Shackling and Hoisting Must End!

Jewish leaders urged to endorse new equipment

For several years, The Humane Society of the United States has been working in concert with the Council for Livestock Protection to develop an alternative system to shackling and hoisting conscious small animals, a practice still in existence throughout the United States in plants performing ritual (kosher) slaughter. The article by Dr. Temple Grandin in the last issue of the HSUS News ("Improving Kosher Slaughter," Spring 1989) describes our success in developing such a system, which is now being utilized in a slaughtering plant in New York State.

This success means that it is no longer necessary to shackle or hoist either large or small animals while conscious in order to convey them to the point of actual slaughter. This also means that continuing to shackle and hoist conscious animals prior to slaughter can no longer be defended or excused on the basis that no alternative systems exist. Finally, this means that the cruel practice of shackling and hoisting conscious animals, whether large or small, can now—indeed, must now—come to an end!

Through the Council for Livestock Protection, The HSUS and a few other groups and individuals have worked unceasingly to develop the alternative system described by Dr. Grandin in order to help end this practice. We have invested tens of thousands of dollars and thousands of hours in bringing this task to fruition, and we have done so with virtually no assistance whatsoever from any organized segment of the Jewish community, religious or otherwise.

The HSUS now calls upon the various Jewish leaders with whom we and the Council for Livestock Protection have been holding a dialogue during the past several months to endorse this system formally and publicly and to encourage its use in all plants currently performing ritual slaughter. We invite leaders of the Moslem community, likewise, to endorse this system and support and encourage its use.

It will, of course, take time for the various plants currently performing ritual slaughter to install and utilize this equipment. But it need only take a matter of weeks for representatives of the Jewish community to endorse enthusiastically this alternative and repudiate the practice of continuing to shackle and hoist conscious animals.

I am most hopeful that the response we are calling for will be forthcoming within a short time, for I am confident that those Jewish leaders with whom we have been in contact during the past several months share both our concern and desire to end this practice.
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**FUR: GOING. . . GOING. . .**

"Fur is going!" said John Grandy, HSUS vice president for wildlife and environment, at a Las Vegas, Nev., press conference in April. The event, organized by local activists with the help of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), The HSUS, and Transpecies, kicked off a protest at the Convention Center, where the International Fur Fair was held. Among the protesters were PETA guests actresses Rue McClanahan and Cassandra Peterson ("Elvira") and music stars Belinda Carlisle and Jane Wiedlin.

The Las Vegas press conference was the most recent in a long list of events that have comprised the HSUS' "Shame of Fur" campaign. Begun in the fall of 1988, "The Shame of Fur" is yielding measurable results: fur ranches have closed down because of a drastic drop in demand for skins; publicly traded fur companies have posted much diminished profits; and, according to trapping magazines, trapping of wild fur animals decreased by 75 to 90 percent in many areas in just one season. Up to fifteen million wild fur-bearers were spared in the 1988-89 season alone.

"Fur is out," claimed USA Today. Prominent fashion designers have stopped designing furs. Celebrities such as Brooke Shields and Candice Bergen have said "no" to fur. This fall, we will throw our efforts into a major follow-up strike for the "Shame of Fur" campaign. We welcome the participation of local organizations and individuals in these activities; write Pat Ragan at The HSUS for details.

**AVON CALLS IT QUITS ON DRAIZE**

Avon Products, Inc., has completely discontinued the use of the Draize Eye-Irritancy Test, in which chemicals are placed in the eyes of anesthetized rabbits. On April 5, Avon announced that it would assess eye irritancy through the use of the Eyetex Test, which does not utilize rabbits or other animals. Although other cosmetics companies also have stopped using the Draize Test, Avon’s high profile in the cosmetics market is seen as having the potential to influence other companies to follow its lead.

On March 2, Avon had announced that it expected to have eliminated all animal testing by June of this year. If Avon fulfills this expectation, we will add its name to the list of cosmetics and personal-care products companies that never have conducted—or no longer conduct—animal testing in the manufacture of their products.

**SPEAKING OUT**

The HSUS is pleased to announce that Candice Bergen will be our special spokeswoman on several important issues in animal protection. Star of "Murphy Brown," the hottest new show on television, Ms. Bergen will be a visible presence in our anti-fur campaign, our boycott of ivory products to save endangered African elephants, and the protection of chimpanzees. She has already taped public-service announcements for the HSUS on these topics, for airing this summer on radio stations across the country.

"I've always made donations to the Humane Society ever since I can remember," says Ms. Bergen. "I think that the work the Humane Society does is tremendous, vital work. I like that the Humane Society has a very broad reach. I think it is a very responsible organization."

