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FOREWORD

The schools of many states are the places where our children—yours and mine—are being indoctrinated with inaccurate, biased, and deficient educational material concerning wildlife. Indeed, the content of this material is so flawed that it has been labeled a detriment to the educational process by some of the nation’s largest and most prestigious animal-welfare organizations. However, largely because it is being distributed with the resources of state fish and wildlife agencies, the sponsors confidently predict that 10 million children will be exposed to it before the end of 1985. This material is called Project WILD and its use must be stopped. To that end, your help is vitally important.

In summary, Project WILD is a purportedly objective and unbiased environmental education program which has now been, at least tentatively, accepted for use in 33 states. Project WILD was largely developed and funded by the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, a group whose budgets are derived primarily from the sale of hunting and trapping licenses. It is distributed in a two volume set of curriculum guides, one for elementary and one for secondary schools.

Unfortunately, Project WILD is not the unbiased objective program that its sponsors allege. Indeed, as the animal-welfare community became aware of the content of Project WILD, The Humane Society of the United States, The American Humane Association, The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Animal Protection Institute, Fund for Animals, International Fund for Animal Welfare, Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals issued a strong protest to the governor of each state regarding its distribution and use. Simultaneously, we invited local humane societies across the country to join these organizations in protest of Project WILD. Hundreds of societies have responded affirmatively. Obviously, the concerns we are voicing are being made on behalf of millions of deeply concerned citizens across this nation.

In response to our concerns, Project WILD officials asked our organizations to submit a critique of the material, together with any changes which we consider necessary in the materials. We have done so. The result is this Special Report.

You will see that our organizations have provided a detailed and thoroughly documented critique of Project WILD which conclusively supports our two primary recommendations:

(1) Discontinue distribution of the Project WILD guides until the problems which we have documented are satisfactorily solved; and,
CRITIQUE
OF
PROJECT WILD*

INTRODUCTION

On November 2, 1984, our organizations issued a joint statement in which we expressed strong objections to Project WILD and opposed the use of public funds for its distribution and use. (The statement is appended.) Project WILD responded by asking that we submit a detailed analysis in which we specifically identify, to the extent possible, our objections and concerns over the material, in a consensus manner, if appropriate.

To that end, we have analyzed the Project WILD material. As our analysis progressed, our concerns grew enormously. We have identified numerous serious and pervasive inaccuracies, biases, and omissions in Project WILD. Indeed, as we document, significant portions of the material in Project WILD are so flawed in their current form as to be a positive detriment to the educational process. For that reason, and based on the analysis contained herein, our organizations call upon the officials responsible for distribution and/or use of Project WILD to take two immediate actions:

(1) Discontinue distribution of the Project WILD guides until the problems which we have documented are satisfactorily solved; and,

(2) Notify, insofar as possible, all of those who have received the Project WILD guides and ask them, for the reasons which we have outlined, to discontinue use of these guides until new and corrected Project WILD guides have been provided.

Our consensus analysis follows.

*This Critique was prepared using the first and second editions of Project WILD. However, our preliminary analysis of the proposed subsequent edition indicates that most of the problems found in the earlier editions remain.
GENERAL COMMENTS

In general, the language, conceptual outline, and selection of topics within Project WILD reflect a strong bias toward a utilitarian and manipulation-based approach to wildlife. Words like “resource,” “harvest,” and “manage” are used repeatedly throughout the activities. These pervasive words are not objective terms but rather represent the jargon of a very specific philosophy that perceives wild animals as commodities that can and should be manipulated to allow consumptive use by humans. Although this utilitarian belief is representative of some segments of the American public, it is by no means universal, and in fact, is in direct opposition to the opinions of a large segment of the public who perceive wild animals to have intrinsic value. More than 70 out of 167 statements in the curriculum framework reflect the utilitarian and/or intervention philosophy toward wildlife. However, the belief—shared by many—in the intrinsic value of animals, while given token attention in one statement of the curriculum framework, is not seriously addressed in any part of the document. Furthermore, no mention is made or discussion given to the concept of wise stewardship of wildlife, where intervention and manipulation are limited to those cases where such activities are truly beneficial to the animals, and where the use of wild animals to provide targets for recreational hunters is eliminated. Obviously, these biases must be corrected.

Project WILD’s manipulation-based approach to wildlife is also demonstrated repeatedly in activities that address the concepts of carrying capacity and population limiting factors. Incomplete and erroneous information is provided in such activities as Oh Deer!, Carrying Capacity, Quick Frozen Critters, Classroom Carrying Capacity, How Many Bears Can Live In This Forest?, Checks And Balances, Turkey Trouble, and Habitat Lap Sit to provide a distorted picture of wildlife population dynamics and to suggest that natural systems are incapable of maintaining equilibria without human intervention; that all species of wildlife overpopulate, destroy their habitat, and starve without human intervention; that natural limiting factors for wildlife populations are always to be avoided; and that therefore wild animals must be manipulated and killed for their own good.

This misleading scenario is based on population theory derived from r-selected species, such as insects and bacteria, whose reproductive strategy is to maximize rate of increase and who have small body sizes, short life spans, massive numbers of offspring, low survivorship, little or no parental care, and density-independent population responses. The conclusions drawn from population theory based on such species—population irruptions and crashes—do not apply (with a few rare exceptions) to K-selected species such as mammals and birds. The reproductive strategy of K-selected species, such as deer, bear, and other species used as illustrations in Project WILD materials, is to maximize survivorship and
competitive ability, not rate of increase. These species typically have large body sizes, low reproductive rates, long life spans, give considerable parental care, and exhibit high survivorship and density-dependent population responses. They rarely exhibit the population eruptions and crashes imputed to them by the Project WILD materials, and they are, in general, quite capable of maintaining their own dynamic equilibria that occasionally fluctuate up or down in response to carrying capacity. K-selected species track carrying capacity quite closely, and, although there may be occasional surges of the population above or below carrying capacity due to time lags (e.g., a population may not respond with lowered reproduction to a food shortage until a year or more later), they almost never cause the kind of irreversible habitat destruction implied by Project WILD. Obviously, these facts must be made clear in the Project WILD materials.

