is “nature” and all of us on this earth are “nature”? In line with that logic, does Mike condone people killing people for sport? It’s the same thing. People eventually die too, and it’s all “nature.” (It is no problem justifying that from the biological standpoint.)

True, it is important for lovers of nature to understand that death is inevitable and “natural,” but this really should never serve as an excuse to kill. There can be no justification for torturing animals (and traps do torture, so do bullets that don’t kill instantly—what about the animals who escape, to suffer and die later?) Killing is a pretty gruesome thing. Killing is not a sport, it’s a disease. No true lover of nature could possibly feel good about callously and senselessly destroying any part of it.

Barbara Groce
Silver Spring, MD

Stopping Cruelty

Your article in the Fall News on how to stop cruelty in your community prompts me to ask what happens if efforts fail? What does one do when we try, we want to stop cruelty, but the law is too lax . . .

Ann Sottolano
South Ozone Park, NY

Anti-cruelty laws in most states and communities are weak in that they often do not specify exactly what is required in the way of shelter for a dog, for example. That is why the strengthening of anti-cruelty laws is a continuing program of The HSUS. The important thing is to persevere in your efforts in all situations relating to animal welfare. Do not give up even when the local animal welfare organization does not seem to be cooperating. You should continue to complain to them until something is finally done and you should ask friends and neighbors to make similar complaints. Also, don’t hesitate to swear out a warrant yourself if the situation is bad enough.

—Editor

FOR YOUR INFORMATION

The Humane Society of the United States is approved by the nation’s two foremost accrediting agencies for charities, The National Information Bureau, Inc. and the Philanthropic Advisory Service, a division of the Council of Better Business Bureaus, Inc. The HSUS has provided both of these agencies with detailed information regarding our many programs and extensive financial information covering all areas of operations.

The National Information Bureau provides a free copy of its Wise Giving Guide to all persons requesting the same. You may secure a copy by writing them at 419 Park Avenue South, New York, New York 10016. To the best of our knowledge, The Humane Society of the United States is the only animal welfare organization in the country which has met their stringent requirements.

The Philanthropic Advisory Service, 1150 Seventeenth Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C. 20036, will also provide a list of the charities who meet their standards. You can secure a copy of this list by writing them at the address above and enclosing a check for $1.00 along with a stamped, self-addressed envelope.
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the outbreaks was $1.5 million. There were found to be infected facilities in Virginia, 1 in Florida, and 5 in California. The U.S.D.A. succeeded in preventing the spread of the disease to domestic poultry, but the price was high in both financial cost and the loss of birds. Until recently, there were no international regulations governing the care of wildlife in transit and unless the importing country had strict anti-cruelty laws, no penalties were given for entire shipments that arrived dead at international airports. Certain regulations are now in effect that have the effect of reducing the huge mortalities common three to four years ago. The International Air Transport Association (IATA), based in Switzerland, has issued the sixth edition of detailed regulations on the transportation of wildlife in international transit, known as “Live Animals Regulations.” Several countries have adopted the regulations, but to date, enforcement is weak. The U.S. Lacey Act has a provision that allows fines if there is a “substantial percentage” of animals found dead on arrival. The wording of this law has made enforcement difficult. Miami Fish and Wildlife law enforcement officers have reported prosecuting only 2 cases, both with 100% mortality of birds, but the price was high in both care of birds are few in number, too. The number of captive-raised birds such as canaries and budgerigars kept as pets is in decreasing favor of the more exotic parrots, mynahs, parakeets and cockatoons, which are not raised in captivity for the most part, but are imported. Since the worldwide trade in birds has been estimated at over 5 million each year, and over 50,000,000 birds die en route, the drain on wild populations of birds is considerable. Somewhere this number is increased by the sale of pets plus those which are rescued from areas threatened by development.

In Virginia, a National Wildlife Refuge was designated specifically for the preservation of bald eagles. In Florida, sandhill cranes fitted with radio transmitters to allow biologists pinpoint the wetland habitat they need to survive. New Jersey has established a bog turtle refuge, and reports to the public about its workings. The average person is often unaware of the drain on wild populations of birds caused by pet trade and many others are suffering drastic population declines.

In Washington sell personalized auto license plates, with the proceeds earmarked for purchases of critical lands for endangered and non-game species. A similar non-game bill was debated in the House in October. HSUS Program Coordinator Patricia Forkan testified for the bill before the subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation efforts in thirty-six states. These are a few of the results of Non-Game Conservation efforts in thirty-six states. The practice of allowing non-game animals—not in the consumptive sense of killing them, but for aesthetic appreciation and enjoyment. As long as hunters support wildlife management, then management programs will be designed to cater to the hunter’s interests. The theory behind this system was that hunting game animals, so why shouldn’t they be the ones to pay for their management? The problem is that those of us who do not hunt or fish or trap may also want to use the animals—not in the consumptive sense of killing them, but for aesthetic appreciation and enjoyment. As long as hunting fees support wildlife management, then management programs will be designed to cater to the hunter’s interests. There are many more species of non-game animals than game animals, and there is an additional concern about non-game species.

There are many more species of non-game animals than game animals, yet less than 2% of all state and federal money spent on wildlife management goes to non-game programs. Non-game species have suffered from this neglect. When habitats are altered to benefit a game species, the change typically occurs at the expense of other forms of animal life also occupying that environment. The environmental awareness that blossomed in the sixties brought with it the realization that benefit non-game animals, consumable or non-consumable animals, not in the consumptive sense of killing them, but for aesthetic appreciation and enjoyment. As long as hunting fees support wildlife management, then management programs will be designed to cater to the hunter’s interests. The theory behind this system was that hunting game animals, so why shouldn’t they be the ones to pay for their management? The problem is that those of us who do not hunt or fish or trap may also want to use the animals—not in the consumptive sense of killing them, but for aesthetic appreciation and enjoyment. As long as hunting fees support wildlife management, then management programs will be designed to cater to the hunter’s interests. There are many more species of non-game animals than game animals, and there is an additional concern about non-game species.

The environment is catastrophic to all wildlife, and food preferences. A monumental amount of work still needs to be done preliminary to developing sound management programs. There is a paucity of information with regard to even basic aspects of wildlife management planning such as species population dynamics, abundance, distribution, habitat, requirements. The environmental awareness that blossomed in the sixties brought with it the realization that benefit non-game animals, consumable or non-consumable animals, not in the consumptive sense of killing them, but for aesthetic appreciation and enjoyment. As long as hunting fees support wildlife management, then management programs will be designed to cater to the hunter’s interests. There are many more species of non-game animals than game animals, and there is an additional concern about non-game species.

The theory behind this system was that hunting game animals, so why shouldn’t they be the ones to pay for their management? The problem is that those of us who do not hunt or fish or trap may also want to use the animals—not in the consumptive sense of killing them, but for aesthetic appreciation and enjoyment. As long as hunting fees support wildlife management, then management programs will be designed to cater to the hunter’s interests. There are many more species of non-game animals than game animals, and there is an additional concern about non-game species.

The environment is catastrophic to all wildlife, and food preferences. A monumental amount of work still needs to be done preliminary to developing sound management programs. There is a paucity of information with regard to even basic aspects of wildlife management planning such as species population dynamics, abundance, distribution, habitat, requirements. The environmental awareness that blossomed in the sixties brought with it the realization that benefit non-game animals, consumable or non-consumable animals, not in the consumptive sense of killing them, but for aesthetic appreciation and enjoyment. As long as hunting fees support wildlife management, then management programs will be designed to cater to the hunter’s interests. There are many more species of non-game animals than game animals, and there is an additional concern about non-game species.