The plight of the elephant is one close to her heart. "I've been to Africa many times and finally stopped going there because it was too depressing. What was happening there was unbearable to me. I have great respect and appreciation for elephants. I think that what they are suffering at the hands of poachers is just devastating."

Ms. Bergen's opposition to the wearing of fur is longstanding. "I haven't worn fur since I was twenty-one, when I gave away a mink coat I had. I love animals—I consider them equals, and I just want to live easily with myself. I don't want to participate in activities that sanction cruelty." She has incorporated her beliefs into her work, as well. "I don't ever wear fur in fashion layouts—I always refuse," she explains. "The only time I've worn a fur coat was when I was playing a dim-witted, very self-centered character in a film. I'll wear fur to make a statement if it's for a character that is clearly self-absorbed, self-centered, and unenlightened."

Future issues of the HSUS News will carry more details of Ms. Bergen’s association with the society. We welcome her active participation in our program.
A WELCOME AWARD

This spring, The National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education’s *Children & Animals* magazine was honored by The Educational Press Association of America (EDPRESS) as its 1989 Most Improved Educational Publication for Adults. *Children & Animals* editor Paul Dewey accepted the prestigious award at the EDPRESS awards ceremony, held May 18 at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C.

"I really feel this award belongs to the entire NAAHE staff. Our publications are a team effort," said Mr. Dewey. EDPRESS, organized in 1895, is an independent association of some seven hundred education periodicals and those individuals directly responsible for them. Its annual competition recognizes significant achievements in a number of publication categories.

NAAHE’s publications have been acclaimed by the educational and humane communities over the years, but great strides in their development have been made since the arrival of Mr. Dewey as editor of *Children & Animals* and *Kind News* in 1987. "Paul’s editorial skill and years of teaching experience have enabled him to make the articles, worksheets, and learning activities in both publications more relevant and useful in the classroom than ever before," said NAAHE Director Patty Finch.

“We feel very fortunate to have Paul at the helm of *Children & Animals* and *Kind News* in this time of unprecedented growth for both of them.”

If you would like more information on how to bring NAAHE publications into classrooms in your area, write NAAHE, Adopt-A-Teacher Program, P.O. Box 362, East Haddam, CT 06423.

---

Reflect for a moment...

**how can I help animals even when I no longer share their world...?**

By your bequest for animal protection to The Humane Society of the United States.

Your will can provide for animals after you're gone.

Naming The HSUS demonstrates your lasting commitment to animal welfare and strengthens the Society for this task.

We will be happy to send information about our animal programs and material which will assist in planning a will.

Please send: Will information

Name ________________________
Address _______________________
City _______________ State ___ Zip ____________

Mail in confidence to: Murdaugh S. Madden, Vice President/General Counsel, The Humane Society of the United States, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.
WILDLIFE AND ENVIRONMENT

The Alaska Oil Spill
A close-up view of a disaster

Alaska, in many ways, is the most beautiful place on earth. Take Valdez, for example — where glaciers run like rivers nearly across roads, meadows rise on seemingly vertical mountain-sides above the town, and people watch a mother black bear raise two cubs. On the roads to Valdez, you dodge moose and caribou, among other animals, never far from the oil pipeline paralleling the road.

What a contrast is this splendor with the death and destruction in the ramshackle Fish and Wildlife Service refrigerated trailer in Valdez, where dead oiled birds are being warehoused since the Exxon oil tanker disaster of late March. Thousands of birds, including bald eagles and pigeon guillemots, and mammals, such as sea otters, are all oiled beyond recognition. Also in town, hidden among the smaller, nondescript buildings, are the newly opened federal offices of the National Marine Fisheries Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the United States Forest Service. There is an Otter Rescue Center and a Wild Bird Rescue Center as well. All exist because of our nation’s worst single environmental disaster, the nightmare of the Exxon Valdez’s 11.1 million gallons of oil spilled in Prince William Sound.

In early May 1989, I visited Alaska on behalf of The HSUS, which has fourteen years of experience in rehabilitating oil-spill victims, to take a first-hand look at the devastation and find out what we could do to help. I thought that I had prepared myself for the destruction that I would see. I was wrong.

When I arrived in Valdez, late in the evening, just at dark, I was struck by the crowded bars and tent cities that housed the workers, people hired by Exxon to help clean up the oil spill and deal with the consequences. The city was simply teeming with life. There was not a room to be had in local hotels and motels. CBS and ABC had taken over much of the communication facilities of the city.