Moreover, examples of wildlife population dynamics that are used in the activities represent the exception rather than the rule and no mention is made of emigration, territoriality, migration, or other behavioral or reproductive adjustments that occur naturally within species and serve to adjust populations to the capacity of their habitats. Death from natural causes is always portrayed as bad, with no discussion of the selective nature of the process which generally takes only the old, sick, or weak. Also ignored is the fact that many scavengers depend for survival upon natural mortality in other species. In contrast, death from hunting is portrayed as necessary, with no discussion of the potential suffering involved or the tendency of hunters to kill the larger, healthier animals and thereby weaken the genetic health of the species over time. These inadequacies in the examples and the guidance to teachers should be corrected.

The utilitarian language and the distorted portrayal of wildlife population dynamics in Project WILD combine to support another pervasive bias in the materials: unqualified support for modern wildlife management practices and philosophy. Not only do the materials mistakenly assume widespread public support for the current game- or consumptive-focused management characteristic of most state fish and wildlife agencies, but they also fail to give even token discussion to differing points of view on obviously controversial topics such as predator control, trapping, and “game” stocking. These inadequacies must be corrected as well.

Hunting is erroneously portrayed as a noncontroversial issue that “has become recognized as a critically important tool for use in managing wildlife populations.” This is an error of fact which is near the heart of the bias permeating the Project WILD guides. Hunting is not a critically important tool for managing wildlife populations. Most hunting is done for sport—human fun—not management. Nearly the only animal allegedly hunted for “management” is the white-tailed deer. And the purported need for this practice is highly controversial. Throughout Project WILD, unwary students and teachers alike are led to believe that hunting is a necessary tool for ending wildlife starvation. Yet no one suggests that hunting of robins, cardinals, other songbirds, or any of the myriad of non-hunted species should be started, even though all are subject to natural processes, including starvation. This is not surprising, given that the “starvation” argument is not based in fact but is instead used as a convenient excuse for justifying the killing of those animals that are favored by sport hunters.

Indeed, most hunting in this country is done for sport, recreation, or trophy. It follows that for most state fish and wildlife agencies, encouraging the sale of hunting licenses, and therefore hunting, is far more a method of raising funds for operating such agencies than it is a method for stopping wildlife starvation (see Who Pays For What?). These points and the ethics of making a sport out of killing wildlife need to be explored thoroughly.

Similarly, throughout the Project WILD guides the word “harvest” is used with respect to wildlife. This terminology is objectionable because, *inter alia*, it equates animals with row crops. Such a concept also reinforces the notion of animals as commodities, and prevents developing an attitude of stewardship, where animals are respected for their sentient natures as well as their function as species in a natural system. Finally, even if one ignores the sentience of animals, it must be apparent that there is no analogy between “harvesting” corn and killing wildlife. Corn, after all, is harvested for consumption, it is not harvested for sport; nearly all hunting, however, is conducted primarily for sport. Clearly, the word “harvest” should be replaced with the more candid term “kill” when referring to wildlife.

Moreover, although ethical questions are raised in reference to obedience to hunting regulations or appropriate conditions in zoos, no attention is given to the more serious underlying questions as to whether sport hunting is appropriate at all or if animals should be kept in zoos regardless of conditions. The only issue that receives serious, ethical discussion is the land-use issue. Even here, however, the rationale for preservation of wildlife habitat is defended in the simulation activity primarily by those who will derive recreational benefit from consumptive use of the wildlife, and not by people who are interested in preserving wildlife for intrinsic, ecological, or other non-consumptive reasons. These omissions should be rectified with discussion on these points.

Throughout Project WILD, very little attention is drawn to the similarities between humans and other animals, even though (and possibly because) the identification of similarities between ourselves and others has been demonstrated to be an important factor in the development of empathy and pro-social or compassionate behavior. On the contrary, at least three activities (Animal Poetry, Interview A Spider, Saturday Morning Wildlife Watching) caution children to avoid attaching human attributes to animals, with no discussion of the fact that humans do share
some characteristics with other animals. Substantial discussion of these similarities must be included. Along these same lines, Project WILD activities never encourage children to look at animals as individual parts of a whole population, focusing instead exclusively on the populations or species themselves. This focus retards the development of compassion and makes it easier for children to condone or ignore violent, inhumane treatment of animals which frequently results in the death of such animals. This detached and accepting behavior is especially likely to occur when these Project WILD activities are coupled with the suggestions that sport hunting or trapping is conducted for the good of the animals or their habitat. A balanced discussion of any wildlife issues should include honest discussion of the impact of the particular action or practice on individual animals as well as the population.

Surprisingly, no activities focus or even touch on the practice of keeping wildlife as pets. This practice is generally seen to be inappropriate by the environmental, conservation, and animal–welfare communities but still continues to be popular nationwide. Young people who are learning to appreciate wildlife often have difficulty differentiating between wild animals and pets, believing that if you like an animal (i.e., it is not “mean” or “ugly” or “scary”), then it is an animal that would be fun to “have” at home. In fact, the keeping of wild or exotic pets is inconsistent with respect for natural ecosystems, usually cruel to the animal involved, sometimes detrimental to whole populations or species of animals, and potentially dangerous to humans. Several of the Project WILD activities (e.g., Animal Charades, What’s Wild?, etc.) make the distinction between wild and domesticated animals, and the activities should be extended to include discussions of what constitutes an appropriate or inappropriate pet.

Finally, one of the most consistent problems with Project WILD is the lack of mention of animal–welfare groups among the resource agencies or organizations listed throughout the activities. The avoidance of the animal–welfare perspective in the selection of organizations from which children and teachers are to seek additional information not only biases the information obtained, it could also erroneously suggest to the uninformed that animal–welfare groups are not responsive to or concerned about wild animals, wildlife–related problems, and the environment. Moreover, to those who know of the dedication of animal–welfare groups to both wildlife and the environment, the omission of these groups as potential “resource agencies” suggests a deliberate attempt to bias the program by excluding the important views which these organizations share.

The comments that follow represent a more detailed, activity–by–activity critique of Project WILD, highlighting examples of the biases and inaccuracies outlined above as well as pointing out other more specific concerns.
on them; (5) that the technology is available to develop alternatives for almost all invasive animal experiments, although a lack of funding and interest has retarded the development of these alternatives; (6) that many scientists have raised serious questions about the validity of generalizing the effects of laboratory studies on animals to human beings; and (7) that the capture and transport of wild animals for research purposes has caused tens of thousands of individual animals to be killed or injured and whole species to be diminished in the wild.

If this activity is to remain in the guide, it should be refocused on the pros and cons of research in wildlife biology and behavior, and resource organizations with contrasting points of view (i.e., wildlife conservation groups and animal-welfare groups) should be listed among the specified resources.