The theory behind this system was that hunting game animals, so why shouldn’t they be the ones to pay for their management? The problem is that those of us who do not hunt or fish or trap may also want to use the animals—not in the consumptive sense of killing them, but for aesthetic appreciation and enjoyment. As long as hunting fees support wildlife management, then management programs will be designed to cater to the hunter’s interests. There are many more species of non-game animals than game animals, and there is an additional concern about non-game species.
1977 Annual Conference

Dr. Amy Freeman Lee (Left), Board Chairman Coleman Burke, and Roger Caras prepare to open the 1977 Annual Conference.

Pamela Caras, Roger's daughter, gets a kiss from a 15 ton killer whale named Shamu.

Roland Lee, firefighter, receives a Certificate of Appreciation for his pet-saving efforts in a recent fire.

John Craver, recipient of HSUS's Annual KIND Youth Award, receives a congratulatory hug from Amanda Blake.

ROGER A. CARAS—JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH MEDALIST

The HSUS was honored to present its highest award to Roger A. Caras. Caras is a well known author, naturalist, photographer, and radio-TV correspondent. He is currently the nation's first full-time television news correspondent, reporting on animals for the ABC network.

Caras' Keynote Address, "Don't Shoot from the Hip," was an inspiring message that reviewed some of the history of the humane movement. Basically, Caras sought to explain why we (the humane movement) are not out of business yet. He left us with the challenge to be informed and patient.

Congratulations Roger!

Roger Caras (right) receives medal from HSUS President John Hoyt.

MEL L. MORSE—SPECIAL KRUTCH MEDAL RECIPIENT

On three occasions since the Krutch Medal was introduced in 1971, a Special Krutch Medal has been awarded to an outstanding humanitarian. Mel Morse was honored with that special recognition this year.

Mel Morse has been actively and enthusiastically involved in humane work for 40 years. He has served as the Executive Director of The American Humane Association, a Vice-President and President of The HSUS, Director of the Humane Society of Marin County (Calif.), and a member of the Council of the World Federation for the Protection of Animals.

Morse authored "Ordeal of the Animals," one of the first and most definitive efforts to tell the story of man's abuse of animals.

Today, Mel Morse is the Executive Director of The Animal Care and Education Center in Rancho Santa Fe, California.

During the educational tour of Sea World, the conferees had the opportunity to meet some playful walruses face to face.

Who doesn't like a puppet show? Conferees learned the difference between a toothed whale and a baleen whale from this puppet.

HSUS Program Coordinator Patricia Forkan chats with Dr. John Lilly, Director of The Human-Dolphin Foundation prior to his address. Dr. Lilly fascinated the conferees with his research into communication between man and dolphin. He predicted that humans and dolphins will soon communicate with each other.

A Photo Review
Pain and Profit

The story of the steel jaw trap

by Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr. (New Jersey)

In Eighteenth Century Europe, a variety of techniques were used to protect the property and privilege of the wealthy from their less fortunate countrymen. Among these was a particularly diabolical device that guarded estates and private game preserves against trespassers and poachers. The "man trap," as described by British author James A. Bateman, was "carefully hidden in covert(s) and set so as to take a man's leg at the knee and smash it. Even if the leg were not broken, which would be a rare occurrence, the injury might well become gangrenous, for the traps would be dirty and rusty although probably well-oiled around the moving parts."

While the man trap was subsequently banned, along with the rack and the pillory, it was a forerunner of a device still very much in use today—the steel jaw, leghold trap. In various forms and sizes, this trap is used to capture millions of animals every year.

The principle of the steel trap is to catch and hold an animal by the paw or leg until the trapper returns to kill it, usually by clubbing. When an animal steps on the camouflaged "pan," a powerful spring is released, causing the two semicircular "jaws" around the pan to snap shut. While most steel traps in use today have smooth jaws, those with teeth or spikes may still be used in all but the half dozen states that ban them. Whether they are toothed or smooth, the jaws must close quickly enough to catch the animal's paw, and must hold tightly enough to keep the animal from escaping.

Some proponents of the steel trap claim that animals do not feel pain as human beings do and that the device is relatively painless in any case. But those who claim that animals do not feel pain ignore basic facts of biology. An animal's nervous system and pain perception are very similar to those of humans. Animals do suffer, and they suffer terribly in steel traps.

In an effort to prove their contention that the trap is painless, trap advocates have sat with one clamped on a hand or finger for several minutes. But such demonstrations are misleading for several reasons. First, they only show the holding force of the trap, not the closing force, which is what causes crush injuries and broken bones. Second, an animal is not likely to sit quietly when a trap suddenly grips its paw. Rather, the animal will struggle to escape, thereby greatly increasing its pain and injury. In fact, there are numerous cases of animals actually biting or twisting off their paws in order to free themselves. Besides the loss of a paw, the price of freedom may be slow death from gangrene or shock. Third, an animal typically stays in a trap not for several minutes, but for several hours or even days before the trapper arrives to put it out of its misery.

The writings of Frank Conibear, a trapper for 32 years, should remove any further doubts that the steel trap causes animals pain. A case in point:

"The next trap has a mink. It is dead—died in the trap. The pen we built has been knocked down, and there are teeth marks on all the sticks and branches within range. There are signs of a terrific struggle; from experience, I know the mink lived about one or two days and then died of hunger and pain. The foot is lacerated, swollen and covered with blood. The stump of the leg above the trap is swollen four times its normal size, and frozen. The shoulder, too, is all continued on page 29"
emotional eeks in the complex machinery of factory farming. Understanding, empathy and compassion must become a part of agribusiness as it was once when farmers "husbanded" their land, crops and livestock. This may be slow to come without the spur of humane legislation, because of the many distracting problems and priorities which intensive agribusiness farming has created, particularly in the domain of animal nutrition, disease, waste disposal, and energy. Such problems create new specialist fields and supportive industries and jobs. In attempting to solve such problems only the symptoms are addressed and not the underlying causes: bad husbandry, with its by-products of cruelty and suffering.

"Factory farming is the popular term for a variety of livestock production systems, all of which share one primary characteristic—confinement. Indoor confinement can occur during one part of the animal's life or for the duration of its existence. The animal is wholly dependent upon the stockman not only for food and water, but also for the cleanliness and temperature, humidity and light control of its environment. Depending on the confinement system, the animal may also be subject to varying degrees of crowding, social deprivation and restriction of movement and the execution and satisfaction of various instincts and emotional and social needs."

—Michael Fox

PHYSICAL ABUSES. In addition to the physical abuses from dominant or "despot" comparisons, farm animals are subjected to other unnecessary physical pain and suffering. Branding of cattle; castration of pigs, lambs and steers; and dehorning are usually done without the use of an anesthetic. These pigs have had their tails cut off to avoid injuries from companions who might bite them in the crowded conditions, but they are still bitten on the ears and shoulders.

THE ULTIMATE RATIONALIZATION is that factory farming is justified to "feed a hungry world." But it is gross and not animal products that supply the hungry world. It is also grain that we feed to our livestock for home consumption. Chickens are the most efficient converters of feed. Beef can digest many feed by-products that we could not utilize ourselves. But pigs and veal calves are less efficient feed converters. Much of what they eat we could utilize ourselves. Acres of corn land could be more efficiently used to grow cereal and vegetable products for human consumption than to be "processed through an animal for conversion into easily animal protein."