With daylight, my first visit was to the Wild Bird Rescue Center, where a dedicated worker, Bruce Atkins, showed me around. In early May, the spill was shifting from Valdez down to Seward and points beyond. The Wild Bird Center, guarded by an Exxon employee and directed by Alice Berkner, was filled with energy. The walls were papered with letters and cards received from concerned children and other citizens from around the nation with messages such as “keep up the good work,” and “we’re with you.”

The other thing that struck me about this facility was the paucity of sick birds there. When I asked why, the angered and frustrated response was that most of the birds were dead. It was at that point I learned that the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and volunteers had picked up some 6,000 dead birds. (Current estimates are 13,000 dead.) These birds died...
either from being oiled directly or from ingesting oiled food or water; they had succumbed to the cold, the oil, and the inevitability of death.

Alice Berkner normally directs The International Bird Rescue Research Center in Berkeley, California, where she does a truly outstanding job. She was hired by Exxon to direct the oiled-bird portion of the clean-up effort. Tired from working long hours in the stressful Valdez environment, Ms. Berkner was devastated by what she had seen—the tragedy of the destruction and the futility of trying to clean up oiled birds. The small number of birds that had been treated in the center demonstrates the futility of it all. We cannot clean up this tragedy, we cannot save the birds. Every life saved is precious, but the reality is that oil, water, and wildlife produces unmerciful death. At the time of my visit, the Wild Bird Rescue facility had taken in only 403 oiled birds; 124 had been released and 277 had died in spite of the care they received. Some of the birds were common types, some uncommon—the beautiful rhinoceros auklet, Barrow's goldeneye, pelagic and red-faced cormorants, Kittlitzes' murrelet, the marbled murrelet, the old squaw duck, pigeon guillemots, glaucous-winged gulls, and bald eagles. The disaster was total.

I moved on to the Otter Rehabilitation Center, where the situation was much the same and equally distressing. If the Wild Bird Rescue Center could have been characterized as a well-run volunteer effort, the otter center could be described as a high-tech, well-financed operation. The director was Dr. Randy Davis, an otter expert on contract from a branch of Sea World. The otter-rescue operation nearly breathed money. It had computers, tanks, water-warming facilities, and a food production line (for otters) that rivaled many college cafeterias. Dr. Davis announced proudly that Exxon had spent $5 million on the Valdez Otter Rescue Center to date. Only 153 otters had been put through the facility; 80 had died, 20 had been released, and 52 were still on hand (1 was missing). Assuming that all otters still on hand were eventually released, Exxon, at that time, would have spent $5 million to save 70 otters. As one employee told me confidentially, these otters are the only decent public relations that Exxon has gotten out of the whole oil spill. As nearly as I could tell, that was certainly true.

Otters being rehabilitated are the cutest things that you can imagine, second only to wild otters breaking clams and crabs across their stomachs. These animals are beautiful in every respect, and their beauty only increases the tragedy you feel when you see them oiled and put through days of being scrubbed with detergent, blown dry, and fed with a pair of tongs through a wire-mesh cage. As I was leaving the facility, I stood near some otters loaded in the back of a truck. They were being sent to a "half-way" facility before being released. As I stood there, one otter...
reduce our dependence on oil and reduce economic pressure for unwise and unproductive development of Alaska’s resources. Finally, and most practically, we should demand an immediate end to further consideration of oil exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Such development was always a bad idea for precisely the reasons demonstrated by this disaster. There is virtually no way to get that oil out safely. If we don’t develop the oil now, nothing will be lost. The oil is not going anywhere. Between now and the time we need it (if ever that time comes), we can improve technology to the point where we can get it out without environmental destruction.

The message is clear. While we can improve the rescue of oiled animals, there is no way to handle an oil spill like this one. The message was clear in Alice Berkner’s eyes: the tragedy is total. We cannot do enough, no matter how many well-meaning people are involved. There are not enough people in the world to handle that kind of tragedy. The lesson from this is clear: such an oil spill must never happen again.—Dr. John W. Grandy, HSUS vice president for wildlife and the environment.

What can we do? We can demand laws and restrictions with which to prevent this kind of tragedy. We can demand adequate enforcement of regulations and new regulations that are stronger and stricter. These would include double hulls on tankers that transport oil through critical wildlife habitats, such as Prince William Sound. At a more mundane, but very important, level we can demand fuel-saving restrictions in automobiles and on highways. Lower speed limits and higher gas mileage for cars are necessary to reduce our dependence on oil and reduce economic pressure for unwise and unproductive development of Alaska’s resources.