**BEARLY BORN**  
Elementary, p. 5  
Secondary, p. 211

Segment 2 under the Extensions section of this activity asks students to compute and graph the growth of bear populations without mentioning realistic limiting factors that might affect that growth. This is an example of the misleading portrayal of wildlife population dynamics that appears throughout Project WILD. This should be corrected.

**CARRYING CAPACITY**  
Secondary, p. 221

The concept of carrying capacity developed in this activity and throughout Project WILD suggests three assumptions: (1) that natural systems are incapable of maintaining dynamic equilibria without continual catastrophic changes in habitat and wildlife populations; (2) that, as a consequence of this, human interference in and manipulation of wildlife populations and habitat are preferable to “letting nature take its course”; and (3) that it is important and even desirable to have natural systems continually populated at their maximum carrying capacity. The first of these assumptions is inaccurate, ignoring the wide variety of natural limiting factors present in complex ecosystems, and the second two assumptions represent highly debatable value judgments rather than fact. These inadequacies must be corrected.

Specifically, the *Carrying Capacity* game fails to explain: (1) why there are more animals than food (i.e., what unusual occurrence caused natural signals to cross to allow the particular species of animal in question to reproduce beyond the support capability of its habitat, or what unusual natural or human–caused event occurred to deplete the food supply); (2) that because of natural limiting factors, this type of radical imbalance occurs infrequently in the kinds of animal populations of concern to wildlife managers, and then only in certain species that do not emigrate and/or which tend to exhibit r–selection characteristics (e.g., existence in unstable habitats, large numbers of offspring); (3) that some loss of animals to hunger or severe weather is a natural occurrence, even if the habitat has ample food available; and (4) that the death of some animals is essential to an ecosystem in order to provide food for scavengers and decomposers. Step 5 under the Procedure section addresses ways of reducing the population of animals in an overcrowded habitat, including opening a hunting season, but fails to mention that artificial reduction of the herd will only stimulate reproduction for the following year so that another “surplus” will develop, and that hunters traditionally kill the larger, fitter animals, leaving the weaker to reproduce and lessen the genetic health of the species. These failures in the game should be corrected.

The example of the Kaibab deer in Arizona is a poor choice for use in the Evaluation section of this activity because it has been thoroughly discredited by Graeme Caughley.* Critically examined, the Kaibab evidence points only to a reasonable fluctuation in the deer population following disturbance (caused by the removal of predators and the impact of livestock grazing on the habitat), not to the large explosion and crash that has become part of the history of wildlife management.

**CHANGING ATTITUDES**  
Elementary, p. 177  
Secondary, p. 165

The example of changing attitudes toward predators discussed in the Background section of this activity in the first printing of Project WILD was an excellent example of how public attitudes are changing and how these changes might require or result in changes in wildlife management ideas and practices. Although the example was accurate and directly related to the objective of the activity, it was removed in the revised version of the guides because of protests received from fish and wildlife agencies, the groups often responsible for predator control programs. This material should be replaced.

The listing of categories of people to interview in step 5 of the Procedure section lacks mention of any animal–welfare activists, even though these individuals represent opinions that are relevant to the activity and distinct from the views of some of the other groups listed; they should be included.

---

CHECKS AND BALANCES

This activity expands on the misconception of wildlife population dynamics developed in such activities as *Carrying Capacity*, *Oh Deer!*, and *How Many Bears?*. It inaccurately suggests, as the other activities do, that if not “managed” (read “hunted”) by humans, all wild species will continue to reproduce far beyond the capacity of their habitat to support them, and will be brought under control only by complete destruction of the habitat and resulting starvation. As noted in the introduction, this scenario is based on population concepts derived from r-selected species, and it is not accurate for K-selected species. Most “game” species, the ones for which wildlife managers contend “control” is necessary, are K-selected (i.e., large ungulates such as deer, antelope, and moose). The Condition Cards provided reinforce this “overpopulation” misconception in that they all represent dramatic or catastrophic increases or declines in overall population numbers, and none depict more realistic situations where some old or sick animals die, others are born, some are killed by predators, some emigrate, some do not reproduce in response to declining food availability, etc.

In addition, although the activity suggests that wildlife managers are often criticized for their actions, it implies that this criticism is merely the result of conflicting politics, and no discussion of the validity of critics’ arguments or the ethical validity of managing wildlife for human sport is provided.

Overall, we believe this lesson is one of the worst from the standpoint of biology in the *Project WILD* series. It is so inaccurate and the inaccuracies are so interwoven that it would take almost a complete rewrite to correct. Thus, we recommend that the exercise be eliminated.

CLASSROOM CARRYING CAPACITY

Step 2 for Grades 4–6 under the Procedure section of this activity fails to discuss how animal populations are regulated by natural limiting factors to respond to the carrying capacity of their habitats (see *Carrying Capacity*, *Oh Deer!*, *How Many Bears?*, *Checks And Balances*, etc.). In addition, this section inaccurately states that killing or moving animals will increase the carrying capacity of a given habitat. Although these actions can reduce the numbers of animals to a point below the limits of the habitat’s natural carrying capacity, it will not change that capacity. These inaccuracies should be corrected.

In addition, the caution “to avoid frightening or depressing students” provided under the Procedure section seems unnecessary, unless one accepts the opinion that natural limiting factors on wildlife populations are in some way “bad” or negative (see *Carrying Capacity*).

ENVIRO-ETHICS

To be consistent with its use in a wildlife-focused curriculum, this otherwise excellent activity should raise questions about the impact of personal actions on wildlife in particular (including species and individual animals) as well as on the environment as a whole.

ETHI-REASONING

Although this activity is supposedly designed to help children examine their own values and beliefs about controversial wildlife issues by evaluating moral dilemmas, the four dilemmas that deal with the topic of hunting presuppose an acceptance of the practice. Three focus the ethical question on when it is appropriate or inappropriate to obey kill limits and hunting season regulations. The fourth involves a non-hunter who accepts hunting, but is opposed to his country club building a game farm. None depict a person opposed to hunting, none address the issue of whether hunting in any form is an acceptable practice or whether subsistence and sport hunting are subject to different ethical judgments, and none deal with the appropriateness or inappropriateness of trapping. As in *The Hunters*, this “stacking the deck” by avoiding key ethical questions is inconsistent with the objectives of the activity and with the principles of good teaching in moral reasoning and critical thinking skills. Obviously, these defects in the lesson must be corrected.