CONFIDENT HELPLESSNESS. One major flaw of factory farming is that when things go wrong, they go wrong in a big way and the animals can't do anything to help themselves. Contaminated feed or water, some dietary imbalance or deficiency, a strain of bacteria or virus, a failure in the heating, ventilation, automatic watering or feeding or cooler-sprinkler system are not unusual cases. The animals are wholly dependent upon men and machines. And they have no escape nor opportunity to rectify things for themselves, which under more natural conditions, they might be able to. The reliability of fail-safe systems decreases proportionately to their increased complexity. An artificial diet, low in phosphorus for example, lessens a chicken's heat tolerance and confined in a broiler hot house, it is indeed helpless.

UNNATURAL SETTING. Confinement in barren stalls, pens or cages can be stressful not only because of overcrowding, but also because of the extreme monotony and lack of varied stimulation in the environment. Such deprivation leads to chronic boredom and under-stimulation stress which may increase susceptibility to certain diseases, lead to "paradise" (excessive moulting, pecking, grooming, nervous ticks and stereotyped behaviors). Acute social deprivation is also common with veal calves and breeding bulls and boars.

DARKNESS. In darkness, animals move less and so they don't waste food energy. They only eat when the lights are switched on. Twenty to 22 hours darkness is usual for confinement systems. Lack of light may also reduce crowding stress and is often employed on some intensive pig farms.
CROWDING. Especially in raising hogs and broiler chickens, crowding is a major feature of confinement farming. Broilers rarely have one square foot of floor space per bird, and battery hens even less; three layers often being kept in cages no larger than 12" x 16" x 18" high. Overcrowding is stressful physically and psychologically and can lead to feather pulling and tail biting, fighting cannibalism, and losses due to secondary infections. The common solutions are to de-beak (remove part of the upper bill) in poultry, and to dock the tails of pigs, and to control crowding stress-related diseases with vaccines, antibiotics and other drugs. Symptoms alone are treated and not the basic causes. Less crowding would be more humane and could also be more profitable, but tradition is hard to change. The hen on the left has not been de-beaked. She has been raigned by overcrowded cagemates. The chickens on the right have been de-beaked but still show evidence of pecking by other hens.

ACCELERATED ANIMAL MACHINES. An often overlooked aspect of factory farming which can cause suffering, stress and disease is the way in which animals are pushed to their limits to produce milk, meat and eggs. Meat animals are fed arsenic and other appetite stimulants as well as growth-promoting hormones. Highly concentrated feeds that are low in natural roughage are used to produce more milk and to "finish" or fatten off beef, cattle and hogs. This approach can cause metabolic problems, acid indigestion, and gastric or rumen ulceration.

Broilers that are pushed to their limits may put on so much weight that they collapse because their bones are too weak and immature to support the abnormal weight. They are usually raised under continuous artificial light to stimulate appetite and accelerate growth. Battery hens are "accelerated" to produce more by being given a longer day under artificial light. At the end of one laying cycle they are either destroyed or deprived of water and are starved for up to ten days to force them to molt. Then, they begin to lay again. Many die under this acute stress. Others burn out from sheer production exhaustion. Still others collapse with soft bones depleted of minerals used to make the egg and shell.

This milk cow has a collapsed udder caused by "overproduction."

HUMAN HEALTH CONCERNS. The widespread use of antibiotics in animal feeds could lead to drug resistance in bacteria pathogenic to humans and animals alike. For example, one out of every ten hogs tested by the F.D.A. for antibiotic residues in the meat in 1976 had illegally high residues. Hormone implants which are used to stimulate growth in beef cattle may be linked with breast cancer in humans. Pesticides, nitrate fertilizers, herbicides and moulds contaminate grains and other crops used in the animals' feed. These substances may be stored in the animals' fat, muscles and internal organs or be concentrated and excreted in milk, and then be ingested by humans. Although most of these substances are carcinogenic, their use is often justified on the ground that they help reduce production costs. Although we cannot buy health, we should at least be able to buy healthy food and to trust that what we eat is good for us. To these hazards we should include the additional element of nitrites. These are added to preserve and color-stabilize most processed meats. When cooked, nitrites form carcinogenic nitrosamines. Reforms and alternatives are difficult to institute when there is economic dependence on the use of such substances.

SHADE AND SHELTER. Feed-lot beef and dairy cattle are rarely provided with shade or shelter from the sun or from cold winds. Concentrated diets can make them more susceptible to extremes in temperature. On the range or pastures, they will naturally seek shade or shelter when available and when needed.
CONFINEMENT IS BEST! The sheep are confined. The pigs are not. Some producers claim that animals have a better life confined indoors in “controlled environments” than they would have outdoors exposed to the elements, predators, etc. On a few farms, this may be true, but by and large, this is an outright fallacy. For example, some argue that tethered sows don’t suffer from fight injuries as they would if kept in yards. But if the yards or fields aren’t overstocked, fighting is not a problem. It is a symptom of bad husbandry when it occurs and keeping sows tied down or penned alone all their lives is not a humane solution. It is, like many aspects of factory farming, a rationalization, a substitute for good husbandry, for humane stewardship, and a way to reduce labor and increase productivity at the expense of the animal’s well-being. The by-product is cruelty and the mottice is profit.

ECOLOGICAL AND POLITICAL ISSUES. No overview of factory farming would be complete without reference to two indirectly related issues. First, the ecological and wildlife impact of over-grazing on public lands and of predator and “pest control” (by indiscriminate poisoning, trapping, etc.) practiced by ranchers, particularly sheep ranchers. This industry makes an insignificant contribution to the diet of the nation (per capita annual consumption of lamb is less than two pounds) compared to its impact on the land and on our native wild fauna. Sheep may become the next farm species to be raised in confinement; crossed feedlot “finishing” stations for sheep are already well established in the West.

An important political issue is the growing corporate agribusiness control of production, distribution and prices and their takeover of the small family farm with its Land grant colleges receive government grants (from non-taxes) and the fruits of much of their research goes to further agribusiness development and profits rather than benefiting the consumer or local farming community directly. On the international scene, multi-national corporations have invested in foreign countries (cheap land and labor) to produce cash crops and meat for U.S. consumption. This has led to the displacement of peasants from their land, together with malnutrition and starvation and loss of habitat to wildlife, in countries such as Costa Rica and Haiti. Much of the meat in the quick-food (hamberger) chains comes from beef raised abroad at the expense of human rights and health.

HSUS OPPOSES REINTRODUCTION OF 1080

The Montana Departments of Livestock and Fish and Game have applied to the Environmental Protection Agency for an experimental use permit which would allow them to use sodium monofluoracetate ( Compound 1080) to kill coyotes in Montana for the next three years. Montana claims that coyotes are inflicting significant losses upon the state’s sheep and mule deer. 1080 is the deadly poison whose use was banned by the Environmental Protection Agency in 1972 because of the extreme environmental hazards involved, particularly to endangered and threatened species. HSUS attorneys, in a submission to the EPA, opposed the applications on a number of grounds. They charged that wool industry and state animal damage control agencies have not made any real efforts to reduce whatever livestock loss there may be by non-poisoning methods such as the resumption of shepherding, increased use of fencing, and enclosures during lambing. HSUS also found that the proposed program contained insufficient protections for endangered species as defined in Montana, such as the grizzly bear, blackfooted ferret and Rocky Mountain timber wolf, especially since the state’s application did not specify where the poisoning would be carried out. The proposed program neglects protection for eagles.