An otter recovering from an injured spine is one of seventy possible survivors of Exxon’s $5 million effort to rehabilitate the wildlife of Prince William Sound.

An otter recovering from an injured spine is one of seventy possible survivors of Exxon’s $5 million effort to rehabilitate the wildlife of Prince William Sound.

What help can we give to that otter or to the birds? The estimated otter population in Prince William Sound, before the oil spill, was 10,000 or more. To date, between 4,000 and 6,000, at least, have died. No one knew what the population of aquatic and shore birds was, but the estimates are that between one hundred thousand to two hundred thousand have died. The stark reminder is in the refrigerated trailer next to the Fish and Wildlife Service’s Valdez offices. You can smell the death fifty yards away. There are deer, ducks, guillemots, murrelets, puffins—birds many of us will never even see—the most beautiful horned and tufted puffins you can imagine. All are blackened beyond life.
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SHARING THE GIFT of SPEECH

BY CAMILLE MOFFITT

I had difficulty seeing, in which this essay of Tennessean, imagine having such limited choices in the cage since he was finally appeared. I learned from the salesman that the dog was hitting below the belt; and probably buy him at the new sale buying the dog would support abhor­ning in the shop window, I no­ticed that inside a cage lay sleeping not a frisky puppy, but a long, lanky, half­grown dog. Against my better judgment, I stepped in.

I had to open or close my eyes. I dared not imagine this frisky puppy, but a long, lanky, half­grown dog. Against my better judgment, I stepped in.

The following day, my three young sons began begging me to go back and buy “Buddy.” They couldn’t understand the adult reasoning that buying the dog would support abhor­rent caretaking, thereby promoting more dogs to being subjected similarly; we already had one “horse” of a dog that lives better than any human I know; someone else would probably buy him at the new sale price; and assigning a name to the dog was hitting below the belt.

Twice that afternoon I secretly tele­phoned the pet store, only to find out that “Buddy” had remained captive. Monday, 9:00 a.m., the Nashville Humane Association informed me that no law exists that governs the length of time a dog can be caged. There is no law that requires any mandatory “free time,” so that the animals could exercise or a regulation regarding the size of the dog vs. the size of the cage.

By 10 a.m., despite adult reasoning, I headed across town to buy Buddy his freedom. There, a sensitive young care­taker informed me, in confidence, that she used to get in trouble for letting the dog out of the cage in the mornings and had to stop when her job became jeopardized. She wept with joy when I told her that I was buying him.

“You’re going home!” she cried. Home he is; Although the pet store is gone from our lives, it is not easily forgotten. I thought of it when Buddy ran smack into the coffee table, unac­customed to maneuvering around objects; I thought of it every time his massive self sat and whined at the top of the stairs, afraid to amble down; I thought of it as he licked his sore leg muscles heretofore rarely used; I thought of it when I had to coax him out onto the unfamiliar turf we call grass; and I thought of it when I watched him put his head under water trying to get a drink from his dog bowl.

No, I will never forget the pet store un­til laws are enacted which protect ani­mals. So a plea to all who care: contact your representative and become the voice for those who lack speech and defense.

Why Buddy Had to Be Rescued

Un­fortunately, we are all too aware of the frustrations de­scribed by Camille Moffitt in her essay. No state has laws governing the length of time an animal may be kept in a pet shop; only a handful have laws we feel are progressive in the standards they set for pet-shop operation. We have found it an uphill battle to pass such pro­ective measures; without them, local humane societies face an almost impos­sible task to protect the Buddys of the world. We suggest, as does Camille Mof­fit, that HSUS members work to enact state and local laws that impose strict re­quirements on pet shops, covering ade­quate cage size and construction and the amount of mandatory exercise, food, water, and veterinary care the animals receive. Failing that, if members come upon a situation like Buddy’s, they should first express concern to shop man­agement and then complain to mall management, if appropriate, or write a letter to the editor of the local paper. Organize friends to call and inquire politely about the con­dition of the animal in the shop and ex­press their concern. Pet industry officials think the general public doesn’t share our standards for pet care—Camille Moffitt proves that they are wrong.

—Ann Church, HSUS state legis­lative coordinator

Camille Moffitt is a free­lance writer and columnist for The Tennessean, Nashville, Tennes­see, in which this essay origi­nally appeared.
In recent years, The HSUS has become increasingly concerned with the practice of captive breeding of animals by zoos. At first glance, it seems that captive breeding would be a productive program, if animals are to be kept in zoos. If animals are going to be kept in zoos, they should not be taken from wild, unacclimated populations but rather from captive, self-sustaining populations. Captive-breeding programs, however, create their own set of problems—unwanted zoo animals and animal auctions that dispose of surplus zoo stock, among them. To evaluate the seriousness of such problems, The HSUS, some time back, began a comprehensive evaluation of captive-breeding programs in roadside zoos, zoological parks, and similar institutions.