ETHI-THINKING

Step 1 in the Procedure section of this activity fails to list hunting and trapping among recreational activities that harm animals, even though these are the most well-known and direct of wildlife-related “sports,” and their objective involves killing, capturing, or injuring animals. In addition, the first segment of the Evaluation section focuses only on a reidentification of the things people do to harm habitat, rather than focusing on both habitat and animals as stated in the objective. These inadequacies need to be corrected.

FIRE ECOLOGIES

While this activity asks students to consider the positive and nega-
tive effects of forest or brush fire on the environment—which will in turn affect the animals living there—it fails to give serious consideration to concerns over the impact of fire on the individual animals that must experience it. The belief that it is only important to be concerned with species rather than individuals is repeated in other areas of Project WILD and is in direct conflict with much animal-welfare/rights philosophy. A thorough presentation that raises questions about the effects of various activities or events on both species and individuals should be included.

**FIRST IMPRESSIONS**

The Extensions section of this activity suggests that the teacher bring into the classroom a snake, spider, or other animal that might normally trigger unfavorable reactions in students, but it fails to discuss appropriate temporary housing for these animals and that they should be returned to the wild as soon as the lesson is complete.

**HABITAT LAP SIT**

This activity oversimplifies the relationship between elements within a habitat, ignoring the dynamic nature of living systems and the ability of the animals within the systems to adjust to change. Contrary to real habitats, any change in the supply of food, water, shelter, or space in the game results in a catastrophic collapse of the system. This activity contributes to the inaccurate portrayal of carrying capacity found throughout Project WILD (see Carrying Capacity, Oh Deer!, How Many Bears?, etc.) and in turn builds support for the inaccurate premise that fluctuations in natural systems are continually producing so many animals that they must be “harvested” to protect all the animals from starvation and the habitat from total destruction. In addition, the game implies that the only expendable or alterable elements within a habitat are the animals, which are not included as part of the “lap sit” circle. This implication creates a pro–killing response to the simplistic situation portrayed in the last paragraph of the Evaluation section which asks students to determine which of two events would have a greater impact on the wildlife living on a farm: (1) killing all the deer (which would not impact the “lap sit” circle); or (2) cutting down the forest and plowing under the land (which would destroy shelter and food, consequently collapsing the circle). This activity needs to be changed to provide an accurate picture of the complex nature of ecosystems and their ability to adjust to changed conditions.

**HERE TODAY, GONE TOMORROW**

This activity fails to mention commercial and recreational hunting and/or trapping as factors that have contributed to and/or caused the extinction or near extinction of animals such as the great auk, Labrador duck, bison, passenger pigeon, and most species of whales. This should be corrected. In addition, the rationale for 4 under the Extensions section is questionable, particularly with no definition provided for the term “unendangered species.” This term is used by hunting groups to differentiate game animals from those animals whose numbers are fully protected by law in order to imply that it is “acceptable” to kill animals like deer and turkey for fun because their populations are healthy. Obviously, this term is potentially “loaded” and, if it is to remain in the guides, must be balanced with substantial material questioning the killing of animals for sport. Perhaps, since the “unendangered species” concept is such a minor part of this exercise, the term should just be deleted.

**HISTORY OF WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT**

This activity fails to address the ethics of traditional and contemporary wildlife management which is designed to “conserve, limit, enhance, or extend [the] values” of wildlife for human use (i.e., the management of “game” species and manipulation of habitat to increase the number of animals available for hunters and trappers to “harvest”). It also fails to discuss the alternative management philosophy of “humane stewardship,” in which animals and their habitats are managed or protected for their own sake and manipulation is limited to those cases where it is demonstrably beneficial to the animals.

The Background section of the activity overstates the responsibilities of state fish and wildlife agencies by ignoring the role of the federal government in protecting and/or managing major portions of our nation’s wildlife (e.g., wildlife on public lands, migratory birds, marine mammals, endangered species, etc.). Finally, it is inaccurate to imply that limiting hunting permits will reduce the population in an area.

The second segment of the Extensions section fails to list major criticisms of traditional and contemporary wildlife management among the
groups to contact for contrasting points of view on the philosophies and practices of wildlife management agencies. All these inaccuracies and failures in this section should be corrected or the section should be eliminated.

**HOW MANY BEARS CAN LIVE IN THIS FOREST?**

This activity, like *Carrying Capacity, Oh Deer!, Habitat Lap Sit*, and others, attempts to establish credibility for the erroneous idea that all habitats continually produce so many animals that they must be “harvested” or face starvation and destruction of their habitat. The emphasis is on starvation as the only natural limiting factor for all wildlife populations, with no mention of other natural factors such as juvenile mortality; predation; death from disease, injury, accidents, or severe weather; or territorial, behavioral, and reproductive needs/adjustments. The bears’ habitat in the activity is inaccurately portrayed as a system where the bears have continued to expand in number in spite of limited food. This type of situation is particularly unlikely in large, territorial predators like bears. Indeed, territoriality in bears is such that they are unlikely to starve as portrayed in the exercise; it is far more likely that population pressures would make them move elsewhere. Most large predators, including bears, are limited not by starvation, but by human disturbance, their need for large areas of relatively undeveloped land, and their own reproductive characteristics and feedback mechanisms. As a matter of theory, it is possible that bears forced to move elsewhere could starve, but the likelihood of such an occurrence is currently so remote (because of low bear numbers) as to make the exercise inaccurate in what it teaches children. These inaccuracies should be explained or this activity should be eliminated.

**THE HUNTERS**

Although this activity is supposedly designed to allow children (and their teachers) to come to their own conclusions about the appropriateness of hunting, the Background section is almost entirely devoted to building support for hunting, beginning with the inaccurate statement that “hunting has become recognized as a critically important tool for use in managing wildlife populations” (see p. 4). Those who are opposed to sport hunting receive one sentence of acknowledgment, and no supporting arguments for this point of view are expressed. No data are provided to indicate the proportion of the American public that support recreational hunting, and in fact the disproportionate attention given to providing rationale for hunting inaccurately suggests that a large majority of the population hunts. This needs to be corrected by, *inter alia*, explaining that no more than 8% of the American public hunts, and that major segments of the public oppose sport hunting.