The EPA Office of Pesticide Programs will issue a decision granting or denying the application within the next few weeks.

TUNA PORPOISE UPDATE

On November 4, 1977, an Administrative Law Judge of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) recommended that the government’s proposals to regulate porpoise mortality related to commercial fishing operations be adopted for the most part. The proposals would abandon a steadily declining kill quota over the next three years. (See the Fall 1977 HSUS News.) HSUS submitted briefs containing that NMFS has overemphasized the reduction of porpoise mortality at the expense of researching and diminishing the non-mortal adverse effects which purse seine tuna fishing wreaks upon porpoises, including trauma, miscarriages, disruption of social structure, and debilitating physical injuries. Such matters were given short shrift throughout the proceeding and in the judge’s written decision, which reached a conclusion that the proposed fishing methods were humane, in spite of a great amount of contrary evidence developed during the hearing. HSUS attorneys urged the Director of NMFS, who will make the final agency decision, to reject the Administrative Law Judge’s finding on humanness.

BALD EAGLE KILLERS CONVICTED

In 1940, Congress endeavored to preserve the bald eagle, then threatened by extinction, by the enactment of the Bald Eagle Protection Act which made it a criminal offense, with certain exceptions, to take (kill) or possess any bald eagle, or any part, egg or nest. Since then the act has been substantially amended twice, the most recent amendment being drafted in 1972. In 1962, the Act was extended to include protection of the golden eagle. In 1972 the penalties for possessing or killing an eagle were increased so that first violators may be sentenced to a maximum of one year imprisonment and a $5,000 fine. For subsequent violations, the penalty may be as high as two years imprisonment and a $10,000 fine.

Recently three men in Real County, Texas were convicted of conspiracy to kill at least 70 golden eagles with shotgun fire from a helicopter. Two of the men were additionally convicted for killing eagles and violating the Airborne Warning Act, which prohibits aerial hunting. The three men, a suspended government hunter, a ranch foreman, and a Real County Commissioner, were convicted largely on the testimony of the helicopter pilot who flew the men in to hunt. The pilot testified that over 70 golden eagles were shot by the men between December 1975 and January 1977. The witness testified most of the birds were shot with a 12 gauge shotgun. The men claimed to be on coyote, bobcat and wild boar hunts. After hours of deliberation, the jury returned a verdict of guilty on all counts.

Sentencing has been deferred until an investigation may be made to assess a punishment commensurate with the acts.
around the Regions

HSUS EXPANDS REGIONAL OFFICE PROGRAM

Southeast Regional Office

On March 1st, The HSUS will open its new Southeast Regional Office in Orlando, Florida. The new office is dedicated in memory of Alice M. Wagner, former Director of The HSUS, and longtime editor of Popular Dogs magazine. Alice Wagner passed away last May in Boca Raton, Florida. The regional office and its work on behalf of animals shall be a living memorial to Mrs. Wagner.

Mr. Coburn’s experiences with the YMCA and his tenure on the S.S. Hope should serve him well as he begins his work as Regional Director.

Mr. Coburn is a graduate of Roberts Wesleyan College, Rochester, New York, and holds an advanced theological degree. He has taken additional course work at Boston University.

Since 1957, Mr. Coburn has served as a Methodist minister in churches in Kansas, New York, and Massachusetts. He has a broad background in community service work and education activities.

The Southeast Office will serve the states of Florida, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, as well as surrounding areas as the need arises. The office will be located at 3165 McCrory Place, Orlando, Florida. Any persons wishing to communicate with Mr. Coburn prior to the official opening of the office should send correspondence c/o HSUS headquarters.

Midwest Regional Office

In early December, John Hoyt, President of HSUS, announced the opening of a new regional office to cover four midwestern states. The office, which opened on January 1, 1978, is located in Kansas City, Missouri. It serves Missouri, Iowa, Kansas and Nebraska.

Ann Gonnerman is the new Regional Director. Ms. Gonnerman is well known in the Kansas City area for her work with Animal Kind, Inc. For the past 2 years, she has also been a part-time representative for HSUS in the Midwest. HSUS members may be most familiar with Ms. Gonnerman’s work on puppy mills, particularly the closing of one Kansas breeding farm which was featured in a special Close-Up Report in February, 1977.

Ms. Gonnerman plans to work for active community involvement in animal issues, and expand communications with animal welfare groups in the area. Special emphasis will be placed on animal control problems and animal cruelty investigations. The address of the new office is:

The Humane Society of the United States
Midwest Regional Office
Argyle Building
306 East 12th Street
Kansas City, MO 64106
Telephone: (816) 474-2070

New Representative

Sandy Rowland is The HSUS’s new Great Lakes Representative. Rowland will serve the people and the animals of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. And, as time permits, Rowland will work in neighboring states.

Rowland comes to The HSUS with a rich background in animal welfare work. In Wood County, Ohio, Rowland helped start the humane society and worked to get a new shelter built. She organized and served as President of the Ohio Committee for Humane Trapping. She was a former representative for the Fund for Animals. Rowland can be contacted at 12810 South Dixie Highway, Bowling Green, Ohio, 43402.

Humane Education Going Strong In Gulf States Region

The Humane Society of Nacogdoches County, Texas sponsored a “Caring” essay contest in the Nacogdoches schools. Gulf States Director Scott and HSUS staffers Donners and Herrmann participated in presenting the awards to the winning youngsters.

More than 20 awards were presented to the budding authors. The winning essay, “The Key to Understanding Animals,” was written by seventh grader Susan Molanders of The Emmeline Carpenter School. Her closing paragraph is an inspiring commentary on man’s relations with the other animals.

There is one more thing that I would like to add. In my opinion it is the best thing about animals. They don’t judge us by our appearance. No matter how pretty or ugly we are, they are willing to love us if we love them . . .
Race Horses Suffer in the Bahamas—HSUS Investigates

“It’s better in the Bahamas” the TV ads tell us. That may be true for the tourists but it’s the complete opposite for the horses at the Government of the Bahamas Hobby Horse Race Track.

The horses are suffering and dying because owners are protesting the Government’s closing of the island nation’s only race track. Last April, the Bahamian government closed down the track to make way for a new convention center and casino.

With no prospects of making money on their horses, most of the horse owners refused to provide proper care for their animals. It was their way of protesting the Government’s actions. The situation regarding the horses came to light when one Bahamian horse owner had his horse shot as a protest. This particular owner is a member of the opposition party who sought to embarrass the government. The owner called in the press following the shooting and demanded that the Government of the Bahamas choose a new location for the track.

Gambling at this track is the only form of entertainment in the country. There are still horse races being held, but tourists are no longer allowed to attend them. The horses are suffering and dying because of a political issue.

Initially, at least 135 horses were at the track when the season ended in April and the Government announced its plans. It has been common practice to feed the horses a minimal amount in the off-season. Then, somewhere prior to the beginning of the racing season in January, the owners begin to improve the diets so that the horses will be ready to race. This has been going on for many years.

Thus, the horses were suffering because of a political issue.

Finally, at least 135 horses were at the track when the season ended in April and the Government announced its plans. It has been common practice to feed the horses a minimal amount in the off-season. Then, somewhere prior to the beginning of the racing season in January, the owners begin to improve the diets so that the horses will be ready to race. This has been going on for many years. Now, however, the decision to close the track was made, the amount of feed became very low. According to the Bahamas Humane Society, it was very difficult to find out who owned the various horses. Without knowing who the owners were, they could not force the Government to prosecute for cruelty. So, the horses continued to starve.