First, it should be noted that there is a tremendous difference between professional captive-breeding programs, with a written policy or goal of stipulating eventual release of animals into the wild, and the indiscriminate breeding that occurs at most zoos in the United States. There is, as well, a difference between managed breeding of endangered species and the production of surplus animals, either incidentally or for commercial purposes.

The goal of the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums (AAZPA)'s Species Survival Plan (SSP) for breeding specific species in captivity with the hope of introducing them into the wild, The HSUS believes, is admirable. We believe that such professionally managed captive-breeding programs certainly have a place in modern zoos. However, we feel strongly that the ultimate goal of these programs must always be the release of resulting animals into their natural habitats. We question whether this is truly a goal for most zoos or merely a carefully constructed rationalization that is little more than a public-relations ploy.

It is important to realize that, while the AAZPA's SSPs are designed to be professionally managed breeding programs, there are probably more than 1,000 different animal species in the 139 zoos accredited by the AAZPA—with only about 50 different species involved in these SSP programs. Examples of species involved in SSPs are the golden lion tamarin, snow leopard, white rhino, scimitar-horned oryx, and bali mynah. Of the 50 species, only about 6 (depending on who is counting) have had any individuals released into their native habitats. If you include all the animals maintained and bred in the more than 1,400 menageries, zoos, and zoological parks, the small percentage of animals that are involved in the SSPs is even further diminished. The HSUS does not question the captive-breeding efforts used to save these species. However, we are deeply concerned about the often indiscriminate production of surplus exotics hidden behind the legitimate breeding of endangered species.

Captive breeding is a two-edged sword. A few zoos are doing it right and for the right reasons. Most zoos, however, whether roadside, municipal, or other, use the existence of some captive breeding of endangered or other species in a very misleading way: breeding is used to justify the existence of zoos to a public that is increasingly concerned with the ethics and propriety of maintaining wild animals in captivity. Professionally managed captive-breeding programs do not exist at most zoos. Indeed, the majority of zoos only breed animals because managers fail to control breeding, or to provide income, or so there will be baby animals born each year. The births are often planned as a tourist attraction so that zoo visitors can see young animals in nurseries and being hand-raised by humans.

Young animals that are pulled from their mothers and hand-raised create another major problem. Such animals have no opportunity to learn parenting from their own species and are, therefore, not fit candidates for release programs. Unfortunately, most animals bred in captivity cannot and will never be released into the wild.

Most of the breeding taking place at the approximately 1,400 so-called zoos in the United States is the result of animals simply being housed together. These are unplanned births which offer nothing to conservation of wildlife. After animals grow out of the “cute” stage, they are cast off indiscriminately by large, small, and even accredited AAZPA zoos. These cast offs become candidates for disposal as surplus or for euthanasia.

Frequently, those indiscriminately bred surplus zoo animals end up in horrendous situations. They may change hands at an exotic-animal auction where they endure transport to and from the auction site in
Births for popular species, including the hippopotamus, are often planned by zoos as tourist attractions so that visitors can see baby animals in display cages, such as this one, or in zoo nurseries.
A camel tied to a livestock trailer awaits sale at the exotic-animal auction in Cape Girardeau, Missouri. Zoo castoffs that find their way to such auctions often face grim futures.

cages that are then sold to the highest bidder with no regard to the quality of care they will receive. For instance, it has been estimated that between 50-80 percent of all large animals found in roadside menageries originated in the breeding programs of major zoos. They may be sold to game ranches where they are hunted as trophies. (Surplus lions from a United States zoo recently ended up at a Texas game ranch where hunters paid $3,500 to kill each of these animals and then take them home as trophies.) They may end up in roadside zoos, where they are neglected or abused and maintained in wretched conditions. They also may end up with private individuals who have no experience in keeping exotic animals. Frequently, these animals die or go from one miserable situation to another; from circuses to performing animal acts to shopping-center photo exhibits. Recently, a well-respected major zoo sold orangutans to a pet dealer, who bred some and sold others to a traveling circus. Animals may even end up in research institutions, utilized for experimentation.