Although “recreation” is mentioned as a reason for hunting, no mention is made of trophy hunting. Recreational hunters are further qualified by the statement “many of these hunters hunt for food,” and the primary justification for hunting is clearly and inaccurately identified as “the need for maintaining wildlife populations at levels within the carrying capacity of the land.” This deceptive summary of the American hunter’s motivations for hunting is not only inaccurate, it is obviously constructed to highlight those reasons for hunting which are most acceptable to the public (food and management) and to avoid or underplay those which the public does not support (recreation and trophy). This is particularly objectionable in light of the fact that virtually all hunting done in the United States is done primarily for sport or recreation. These facts need to be explained and discussed.

Segment 1 under the Extensions section needs to be extended to address the appropriateness of the current system of funding wildlife programs. Currently, license fees and other taxes on hunters, shooters, and trappers provide a large proportion of the funds available for many state wildlife management programs. This section alludes to that fact. However, the section fails to discuss the fact that this system makes sport hunters and trappers the predominant influence on wildlife management policies in North America. Indeed, this influence of hunters—not any purported need to prevent starvation in wildlife populations—is a fundamental reason why hunting is so widely accepted and encouraged by governmental wildlife agencies. The effect of this funding structure on wildlife management, and the fact that it excludes most of the public from participating in decisions about wildlife, should be explored here. (See *Who Pays For What?* for further suggestions on this topic.)

“The Twins,” which appears in both the elementary and secondary manuals, and “The Hunter,” which appears in the secondary guide, are highly romanticized stories about the symbolism and mysticism attached to hunting. The young boy in “The Twins” kills the deer as his coming-of-age experience, and the native American in “The Hunter” is more concerned with the religious ritual than with the reality of killing an animal. Neither story provides a realistic picture of a typical hunting experience in modern-day America, and although the young boy in “The Twins” demonstrates a mixed emotional response to his first hunting experience, neither of the characters addresses the issue of killing animals on ethical grounds. From an educational perspective, the romanticized stories “stack the deck” in favor of hunting and fail to provide the clear values conflict that is necessary for a meaningful exercise in moral reasoning or values clarification. Moreover, sport hunting is not portrayed...
(and consequently not presented for ethical discussion) in either exercise, although it is clearly the most common type of hunting in North America. These inadequacies should be corrected, and additional stories or wholly new lessons should be added to accurately illustrate sport hunting and to illustrate—in a positive light—individuals with objections to sport and trophy hunting.

**IMPROVING WILDLIFE HABITAT IN THE COMMUNITY**

An additional resource for this activity would be the National Institute for Urban Wildlife Research, 10921 Trotting Ridge Way, Columbia, Maryland 21044.

**INTERVIEW A SPIDER**

The caution against anthropomorphism in the Background section of this activity incorrectly suggests that animals never experience feelings or emotions similar to those felt by humans. Most animal behaviorists agree that other animals can experience fear, stress, sadness, and other emotions, and that they often react to these emotions with the same or similar physiological responses as those of humans. These facts should be adequately explained.

**KNOW YOUR LEGISLATION: WHAT'S IN IT FOR WILDLIFE?**

Step 2 in the Procedure section of the activity fails to include local animal-welfare groups in the listing of possible resource agencies for information on legislation, in spite of the fact that these organizations are often directly involved with state legislation and local ordinances that affect wildlife. This failure should be corrected.

**LITTER WE KNOW**

Animal-welfare agencies are not listed among the sources of information on animal-related problems resulting from litter, in spite of the fact that local shelters each year handle thousands of cases involving wild and domestic animals that have been injured by litter. Animal-welfare agencies should be listed.

**LOBSTER IN YOUR LUNCH BOX**

A logical addition to the Extensions section of this activity would be to explore the systems under which food animals are raised and the effects of these systems on the animals and the environment (e.g., the need to use large amounts of land to produce grain or fodder for livestock, intensive modern livestock confinement systems that require excessive energy use, competition between wildlife and livestock on rangelands, etc.).

**MAKE A COAT!**

By focusing only on the distinction between renewable versus nonrenewable “resources” as the source of clothing, this activity fails to differentiate between animals and plants, thereby ignoring the sentience of animals, their evolutionary and biological kinship with humans, and the moral/ethical relevance that much of our society attaches to them. In addition, although the teacher Background section mentions that some “people raise ethical questions as to the appropriateness of [animals'] use for products such as clothing, or food,” the question of ethics is not brought up in the actual activity. The lesson also fails to address how animal skins are obtained, instead asking students simply to express their feelings about “the use of wild animals or ranch-raised animals to make fur coats” without the benefit of background information or resources on these highly controversial topics. Step 4 under the Procedure section ignores the possibility that the students’ motivation for choosing certain materials for their coats might include concern for the suffering of individual animals or general wildlife preservation. The Evaluation suggestion for Grades 2–6 again ignores the distinction between plants and animals, and the suggestion for Grades 4–6 fails to ask why some people choose not to wear or buy fur, focusing instead on those who do use these products. These inadequacies should be corrected. One way to correct the lack of plant/animal distinctions would be to divide the “renewable” group into plants and animals, then divide the “animals” group into those products that require the killing of animals versus those that do not. This would have the additional advantage of raising the ethical questions about the use of animals for food, clothing, and fur that the lesson now avoids. It could also be used to raise the question of the impact of clothing choices on animals as well as the environment. (See also the discussion of What You Wear Is What They Were.)
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NOISY NEIGHBORS

Secondary, p. 137

This activity's list of examples of sources of noise pollution that can
affect wildlife fails to include hunters, in spite of the fact that the
presence of hunters in wilderness areas can be at least as noisy as
backpackers, and their “sport” in most cases involves the sound of gun
blasts, not to mention the killing of wildlife.

OH DEER!

Elementary, p. 131

Secondary, p. 107

Unlike several of the other activities dealing with wildlife population
dynamics, Oh Deer! does acknowledge, in the Background section, that
there are a variety of natural and human–caused factors that limit the
growth of wildlife populations. However, the activity itself fails to incor­
porate these and suggests instead that, if left alone, the population of
deer will continue to grow until it destroys its habitat and then will
starve and crash dramatically. Although deer are somewhat more sus­
cceptible to fluctuations in population size than other K-selected species,
a number of natural factors influence their reproduction and survival
grates and generally prevent the kind of continual dramatic ups and
downs represented in the Oh Deer! game (e.g., deer populations near
carrying capacity simply do not double in size in one year just because
they have “good habitat”). In addition, the oversimplification in the
game, reinforced by the hare–lynx example in the Extensions section,
suggests that without human intervention all wildlife populations ex­
perience regular, dramatic explosions and equally dramatic crashes, in­
stead of more accurately depicting the normal relationships within ani-
mal/plant communities as dynamic equilibria, where a variety of factors
interact to prevent catastrophic change. This activity should be exten­
sively changed to reflect these facts.