By this time, Americans were aware of the situation. Two consultants, Sherry Schlaeter of the Broward County (Fla.) Humane Society and another humanitarian, Bonnie Denman of North Miami, began arranging for an airlift of food to the horses. And, in cooperation with the Bahamas Humane Society, they began flying out some of the horses to quarantine stations in Florida. As of this writing, these two people have spent more than $10,000 of their own money on this life saving project.

HSUS Investigator Phil Steward and John Walsh of I.S.P.A. (the International Society for the Protection of Animals) flew to Nassau to attempt to get the Bahamian government to intervene in the situation. Their efforts were met with protest and resistance. Although the Bahamian government announced plans to close the track, they have not been implemented.

Steward and Walsh have been promised by the Bahamian Director of Agriculture that he would file an official report and recommend some action be taken.

United States, 8 were reportedly due to rabies in wildlife (4 were from bat exposures, 3 from skunks, and 1 from a bobcat). So far, there have been no exposures for 2 of the other 3 cases were a cat and a laboratory accident, and 1 in someone’s car was unknown.

Rabies and the Steel Jaw Trap

An emotional non sequitur

by Carol Moulton, Assistant Editor

Habits have always been used to control the spread of rabies. But the theory promoted by the commercial fur trapping industry is that the thinning of animal populations through trapping will result in a lessening of the spread of rabies because the animals that are trapped are rabid. This conclusion is not supported by facts.

In the United States, 8 were reportedly due to rabies in wildlife (4 were from bat exposures, 3 from skunks, and 1 from a bobcat). So far, there have been no exposures for 2 of the other 3 cases were a cat and a laboratory accident, and 1 in someone’s car was unknown.

This short paragraph highlights several important points. First of all, even though every individual case of human rabies is tragic in itself, a total of 18 cases in 11 years does not constitute a major public health problem. Given the U.S. population of 215 million people, the average individual has less than a one in a million chance of contracting rabies.

One reason rabies is so rare in humans is that post-exposure treatments have proven effective in preventing the onset of the disease. These treatments consist of a 4 to 21 day series of shots. They are not given with a ‘foot-long’ needle, as one might imagine. In fact, the shots themselves are no more painful than any normal shot, but the body may react to the serum injected with fever and swelling. Recently, European researchers developed an effective new treatment involving a 4 to 6 day series of shots which may soon replace the old method.

About 20,000 people a year undergo post-exposure treatment. This does not mean that 20,000 people are exposed to rabies. Usually it means it was impossible to locate or test the animal that bit the person, and treatments are given as a safeguard.

A vast majority of those who get post-exposure treatments do so because of dog bites. Yet the CDC summary shows that the rabies inoculation programs begun in the early 50’s for pets have been highly effective. It has been over ten years since a person bitten by a dog in the United States has contracted rabies.

Of rabies deaths resulting from contact with wildlife, four were from bats and three from skunks. These two animals are the major carriers of rabies in the wild. In the southeastern states, a number of cases of rabies have been reported in raccoons, although no humans have developed rabies from contact with raccoons. Foxes, coyotes, and bobcats are occasionally reported as rabid.

Significantly, rabies is rarely found in rodents. Beaver, muskrat, squirrels, rats, gerbils and rabbits in general are considered to be rabies free.

What does rabies have to do with the steel jaw trap? Not much. The theory promoted by the commercial fur trapping industry is that ‘the thinning of animal populations through trapping will result in a lessening of the spread of rabies because the animals that are trapped are rabid.’ This theory is not supported by facts.

Rabies has always been used to control the spread of rabies. But the theory promoted by the commercial fur trapping industry is that the thinning of animal populations through trapping will result in a lessening of the spread of rabies because the animals that are trapped are rabid. This conclusion is not supported by facts.

Trapping Study Available

“A Contemporary Analysis of Animal Traps and Trapping is now for sale for $10. Written by Martha Scott for HSUS’s Institute for the Study of Animal Problems, the study clears up many of the misconceptions and myths about the steel jaw trap. Write HSUS Trapping Study, 2100 L St., N.W., Washington D.C. 20037

The Bat—among the most likely to be rabid, it is least likely to be trapped.

Available

Trapping Study

“A Contemporary Analysis of Animal Traps and Trapping is now for sale for $10. Written by Martha Scott for HSUS’s Institute for the Study of Animal Problems, the study clears up many of the misconceptions and myths about the steel jaw trap. Write HSUS Trapping Study, 2100 L St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.

The Humane Society News • Winter 1978
Commercial trappers want the pelts that fetches the highest price. Skunk pelts currently sell for about $2 apiece. A bobcat pelt may bring as much as $400. In 1976, only 3 bobcats were found to be rabid. Almost 1500 skunks were found to be rabid, but due to their lack of popularity as fashion furs, they did not account for a high percentage of animals trapped.

Muskrat is a most heavily trapped animal, since it is both numerous and popular. The muskrat is a rodent, and therefore not a carrier of rabies. Bats, which are frequently found to be rabid, are not trapped at all with the steel jaw leghold trap. Unless the public starts demanding skunk and bat fur coats, commercial trapping will have no effect on rabies control in wildlife.

When a trapping program has been specifically designed to thin out a target population in an area where there is a known rabies epidemic, the results have not favored the trapping approach.

A rabies outbreak will run its own course, with or without trapping. As those animals most susceptible to the disease die out, so does the disease. It is impossible to predict where an outbreak of rabies may next occur. By the time it is discovered and trapping begins, the numbers of diseased animals may already be declining.

In New York State in 1945, a rabies outbreak among foxes occurred in the southeastern part of the state. A trapping program was set up to stop the spread of the disease. Initially, trapping was done in five to ten mile zones around the infected area. This proved to be ineffective. The zones were extended to 15 to 18 miles, and later to 50 miles. Rabies continued to spread in all directions. The trapping zone then moved into the center of the infected area. A severe outbreak occurred to the west in a previously rabies-free area.

Trapping did not prevent the spread of rabies.

The 1973 report of the National Academy of Sciences recommends we:

- Abolish persistent trapping or poisoning campaigns for the purpose of rabies control. No evidence exists that these costly and politically-attractive programs produce either a reduction in wildlife reservoirs or in rabies.

Humans are often accused of being long on emotion and short on facts. It is ironic to find that the Humane Society of the United States believes money is no less justification for the plight of the pelts. Skunk and cat fur sales amount to millions of animals each year by the steel jaw trap.

COMMON SENSE RABIES PROTECTION

The steel jaw trap will never protect you from rabies, but the following common sense precautions will minimize your chances of being exposed to the disease:

- All dogs, and all cats allowed outdoors should be vaccinated. The law requires that dogs be vaccinated.
- Don’t keep wild animals as pets. Many who receive post-exposure rabies treatment do so because they have been in contact with pet skunks. Even a baby skunk born in captivity can be a rabies carrier. Anti-rabies vaccinations used for dogs and cats are often ineffective for other species.
- If you live near a forested area, make your house and yard attractive as possible to wild animals. Keep garbage cans lightly shut and seal off cracked areas under porches, in garages and basements.
- Don’t approach animals in the wild. Almost any animal will attack when threatened or cornered. Don’t attempt to coax a wild animal to sit on your lap, as this can result in bites or scratches and the possibility of rabies transmission.
- If bitten or scratched by a wild animal, wash the wound thoroughly with soap and water and see a physician immediately. If the animal can be caught, its brain tissue can be tested for the presence of rabies. As a last resort, try to identify the species of the animal.