Finally, private owners, zoos, or other institutions may offer these unwanted animals to local or national animal-protection groups. Humane societies and SPCAs have neither the monetary resources nor the facilities for exotic animals. These animals are not the responsibility of humane societies, SPCAs, or the concerned public—they are the responsibility of those who own them or those responsible for bringing them into the world. We must demand that those parties provide humane and professional care for surplus exotic animals. It is irresponsible and unfair for entrepreneurs, breeders, or others to try to shift the responsibility for maintaining surplus zoo animals onto charitable organizations, which have many other demands upon their resources.

Even large zoos often claim that the most important benefit derived from keeping animals in captivity is the breeding of endangered, threatened, protected, and diminishing animal species. Zoos proudly claim that they are the "arks" of the future. They mention the reintroduction of Pere David's deer and a few other species as evidence of their role in species preservation. Such successes are not widespread.

Based on the numbers of animals needed to maintain the genetic diversity of a species and the amount of space needed to breed these animals, the potential for success of such "arks" is extremely limited. At least two American zoo directors have admitted that zoos should be honest with the public as to the potential for release of zoo and aquarium specimens back into the wild. At best, relatively few species can ever be rehabilitated through captive breeding.

There are very few places in the United States where successful professional breeding of endangered species can occur. The St. Catherine's Survival Center, the New York Zoological Society's breeding facility on St. Catherine's Island, Georgia, and the National Zoological Park's Conservation and Research Center in Front Royal, Virginia, conduct professional programs, but the amount of space they occupy is substantial and well beyond that which most zoos can offer. Neither of these breeding facilities is open to the general public. In order for animals to develop the natural behaviors leading to successful breeding, the rearing of young, and introduction of individuals in the wild, space and seclusion are mandatory. Space and seclusion are the very elements that most zoos can never hope to provide their animals.

While we recognize that contributions to true conservation can be, and have been, made by the breeding of endangered species at places such as St. Catherine's Survival Center and the Conservation and Research Center, we question the overall feasibility of these programs in most other places. Even if space were not a limiting factor, monetary resources would be, because a successful professional program requires space and money to implement short- and long-term goals. In most cases, the resources spent on captive breeding would be better spent on other, more achievable programs, such as improvement of captive animal care or conservation education.

The truth is that most zoos are commercial ventures and are not concerned with maintaining large breeding areas not open to the general public. They cannot make money from such facilities. Therefore, most zoos are not involved with, or interested in, operating them.
We feel that zoos, which entertain millions of visitors a year, would be better off if they concentrated on high-quality education programs for their visitors. Most zoos spend relatively little, if any, time and money on education, and all menageries miseducate the public. It is evident from our many years of zoo inspections that those menageries and zoos not AAZPA recognized are adding nothing to desirable captive-propagation and release programs or to education. In fact, they miseducate the public about wild animals and the important roles these animals play in their native habitats. By exhibiting their animals in small cramped cages, and, as a consequence, creating psychotic animals that demonstrate stereotypical, stress-related behaviors such as pacing, self-mutilation, and head swinging, these menageries squander the opportunity to educate the public about conservation and wildlife appreciation.

The number of animals that are unnecessarily bred and then disposed of is always hidden from the general public by zoos. The HSUS and other watchdog entities are denied access to the AAZPA's monthly listing of surplus animals, Animal Exchange. However, when The HSUS received a purloined copy of Animal Exchange, we found that, in one month, approximately 1,400 surplus animals were offered for sale from approximately 53 accredited zoos. Assuming a generous placement rate of 50 percent each month, this figure translates into 8,400 surplus animals annually from AAZPA accredited zoos alone.

This figure is only the tip of the iceberg. The surplus animals of many of the best zoos never reach the surplus list because they are already "placed" through individual arrangements among the zoos themselves. If the miscellaneous other zoos are included in this traffic, the number of surplus animals and their suffering is overwhelming.

Because the AAZPA publication limits the number of animals that can be listed to a total of 20 a month (for both surplus and wanted) and because animals are not all placed within a month, a number of animals must wait weeks for placement. What happens to animals that are designated "surplus" while they are waiting to be sold? Often, they are relegated to living behind the scenes. A zoo that has decided that an animal has to be sold will not want to waste an important exhibit cage on it and will, therefore, keep it in a smaller, often poorly maintained, off-exhibit cage. An animal's life in such a grossly abusive cage can drag out indefinitely.

What can be done to clean up captive breeding and to ensure the welfare of zoo animals?