In addition, the tables in the Extensions activity are inaccurate in
that they suggest a one-to-one relationship between the number of lynx
and the number of snowshoe hares. Moreover, while the example as
written is otherwise accurate, the lynx–hare oscillations are not typical
of most wildlife populations, only of some species in extreme habitats—a
fact which should be noted. On the other hand, the lynx–hare example
should be used to indicate that manipulative management by man is not
desirable as a tool to prevent dramatic population changes and/or habi­
tat destruction for lynx and hare. Here the lynx and hare populations
and the habitat have adapted quite well to what must be considered as
“normal” and “natural” population fluctuations. This activity should be
changed so as to make this additional point.

PHILOSOPHICAL DIFFERENCES

Secondary, p. 39

First, by referencing only “resource managers” and “private con­
servation groups” as sources to assist in the identification of a con­
troversial issue, the Procedure section of this activity sets up the poten­
tial for biasing the lesson through selection of an issue more palatable to
these groups.

Secondly, step 4 in the Extensions and Variations section establishes
acceptance by the “scientific community” as the only criterion by which
a point of view should be judged. No validity is given to ethical considera­
tions, a situation which should be corrected. Moreover, students should
understand that the public positions of scientists and administrators
alike are often based on who pays their salaries and on their own ethical
or philosophical value structures, as much as on scientific fact. An im­
portant point to note in this discussion is that salaries of most state fish
and wildlife agency personnel come indirectly from the sales of hunting
licenses.

Finally, the example of the California condor controversy is a poor
choice for use in the Evaluation section of this activity. This issue is
highly complex even for adults, and the differences in opinion are divided
along very fine lines. If the activity is truly supposed to engender discus­
sion and thought about philosophical differences on controversial topics,
issues such as sport hunting and/or trapping are more appropriate
choices, and resource organizations should be listed that represent clearly
different and/or contrasting points of view (i.e., state fish and wildlife
agencies, the National Wildlife Federation, Fund for Animals, National
Rifle Association, The Humane Society of the United States, Audubon
Society, Defenders of Wildlife, Friends of Animals, etc.).
PLANTING ANIMALS

The Background section in this activity needs a note stating that the practice of “providing people with a new population of game animals” is highly controversial. In addition, the activity fails to distinguish between the reintroduction of native species and the introduction of nonnative animals, nor does it specifically mention the severe environmental impacts that can result from the introduction of the latter, though some negative impacts are listed for introductions in general. Finally, the reference to Isle Royale in Michigan is incorrect. Wolves reappeared on the island on their own; they were not reintroduced by humans. These inadequacies should be corrected and necessary changes should be made.

POLAR BEARS IN PHOENIX?

Although the activity does address the importance of—and difficulty in providing—natural habitat for wild animals in zoos, no mention is made of the problems and ethics associated with capture and transport of animals for display in zoos. These omissions should be corrected.

PRO AND CON: CONSUMPTIVE AND NON-CONSUMPTIVE USES OF WILDLIFE

First, the definition of non-consumptive user excludes a host of non-consumptive users who care deeply about wildlife but are not actively involved in wildlife-related activities (i.e., “bird watching,” “hiking,” etc.), except in casual observation, television viewing, or vicarious enjoyment. This definition should be changed and this larger understanding of the non-consumptive user should be a major focus of this exercise.

Secondly, the premise for the debate, as stated in step 2 of the Procedure section, does not contrast the two kinds of uses described in the activity. To win the debate, students have to prove that both consumptive and non-consumptive uses of wildlife are acceptable, or that neither is. The debate should allow for more options by including a premise reading, “Wildlife should only be used for non-consumptive purposes,” and by having at least one other debate featuring the distinction between recreational or trophy killing and subsistence killing (i.e., that which is necessary for human survival).

Finally, animal-welfare groups should be included among the listing of interested organizations and individuals in the Extensions and Variations section.

QUICK FROZEN CRITTERS

The Background section of this activity provides one of the key examples of a common but inaccurate Project WILD theme: that natural limiting factors are “bad” for wildlife populations, and that the presence of these factors always results in catastrophic change that “drastically affects the well-being” of the animals, causing whole populations to die from starvation, disease, etc. This misconception sets the stage for the pro-hunting, pro-wildlife management argument that human-imposed limiting factors (such as hunting or trapping) are preferable or “more humane” than the “harsh” world of nature. In reality, natural limiting factors are always at play in wildlife populations, killing the weak, old, or sick; preventing others from being born; causing others to move to new areas; and thereby preventing, except in rare instances, overpopulation and mass death through disease or starvation. Natural limiting factors therefore do not always result in death, contrary to the examples provided in the activity. Many animals, particularly predators, exhibit behavioral and physiological mechanisms that prevent them from reproducing beyond the carrying capacity of their habitat. For example, in wolf packs with intact social structures, only the dominant male and female will breed. Some scientists believe that even deer, when not artificially stimulated by habitat manipulation or hunting seasons that kill large parts of their populations, will also self-regulate, among other ways, by producing a greater percentage of male offspring. Human-imposed limiting factors, such as hunting, tend to kill the largest and healthiest animals, weakening the genetic health of the species while at the same time stimulating future population growth by preventing the conditions that trigger natural reproductive limiting factors. The lesson should be thoroughly revised to reflect the above material.

In addition to the above, the game described in the Procedure section of the activity provides an incomplete picture of predators in that it fails to discuss or allow for the fact that most predators have more than one source of food (e.g., other forms of prey, carrion, etc.). The game should be revised accordingly.

RARE BIRD EGGS FOR SALE
SATURDAY MORNING WILDLIFE WATCHING

The discussion of anthropomorphism provided in the Background section of this activity fails to mention that humans and other animals do have many similarities, and that therefore not all human-like behavior is inappropriate to ascribe to animals (see Animal Poetry and Interview A Spider). This point should also be brought out with students by revising the Procedure section.