The Second Session of the 95th Congress starts in January. Hopefully Congress will direct its attention to bills of major concern to humanitarians. One way to get that attention is to be the chairmen of the subcommittees and request that they schedule hearings on animal welfare bills before their subcommittees. Also write your own congressman and senators and ask their support for the pro-animal bills you favor.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION

Trapping

S. 818, sponsored by Senator Harrison Williams (N.J.) (see page 74) would outlaw the interstate and foreign commerce in the steel leghold trap and fur or leather products which have been caught in states or foreign countries that have not banned the trap. Since this approach is so restricted, it will be to the advantage of states as well as other countries to ban the leghold trap. Violations of this law would be punishable by a $1000 fine for the first offense and a $5000 fine and imprisonment for up to two years for the second and subsequent offenses. The measure would take effect one year following enactment. S. 818 is currently pending before the Subcommittee on Resource Protection, Environment and Public Works Committee, 420 Dirksen Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

H.R. 3516 was introduced by Representative Clarence Long (Md.) and has been co-sponsored by 75 other congressmen. This bill would prohibit the interstate and foreign commerce in both the steel leghold trap and fur products, or leather products which have been caught of any country which has not banned the trap. Senator John Culver (Iowa) is the chairman of the Subcommittee.

H.R. 3516 was introduced by Representative Clarence Long (Md.) and has been co-sponsored by 75 other congressmen. This bill would prohibit the interstate and foreign commerce in both the steel leghold trap and fur products, or leather products which have been caught in states or nations which have not banned the leghold or snare trap. Senator Williams’ bill, however, does not propose a ban on the interstate and foreign commerce in the traps themselves. If enacted, H.R. 3516 would become effective four years after its passage. The first offense would be punishable by a fine of not more than $2000 and for second and subsequent offenses, a fine of not more than $5000 and imprisonment of one to three years. H.R. 3516 is pending before the Senate Agriculture and Foreign Commerce Committee, Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, 215 Rayburn, Washington, D.C. 20515. Representative Paul Rogers (Fl.) is the chairman of this Subcommittee.

H.R. 5292 is a revision of trapping legislation which was the subject of heated debate during congressional hearings in 1975. The bill sponsored by Rep. Glenn Anderson (Calif.) would provide that the Secretary of Interior issue regulations for trapping animals on federal lands. These rules would be rules designating “approved” traps, visitation times, trap identification and catch reports. A seven member advisory committee appointed by the Chairman of the President’s Council on Environmental Quality would assist in preparation of the standards. Every hundred thousand dollars would be authorized for research on the development of more humane traps, and interstate commerce in the traps would be prohibited. States would be able to promulgate their own regulations if they are as strict as the federal regulations. In essence, this bill would allow for the use of traps which provide the most humane capture method available. H.R. 5292 has been referred to three separate House Committees: Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Judiciary, and Agriculture and Foreign Affairs. However, it is expected that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Judiciary Committee will defer to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. In this Committee, the bill has been referred to the Fisheries, Wildlife Conservation and Environment Subcommittee chaired by Representative Robert Leggett (Calif.), 1345 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

S. 2223, sponsored by Senator Birch Bayh (Ind.) is almost identical to H.R. 5292 with a few exceptions. The minimum age requirement to receive a permit to trap in Indiana is 16 years of age and the Anderson Bill. Either would stop children from trapping. The trap visitation requirement is slightly different in that the Anderson Bill sets 12 hours a week as a goal but allows the Secretary of the Interior wide discretion in permitting a 24 hour limit. This Senate bill does not contain the section in H.R. 5292 which provides that any product coming from a trapped animal must have attached a detailed certificate attesting to the catch method and containing other information. S. 2223, like S. 818, is pending before Senator Culver’s Subcommittee on Resource Protection, 420 Dirksen Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

HSUS supports all efforts to stop trapping. While we recognize that the Williams and Long bills would go farthest to accomplish this goal, they will be very difficult to get passed. The Anderson and Bayh bills, while not calling for a total ban, would bring some of the worst abuses of trapping under regulation. These bills may have a better chance of passage in the face of heavy lobbying by pro-trapping interests, who want no legislation passed.

Humane Slaughter

Hearings have still not been scheduled on H.R. 1464, the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act of 1977. The bill was introduced by Representative George Brown (Calif.). It would require humane slaughter in all federally inspected packing plants. The bill is before the Livestock and Grains Subcommittee, chaired by Representative W. R. Poage.

African Elephants

In mid-December, Kenya announced a ban on the sale of all game skins and trophies in their country. Although big game hunting has been banned in that country since last May, poachers have destroyed thousands of elephants and other wildlife for the valuable ivory and skins.

Representative Anthony Beilenson (Calif.) has introduced a bill (H.R. 10085) in Congress that would...
outlaw the import of ivory or other elephant products in this country. In addition, the Administration would be directed to request that the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species suspend all trade in elephant products among its member nations.

The bill is pending before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, chaired by Representative John Mica, R-Fla., and the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife Conservation and the Environment. Both should be urged to lend their full and active support to this bill. Their address is 1334 Longworth, Washington, D.C. 20515. At press time, the Department of Interior was gathering data on the African elephant in consideration of listing it as an endangered species. If it is given endangered status, the importation of ivory or skins from these animals will automatically be banned.

Correction

In the Fall issue of the HSUS Report, it was erroneously reported that the Pennsylvania legislature enacted a ban on trapping. The Senate did pass a bill restricting the use of this and similar kinds of traps, but the bill is still pending in the Pennsylvania House.

The Pennsylvania Senate has passed a bill restricting the use of this and similar kinds of traps, but the bill is still pending in the Pennsylvania House.

In the Fall issue of the HSUS Report, it was erroneously re­
ported that the Pennsylvania legislature enacted a ban on trapping. The Senate did pass a bill restricting the use of this and similar kinds of traps, but the bill is still pending in the Pennsylvania House.

How You Can Help

Your letters can make all the difference where legislation involving animal welfare is concerned. When government agencies or private companies are setting policies on animals, your letters of encouragement or protest can have a definite impact.

Your letters are even more effective when they are timely. That’s why HSUS instituted the Action Alert System. It is a postcard that briefly describes the issue involved. It is sent to a special list of HSUS members who have pledged to respond with letters, reports or telegrams whenever they receive the Alert.

If you are willing to take “action” to help the animals, and want to be included on the Action Alert list, just send your name and address to HSUS Action Alert, 2100 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.

Those who claim that animals do not feel pain ignore basic facts of biology.

The number of unwanted animals caught in steel traps may well exceed the number of “target” animals caught. Most of the nontarget animals can be destroyed because of the injuries they sustain.

Endangered species are sometimes included in this trap of wildlife. Thomas J. Harper, a U.S. game management agent, reported that some 2,900 eagles were accidentally trapped in Northeastern Nevada during a recent winter. Between 700 and 1,000 hawks, owls, and other birds of prey met the same fate.

In addition, there are hundreds of well-documented cases of pets being caught in steel traps. Children, too, have been victims of carelessly placed traps.

The New Jersey Branch of HSUS has compiled an extensive list of cases of trapping abuses in New Jersey over the past several years. It is a sad and brutal narrative that includes cases of poisoning—“For one cold, grey week, returned dragging trap, in staved condition. Paw hanging, almost severed, leg gangrenous;” “Young girl’s ankle broken when she stepped on a camouflaged trap. It was thinning away, the mink died."