First, there must be open discussion and recognition of the problems caused by captive breeding of wildlife and its surplus of animals. The AAZPA, or a similar institution, should undertake to monitor and coordinate captive breeding of animals in all member institutions. This should be done not just for captive breeding of endangered, threatened, or rare species, but for all species that have been or are becoming problems. The AAZPA should maintain a registry for each species or subspecies and record details of genetic characteristics, studs, and other useful information related to breeding. The AAZPA should tabulate requests for certain animals and facilitate contact between institutions with suitable mates. Production should be limited to that which is necessary to fulfill a legitimate, justifiable need. Member institutions should agree to limit their captive breeding to programs coordinated through and approved by the AAZPA. Such a system would not only ensure an adequate, but limited, supply of animals, but it would also systematically ensure desirable genetic interchange and would virtually eliminate removal of species from the wild. Some elements of this system are already in place for endangered species, but the pressing need is to expand the system in scope and detail for all species involved in captive breeding. Finally, in an effort to increase animal protection and the welfare of animals in zoos, the AAZPA and the better zoos should unite with The HSUS and our counterparts in Canada to demand strict standards for care of animals in zoos and the abolition of roadside menageries so common in the United States.

There is light at the end of the tunnel. The AAZPA and The HSUS are working actively together to find ways to upgrade the requirements for maintaining animals in captivity. If requirements are strengthened, then roadside menageries will either have to improve or close down. We are also working with the Chicago Zoological Park (Brookfield Zoo) and innovative research scientists to find ways to limit reproduction in captive wildlife. This holds great promise for reducing production of surplus animals.

Still, much more needs to be done. Our members can help by maintaining contact with local zoos and demanding responsible breeding programs. If a local zoo is publicly or municipally supported, encourage the local governing body to direct that captive breeding be strictly limited. Through such efforts, the horrors of roadside zoos and animal auctions can be diminished.

John W. Grandy is vice president of wildlife and environment for The HSUS.
Old Myths Die Hard

A New View of Animal Research Questions Its Scientific Value

By Dr. Brandon Reines

During the last week of April each year, as predictably as the chirping of robins, the deputy director of the National Institutes of Health sings the praises of animal experimentation. "Visually every medical innovation of the last century," claims Dr. William F. Raub, "has been based to a significant extent upon the results of animal experimentation." The inspiration for such oratory is the agitation of animal-rights and animal-protection groups, marking the observance of April 21-28 as World Week for Laboratory Animals.

Dr. Raub is hardly alone in contending that medical discoveries usually come from animal experiments. In fact, that contention is an article of faith among thousands of animal researchers the world over. Not only scientists but the media and many members of the public, as well, believe that no breakthrough in treatment is possible without experiments on animals. This is due in part to the efforts of special-interest organizations whose sole purpose is the promotion of animal research. For example, the National Association for Biomedical Research (NABR) represents laboratory-animal-use interests, including animal breeders, dealers, and researchers. For many years, NABR spokesmen have utilized lobbying and public-relations techniques to promote the self-serving dogma that current medical science is a result of animal experimentation. For example, the National Association for Biomedical Research (NABR) represents laboratory-animal-use interests, including animal breeders, dealers, and researchers. For many years, NABR spokesmen have utilized lobbying and public-relations techniques to promote the self-servin

possible that the usefulness of animal experimentation has been exaggerated?

Answering that question accurately has been my occupation for the past several years.

The answer is an unqualified "Yes." In fact, animal-research interests have been engaged in a propaganda campaign every bit as vigorous and distorted as that they attribute to animal protectionists. Animal-research interests have consistently taken anecdotal information, "expert" opinion, and selected case studies to construct an allegedly airtight case for the indispensability of animals for medical discovery and testing. However, analysis of the history of modern medical miracles—wonder drugs, hormonal therapies, and surgical procedures—reveals that animal research has often not served a scientific function at all. The primary historical role of animal experimentation is forensic. It is a method of "selling" a favored hypothesis to the medical community and/or the public. Medical breakthroughs almost always have arisen from detective work done by doctors in the context of clinical practice (with patients). In the fields of research
that have seen the most spectacular advances and milestones (cardiology, immunology, oncology, neurology, pharmacology, endocrinology, hematology), the role of animal experimentation in advancing progress has been grossly exaggerated. An increasing number of scientists share that view.

Dr. Irwin D. J. Bross, former director of biostatistics at Roswell Park Memorial Institute for Cancer Research in Buffalo, New York, maintains that none of the major drugs for the treatment of childhood leukemia was discovered through animal experimentation. He claims that the drugs were actually developed in the clinic by direct observations of human patients. This conclusion seems to contradict the findings of scientists such as Dr. C. G. Zubrod, who has written repeatedly that all of the major anti-cancer drugs were discovered by animal experimentation. Based on my historical research, it has become clear that Drs. Zubrod and Bross have been "talking past each other." The apparent contradiction is due to a lack of semantic precision in Dr. Zubrod's published statements. Although his formal claims in the literature imply that the main antileukemic drugs were discovered in animal experiments, in a personal communication, Dr. Zubrod conceded, "I guess the role of the animal experiments was to convince the clinicians to allow the tests in man." That is a very different conclusion from the one he has championed in print for years—that the drugs were actually discovered by animal experiments. Most of the main drugs for cancer treatment were discovered in human studies and, only later, tested on animals.