SHRINKING HABITAT

Although this activity does an excellent job of demonstrating the impact of development for homes and cities on wildlife and its habitat, it overlooks the real and potential land-use problems associated with agriculture and livestock grazing, such as pesticide/herbicide applications, predator control, soil erosion, stream siltation, and overgrazing (leading to reduced grassland productivity and desertification). These omissions should be corrected.

SMOKEY THE BEAR SAID WHAT?

This activity gives only incidental mention of the effects of fire on wildlife. In a wildlife-focused curriculum, more attention should be given to the impact of fire on both individual animals and species.

SURPRISE TERRARIUM

Unlike Grasshopper Gravity, this activity fails to provide discussion of the importance of returning "captured" animals to their natural homes. Such a discussion should be included. Maintaining wildlife in an artificial classroom environment is not only potentially harmful to the animal, it is also inconsistent with the development of respect for the relationship between and importance of individual elements of the environment to the overall health of ecosystems.

TO ZONE OR NOT TO ZONE

Of the fourteen individuals depicted for role playing in this simulation activity, none are identified as animal-welfare activists or animal protectionists. Three of the fourteen, however, are hunters, although in real life no more than 8% of the American public hunts. This disproportionate selection of "concerned citizens" not only suggests that hunting is a more widespread practice than it actually is but also inaccurately implies that hunters are the primary "special interest group" concerned with protection of wildlife and habitat, and that animal-welfare activists or animal protectionists are unconcerned about land-use matters. This activity should be changed to correct these inaccuracies and inadequacies.

TURKEY TROUBLE

Although the Background section of this activity acknowledges that "population is limited by many factors," the activity does not take these into account, and in fact begins with assumptions that dismiss some of the factors. Presumably this is done so that students may recognize the error in the incorrect assumption when answering the question posed in Step 2 of Task 5 in the Procedure section. However, insufficient background is provided to assure a realistic discussion of natural population controls, nor is an answer guide even provided for the teacher! The background information should make clear that growth of bird populations is affected not only by food and cover availability, disease and weather, but also by broken or infertile eggs, other eggs that fail to hatch, predators that prey on the eggs or young chicks, etc. In addition, the example provided in the Evaluation section should ask students to list the natural limiting factors that would restrict the growth of the rabbit population. These inadequacies should be corrected.

WHAT DID YOUR LUNCH COST WILDLIFE?

As in What You Wear Is What They Were and Make A Coat! this activity fails to make a distinction between plants and animals, this time as sources of human food. The plant/animal distinction is particularly germane to a discussion of the environmental impact of human food choices given that (1) increasingly large numbers of food animals are being raised in energy-intensive confinement systems which in turn generate a substantially higher use of hormones, drugs, and other food additives, as well as greater animal suffering; and (2) a meat-based diet that requires huge quantities of plant protein to be grown in order to be converted to relatively small amounts of animal protein constitutes a major land-use problem. Additions to this exercise should be made which emphasize the foregoing points.
WHAT YOU WEAR IS WHAT THEY WERE  Secondary, p. 147

As in Make A Coat! this activity makes no distinction between plants and animals, thereby ignoring the sentience of animals, their evolutionary and biological kinship with humans, and the moral/ethical relevance that much of our society attaches to them. A classification exercise that stops with and focuses on the ethics of choosing between products derived from renewable versus nonrenewable sources avoids the other serious ethical question of whether or not it is appropriate to kill animals for use in human clothing. The one reference to the ethics of using animals that appears in the Background section of the activity acknowledges concern only when endangered animals are involved but fails to point out that many people raise questions about whether it is appropriate to use any animals for food or clothing. Moreover, a distinction should be made between killing wild animals and domestic animals for human clothing, and the question of how wild and other animal skins are obtained should be addressed. The activity should be revised to explore all of these questions.

Furthermore, classification of the “renewable” group into plants and animals, and subdivision of the “animals” group into products that require killing of the animals versus those that do not, would expand the activity so that it still meets the stated objective but at the same time raises additional important, relevant ethical questions. Expansion of the activity in this manner would also demonstrate that it is possible for an individual to be concerned with both environmental preservation and the rights and well-being of individual animals. Questions also need to be raised in step 4 of the Procedure section to elucidate the impact of clothing choices on animals as well as the environment, and the second segment of the Evaluation section should reflect all the ethical questions relevant to clothing choices.

WHAT'S FOR DINNER?  Elementary, p. 49  Secondary, p. 63

Although the Background section of this activity acknowledges that some people choose not to eat meat, the first segment of the Evaluation section indirectly encourages children to construct food chains in which people eat animals, for otherwise the food chains have only two components. By eliminating the phrase “starting with people” and adding one or more wild predators to the list, the activity would provide children with the option of making food chains with three or four components without portraying people eating animals, unless the child chooses to do so. This would reinforce the stated objective by demonstrating that all animals, even predators, ultimately depend on plants for food. We recommend that this change be made.

WHAT'S WILD?  Secondary, p. 149

A logical and important extension of this activity—and one that would address a key wildlife issue not covered by other activities—would be to discuss the problems associated with keeping wild animals as pets. The keeping of wild or exotic pets is inconsistent with respect for natural ecosystems, usually cruel to the animal involved, sometimes detrimental to whole populations or species of animals, and potentially dangerous to humans. These important points should be made.

WHEN A WHALE IS A RIGHT  Secondary, p. 149

This activity fails to raise any questions concerning the ethics of killing whales—or any animals—focusing instead on the need to curtail hunting of whales in order to preserve “stocks” of the various species. This ethical question has achieved the status of a major controversy in American society in the last decade, and its omission makes this activity remarkably out of date. In addition, the activity fails to refer to the wide variety of resource agencies that produce information on the whale issue, including animal–welfare organizations and conservation groups. This activity should be rewritten to include these points.

The second question in the Evaluation section asks why whale populations have declined while other animal populations which are “harvested” are not declining. Presumably, the desired answer is that the other populations are “managed” to prevent population declines, even though “harvesting” is allowed. If this implication is retained, there must be a complete discussion of the ethics of commercial whaling, sport killing, etc.

WHO LIVES HERE?  Elementary, p. 139  Secondary, p. 17

The Background section of this activity lacks discussion of why humans have introduced nonnative wildlife into new areas, e.g., to have new species of animals to hunt, through accidental release, as pest control, etc., and the ethics of these actions.