Our legislators must be directed to request that the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species suspend all trade in elephant products among its member nations.

The Steel Trap is a Tool of the Hunter

In the Southwest, in the Great Lakes, during the Florida Keys, it is time we insisted that our wildlife is not the one that is killed. It is time we wielded the steel trap to a museum where it belongs.

In any case, the trapper’s “target”, the animal whose fur commands the highest price, not the one that is “surplus”, or di­

So long as the steel trap remains, we will continue to see the same sort of thing. In the Fall issue of the HSUS Report, it was erroneously reported that the Pennsylvania legislature enacted a ban on trapping. The Senate did pass a bill restricting the use of this and similar kinds of traps, but the bill is still pending in the Pennsylvania House.

How You Can Help

Your letters can make all the difference where legislation involving animal welfare is concerned. When government agencies or private companies are setting policies on animals, your letters of encouragement or protest can have a definite impact.

Your letters are even more effective when they are timely. That’s why HSUS instituted the Action Alert System. It is a postcard that briefly describes the issue involved. It is sent to a special list of HSUS members who have pledged to respond with letters, reports or telegrams whenever they receive the Alert.

If you are willing to take “action” to help the animals, and want to be included on the Action Alert list, just send your name and address to HSUS Action Alert, 2100 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.

Those who claim that animals do not feel pain ignore basic facts of biology.

The number of unwanted animals caught in steel traps may well exceed the number of “target” animals caught. Most of the nontarget animals can be destroyed because of the injuries they sustain.

Endangered species are sometimes included in this trap of wildlife. Thomas J. Harper, a U.S. game management agent, reported that some 2,900 eagles were accidentally trapped in Northeastern Nevada during a recent winter. Between 700 and 1,000 hawks, owls, and other birds of prey met the same fate.

In addition, there are hundreds of well-documented cases of pets being caught in steel traps. Children, too, have been victims of carelessly placed traps.

The New Jersey Branch of HSUS has compiled an extensive list of cases of trapping abuses in New Jersey over the past several years. It is a sad and brutal narrative that includes cases of poisoning—“For one cold, grey week, returned dragging trap, in staved condition. Paw hanging, almost severed, leg gangrenous;” “Young girl’s ankle broken when she stepped on a camouflaged trap. It was thinning away, the mink died."

Our legislators must be directed to request that the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species suspend all trade in elephant products among its member nations.

The Steel Trap is a Tool of the Hunter

In the Southwest, in the Great Lakes, during the Florida Keys, it is time we insisted that our wildlife is not the one that is killed. It is time we wielded the steel trap to a museum where it belongs.
GRIZMEEK’S ANIMAL LIFE ENCYCLOPEDIA

Zoologist Bernhard Grzimek is the Editor-in-Chief of the thirteen volume Animal Life Encyclopedia. The Encyclopedia is an impressive literary work totalling 7,790 pages. Preparation of the publication involved contributions from more than 200 internationally prominent scientists. The Encyclopedia includes four volumes on mammals, three on birds, and two on reptiles and amphibians. There are also separate volumes on mollusks, insects, lower animals, and reptiles.

Grzimek’s Animal Life Encyclopedia is unique in format. Chapters are written in narrative form. Individual chapters address distinct animal groupings as identified by physical or behavioral characteristics. For example, separate chapters are devoted to egg-laying mammals, kangaroos, primates, and invertebrates. Information for each species includes distinguishing characteristics, distribution, habitat, physical dimensions, discovery of the animal, taxonomic classification, uncommon facts, and anecdotes. Each volume contains a supplemental reading list, metric conversion table, and a dictionary of foreign language animal names.

Each volume is illustrated with pen and ink drawings, color plates, and multi-level overlays. Margin notes are used extensively throughout the encyclopedia.

Each volume in the set has been written as a complete and independent reference to its subject matter. Thus, the encyclopedia is a useful reference for scholars with a particular topic of interest.

The purchase price for the thirteen volume set is $39.50 per book.

Grzimek’s Animal Life Encyclopedia can only be described with superlatives. The set is the most authoritative and singularly most important general reference on world wildlife in existence. This encyclopedia is certain to remain the standard reference for animals for decades into the future.

Grzimek’s Encyclopedia of Ethology

Grzimek’s Encyclopedia of Evolution

Grzimek’s Encyclopedia of Ecosystems

Grzimek’s Encyclopedia of Evolution

This three-volume set, a supplement to the Animal Life Encyclopedia, reviews current theories and research findings in animal behavior, species development, and the interrelationships of animals and their environment. These scholarly reference books, together with the Animal Life Encyclopedia, are an excellent cornerstone for any natural history book collection.

WILD FREE-ROAMING HORSES AND BURROS

Whereas, the National Park Service, whose lands are not currently subject to the present federal legislation intended to protect wild and free-roaming horses and burros has jurisdiction over a substantial portion of these animals throughout the western United States; and

Whereas, Congress has found and The Humane Society of the United States believes that all of these animals are important to our heritage and are deserving of humane treatment; and

Whereas, certain federal legislation has been introduced which would make the National Park Service lands subject to the protective laws already enacted; and

Whereas, several bills have been introduced in Congress which would allow sale or slaughter of excess wild horses and burros from public lands of the United States; and

Whereas, it is a demonstrated fact that allowing such sale or slaughter of excess wild horses and burros, thereby removing them from the protection of the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act of 1971, encourages economical exploitation of these animals by slaughter houses and other interests, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States continue to support efforts such as Senator Mathias’ bill, S. 6, 1981, to protect these precious wild horses and burros on lands administered by the National Park Service within the coverage of the Wild, Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act of 1971; that The Humane Society of the United States continue to work for more effective and humane administration of the Act, particularly with regard to the Adopt-A-Horse program, and that The Humane Society of the United States oppose any measures, such as allowing title to excess horses to pass to private parties, which would make economical exploitation of wild horses and burros again possible.

FIELD INVESTIGATIONS

Whereas, the anti-cruelty laws of many states are weak and inadequate, and

Whereas, the conditions which produce a great deal of cruelty and suffering among animals could be rectified, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States maintain and expand its efforts to properly train local investigators in the proper techniques of the investigative process, and

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States’ Field Investigative Department continue to consider this serious national problem as a high priority program and continue its own vigorous efforts to investigate and effect enforcement of all animal protection laws at the national level.

KIND

Whereas, the education of youth in the humane ethic is a major objective of The Humane Society of the United States, and

Whereas, the KIND Program has been well received and proved a valuable and useful educational tool among those school systems that have learned about it, and

Whereas, the full realization of this major objective cannot be achieved without widespread and extensive promotion, and

Whereas, personal recommendation often is the most successful means of promotion, therefore let it be

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States strongly urge the U.S. Congress to file an objection to the zero funding level given to the IWCA and urge the government to work with the Eskimo community to develop an effective conservation & management program to be presented to the IWCA at its next meeting.

HUMANE SLAUGHTER

Whereas, existing federal and state humane slaughter laws have not resulted in the exclusive use of humane slaughter methods; and

Whereas, enforcement of existing laws has been sporadic and enforcement of some laws virtually non-existent; and

Whereas, existing federal law requires humane slaughter practices which are facilitated by the rapid killing of animals, thereby avoiding the suffering of animals during the slaughter process, and

Whereas, proposed federal legislation would require expansion of humane slaughter practices to all slaughter houses presently covered by the Federal Meat Inspection Act as well as all imported meat and meat products; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States work vigorously for the enactment and enforcement of this legislation.