WHO PAYS FOR WHAT?  Secondary, p. 191

This activity needs to be expanded to explore the adequacy of the current funding structure for wildlife programs, which has, in many ways, disenfranchised most of the American public with regard to establishing wildlife management policies and goals. Because state fish and wildlife agencies are funded primarily by hunters and trappers, the policies of these agencies are frequently aimed at satisfying the desires of
this group, who represent a small part of the public interested in wildlife. There are understandable historical reasons for this situation, but changing social values towards wildlife, plus a greater interest on the part of non–hunters and non–trappers, have made this system wholly inadequate. Indeed, as the system currently exists, it is virtually impossible for the non–consumptive user to affect wildlife policy, particularly for hunted species.

This system has begun to open up a little to non–consumptive users with the advent of nongame programs, but consumptive philosophies prevail in government wildlife agencies, and non–consumptive users continue to be regarded as having no right to have a voice in decisions on hunted animals. Given the fact that all wildlife legally belongs to all the people, not just hunters and trappers, these anomalies in the funding structure, and their impact on wildlife policy, should be included in the discussion. As a further point, general tax revenues should be included under 1 in the Procedure section as a source of funding; this is the major mechanism of financing wildlife activity at the federal level.

In addition, the listings of resource agencies in the Procedure and Evaluation sections includes a disproportionate number of groups that support hunting and consumptive uses of animals; these sections should be changed to include organizations with differing viewpoints.

WILD BILL’S FATE

Secondary, p. 143

Step 1 under the Procedure section fails to include animal–welfare groups under the list of resource agencies to be contacted for information on wildlife–related legislation, even though these groups represent a major source of wildlife legislation at both the state and national levels. This section should be changed to include these groups.

WILDLIFE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Secondary, p. 145

This activity lacks discussion of: (1) the nonutilitarian values that aboriginal people placed on wildlife (i.e., as an important source for their art and religions); and (2) the growth in modern times of an appreciation of wildlife for its own sake. Aboriginal views can be illuminated by examining the attitudes of pre–contact Amerind and Eskimo subsistence cultures towards animals. The changing perspectives in the modern political and social view of wildlife can be demonstrated by comparing the focus of early laws and conflicts concerning wildlife, which generally focused on who had the right to use or “harvest” the animals, to those that exist today, which focus more on whether wild animals should be used or killed at all.
APPENDIX I

JOINT POSITION STATEMENT ON ‘PROJECT WILD’

approved by

The American Humane Association
The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
Animal Protection Institute
Fund For Animals
The Humane Society of the United States
International Fund for Animal Welfare
Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals

November 2, 1984

Although many of the activities contained in the Project WILD teaching guides are designed to create an understanding of and appreciation for wildlife, the materials’ explicit acceptance of animals as resources for human use and the acceptance and support of sport hunting and commercial or recreational trapping as necessary or desirable tools for controlling or manipulating animal populations represent strong biases which permeate much of the document and destroy its credibility as objective educational material. These biases are evidenced throughout the materials by the:

1. portrayal of wildlife as a resource for consumptive use by humans and a corresponding failure to discuss the desirability, as a matter of ethics, of providing responsible stewardship for, and limiting human-caused suffering to, wild animals to the maximum extent possible;

2. failure to address recreation and sport as the primary motivation for hunting in North America; providing instead the totally inaccurate implications that all hunting is done for necessary management or cultural/subsistence purposes, i.e., for the good of the animals or needy people;

3. failure to provide balanced discussion of the ethical concerns of those opposed to the killing of animals for sport or recreational purposes, implying instead that the only ethical questions associated with sport hunting involve whether one should obey kill limits and other hunting regulations;

4. oversimplification and misrepresentation of relationships between animals and their habitats to suggest that animals, if not “harvested” by humans, will overpopulate, destroy their habitats, and starve; and a corresponding failure to explain the dynamics of animal populations in relation to the continued health and viability of biotic communities;

5. lack of representation for animal-welfare groups in listings of possible resource agencies and for animal-welfare concerns in background for debates, suggested dilemmas, sample stories, and other activities supposedly designed to foster critical thinking on controversial issues.

Because of the strong biases reflected in the Project WILD materials and the lack of balancing which should be provided by alternate viewpoints and representative data, we oppose the use of public funds for the future purchase, distribution, and/or promotion and use of Project WILD materials without the addition of substantial acceptable balancing material. In those States and Provinces where the materials have already been purchased and distributed, we believe the States and Provinces accepting this material should promptly distribute acceptable balancing material and have it used by those teachers who are using the Project WILD guides. We also believe that animal-welfare organizations must be included on State and Provincial steering committees and as resource people at workshops designed to introduce the materials to teachers. In the unfortunate event that a State or Province refuses to use necessary balancing material, we believe that the Project WILD material should not be used in the interests of the integrity of the educational process.

Finally, we wish to reiterate that we do not oppose the use of balanced objective materials which would, by definition, provide fair, accurate treatment of contrasting points of view.
APPENDIX II

CURRENT STATUS OF PROJECT WILD IN EACH OF THE FIFTY STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

I. States currently stating that they will not participate:
   - Michigan (some indication of interest in participation in 1987)
   - Missouri
   - Rhode Island

II. States not yet participating, but targeted to do so (prospective date, if known):
   - Alabama
   - Connecticut (Fall 1985)
   - District of Columbia
   - Indiana
   - Iowa
   - Kansas
   - Louisiana
   - Maine (1986)
   - Maryland
   - Mississippi
   - North Dakota
   - South Dakota
   - Vermont (1985)
   - West Virginia (1985)

III. States planning to buy guides, but purchase currently on hold because of concerns expressed:
   - New Hampshire

IV. States having purchased, but not yet distributed, guides (distribution date indicated):
   - Texas (Summer 1985)

V. States having purchased guides, with distribution in progress; teacher training in progress (check locally to determine if additional funding is being sought in your state as it is, for example, in California and Nevada):
   - Alaska
   - Arizona
   - Arkansas
   - California (currently seeking additional funds in state legislature)
   - Colorado
   - Delaware
   - Florida
   - Georgia
   - Hawaii
   - Idaho
   - Illinois
   - Kentucky
   - Massachusetts
   - Minnesota
   - Montana
   - Nebraska (beginning May 1985)
   - Nevada (currently seeking additional funds in state legislature)
   - New Jersey
   - New Mexico
   - New York
   - North Carolina
   - Ohio
   - Oklahoma
   - Oregon
   - Pennsylvania
   - South Carolina
   - Tennessee
   - Utah
   - Virginia
   - Washington
   - Wisconsin (beginning April 1985)
   - Wyoming