ANIMAL QUARANTINE AND DESTRUCTION

Whereas, each year it is estimated that more than 100,000 domestic animals are sentenced to death by public health agencies for having inflicted injuries upon humans; and

Whereas, a majority of incidents are provoked or result from mishandling by animal owners or custodians, and

Whereas, only an extremely small portion of these sacrificed are vicious or prove to have been infected with rabies, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States encourage state and municipal health departments to reconsider current rigid regulations requiring the destruction of biting animals or animals otherwise inflicting injuries upon humans, and be it further

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States encourage state and municipal health departments to reconsider current rigid regulations requiring the destruction of biting animals or animals otherwise inflicting injuries upon humans, and be it further

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States encourage state and municipal health departments to reconsider current rigid regulations requiring the destruction of biting animals or animals otherwise inflicting injuries upon humans, and be it further

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States encourage state and municipal health departments to reconsider current rigid regulations requiring the destruction of biting animals or animals otherwise inflicting injuries upon humans, and be it further

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States encourage state and municipal health departments to reconsider current rigid regulations requiring the destruction of biting animals or animals otherwise inflicting injuries upon humans, and be it further

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States encourage state and municipal health departments to reconsider current rigid regulations requiring the destruction of biting animals or animals otherwise inflicting injuries upon humans, and be it further

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States encourage state and municipal health departments to reconsider current rigid regulations requiring the destruction of biting animals or animals otherwise inflicting injuries upon humans, and be it further
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RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States encourage state and municipal health departments to reconsider current rigid regulations requiring the destruction of biting animals or animals otherwise inflicting injuries upon humans, and be it further
RITUAL SLAUGHTER PEN FOR SMALL ANIMALS
Whereas, no progress has been made in the field of humane slaughter legislation since 1958;
Whereas, the HSUS, together with other humane organizations, undertook in January 1971 to organize the Council for Livestock Protection for the purpose of building a pen for ritual slaughter;
Whereas, the HSUS has contributed thousands of dollars for the construction of such pen;
Whereas, the University of Connecticut Engineering Department, in contractual relations with the Council for Livestock Protection, has built such a pen, stated in 1975 that such pen was ready for commercial construction;
Whereas, the Council for Livestock Protection at the present time is engaged with the Cincinnati Butcher Supply Company in building a pen for ritual slaughter;
Whereas, the same company has not been able to report any progress in providing such a pen;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors of the HSUS create a committee consisting of members of the Board and members at large in good standing of investigating the feasibility of continuing the project.

HUMANE EDUCATION
Whereas, humane education is a high priority objective of The Humane Society of the United States; and
Whereas, the organization has committed financial support and staff to the implementation of humane education programs throughout the United States; and
Whereas, The Humane Society of the United States has a need to clarify the operational goals of its humane education activities; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States adopt the following goals for its humane education efforts:

1. To foster the concept of reverence for all living things.
2. To create an understanding of the interrelatedness of all living things.
3. To reach children and adults aware of their responsibilities for the humane care, treatment, and protection of domestic animals and wildlife.
4. To help parents and educators understand that fostering humane attitudes in children will result in the development of more responsible and effective citizens.
5. To encourage and improve animal-related career education opportunities and programs in the schools.
6. To develop standardized methods and materials for curriculum-integrated humane education programs.
7. To assist human beings in translating their respect for all forms of life into positive action which will result in improving conditions for all animals, and be it further

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States use these operational goals to evaluate all current and future humane education activities.

MARINE MAMMALS IN CAPTIVITY
Whereas, there continues to be abuses associated with the acquisition, transportation, care and display of marine mammals; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States support the promulgation of optimal standards and guidelines governing such acquisition, transportation, care, and display of these mammals, and be it further

GREYHOUND RACING
Whereas, the greyhound industry is growing in popularity throughout the United States, and
Whereas, that industry frequently uses live animals in training greyhounds, and
Whereas, the use of live animals continues in coursing events, and
Whereas, there are other cruelties attendant to the industry as a whole, and
Whereas, state legislation has failed to stop the use of live animals by this industry in violation of the fundamental moral principles of a uniform nationwide policy on this issue, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States work to end the use of live animals in Greyhound Racing, and be it further

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States work to amend the Animal Welfare Act to prohibit the shipment to commerce of animals used as live lures for the training and racing of dogs and to prohibit the shipment of all such animals.

FOOD ANIMALS
Whereas, the raising and slaughter of animals for human consumption annually involves 140 million mammals and 3 billion birds, and
Whereas, the enormity of the suffering associated with animal farming and slaughter marks this form of animal usage as a primary form of cruelty to animals and
Whereas, vegetarianism represents an active personal protest against the suffering of animals, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States increase its campaign to inform the public of the abuses involved in current methods of raising, transporting and slaughtering animals for food purposes, and be it further

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States support more local involvement in 4H Clubs and Future Farmers of America in relation to the humane treatment of farm animals as we have already done in the case of High School Science Fairs, and be it further

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States formally acknowledge the contribution toward animal welfare made by ethical veterinarians and the vegetarian community.

HUMANE ETHIC IN VETERINARY EDUCATION
Whereas, there exists a critical need for better understanding between the Human Movement and Veterinary Medicine, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States encourage local and national animal welfare organizations to establish channels of communication with Veterinary Medical Schools and other universities for the purpose of the further fostering of a societal approach incorporating the humane ethic in their established curricula.

EUTHANASIA
Be it RESOLVED, that The Humane Society of the United States urges the discontinued use and ultimate ban of Succinyl Choline Chloride for euthanasia of animals and the combination of this drug with Strypthine Sulphate and Nicotine Sulfate for euthanizing horses and actively promotes appropriate action prohibiting its use wherever and whenever legally possible.

The Quality of Humaneness . . .

In the article “How Humane is Your Society?,” Phyllis Wright discusses some of those areas of management and operations that must be carefully scrutinized to insure a quality animal sheltering program. More importantly, however, she points out that the first priority of any animal welfare organization must be the commitment to sensitivity and caring. As was noted in the few examples cited, such is not always the case.

The Humane Society of the United States, while fully cognizant of the vulnerability of any society seeking to perform a civic function, refuses to defend those organizations failing to provide quality care for animals. Indeed, through our Accreditation Program and numerous workshops held annually throughout the country, we acknowledge the need for improvement at all levels. The humane movement is far from perfect, including our own organization.

On the other hand, we have refrained from public criticism of other animal welfare organizations, be they local or national. We take no satisfaction in another group’s failures or mistakes, nor do we seek to enhance our own programs and efforts by invidious comparisons. Likewise, we have always recognized the legitimacy of differing points of view and a variety of emphases.

However, we cannot and will not compromise humaneness. This is the one characteristic and quality of any animal welfare organization that must stand the test of inquiry and criticism. And, if need be, at this level we will join the critics. This is not a statement of arrogance, for we are mutually involved with many organizations, local and national, in furthering the cause of animal welfare. And when any such organization fails, it is a failure for which we must likewise assume responsibility.

The task any animal welfare organization assumes is formidable. And even the strength of our combined efforts will not win the day on every front. But if our purpose is clear and our commitment sincere, there is nothing that can finally frustrate our efforts.

The quality of humaneness is uncompromising. It is also undefeatable so long as compassion and caring concern are affixed in the hearts and minds of human beings.
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