One of the main anti-leukemic drugs is nitrogen mustard. It became of interest to oncologists when a surgeon treating victims of mustard-gas poisoning showed that it knocked out the white blood cells of those victims. Since leukemia is a proliferation of white blood cells, the surgeon argued, any substance that kills white blood cells should be effective against leukemia. With that rationale, researchers proceeded to test nitrogen mustard on a variety of mouse and rat tumors. The results were mixed; nitrogen mustard was actually ineffective against most of the strains tested. The researchers discounted the largely negative studies because the experience with human victims was too convincing to ignore. Researchers convinced doctors to try nitrogen mustard as a therapy by emphasizing its positive effects against certain mouse tumors. These positive results did more to reassure doctors than prove the accuracy of the original hypothesis. That was their value.

In studying the history of cancer chemotherapy, heart surgery, and several other areas, it becomes clear that animal experiments are often not even part of the scientific research process. They are a sales tool used to dramatize hypotheses. Of course, experiments in the modern view of science are supposed to test hypotheses—not dramatize them. If this new perspective is correct, then animal experiments are no more inherently scientific than is an inspirational speech.

Consider psychological research for a moment. The most famous experimental psychologist in the world, Harry Harlow, is immortalized for his mother/infant separation experiments utilizing rhesus monkeys. He ostensibly sought to answer the question of whether human infants love their mothers because they provide contact comfort or because they are a source of nourishment. To test various theories emanating from clinical observation, Harlow chose an animal species—the rhesus monkey—that has a highly-developed need to cling to its mother in order to survive. Ethnologists were already well aware that contact comfort is more important for rhesus infants than for human infants. "Anyone who has ever watched an infant monkey cling tightly to its mother as the latter swings through the trees can easily understand why," writes Dr. Dallas Pratt. By his choice of experimental
species, Harlow stacked the deck in favor of contact comfort as the preferred stimulus. Lo and behold, infant rhesus monkeys preferred the cloth surrogate mother to the wire surrogate mother equipped with a milk nipple.

Regardless of whether or not Harlow had a personal bias towards the contact-comfort theory, his experimental design itself favored a particular result. Rather than a scientific break-through, Harlow’s experiment, extremely cruel in its many variations, emerges as nothing but a dramatic illustration of an old hypothesis. As far as human infants are concerned, however, the relative importance of contact comfort and nursing remains unsettled. Nonetheless, Harlow, named president of the American Psychological Association, was revered for his research for decades.

In case after case, animal experiments are used merely to dramatize a clinical hypothesis. If one strain does not respond in the “right” way, some other strain surely will. Given the thousands of possible combinations of species, experimental manipulation, and environmental circumstances, someone with a vested interest in a particular result can almost always either cite or produce an experimental finding that will justify almost any public-health decision—even a dangerous one. In fact, some scientists prefer to base public-health decision on highly-variable animal data, even when reliable data on human exposure is available!

For example, on occasion, it is virtually impossible to find an experimental species whose reactions mimic those of the human body. Take the rodent—and later beagle—experiments conducted to determine the safety of cigarette smoking. When attempts to develop cancer in rodents through smoking failed, public-health actions against cigarette smoking were stalled for more than a decade. While human population studies had clearly shown that smoking caused cancer in people by 1950, experimenters could not produce cancer in animals, no matter how many different animal strains they tried. Tobacco apologists marshalled leading laboratory scientists to defend the accuracy of the rodent data. No less a scientist than Dr. C. C. Little, the founder of Jackson Memorial Laboratories in Bar Harbor, Maine, insisted that the negative findings in rodents were absolutely conclusive for man; there was no evidence that cigarette smoking causes cancer because human studies are “merely statistical.” Dr. Little maintained that only animal experiments could prove that cigarette smoking causes cancer in humans. By sheer persistence, the American epidemiologist who had already shown that cigarettes cause cancer in man managed to find a strain of mouse whose skin would become cancerous after painting it with tobacco tars. In desperation, Dr. Ernest Wynder appeared on national television to hold up the mouse he had rendered malignant with cigarette tars. Dr. Wynder’s statistician at the time was the aforementioned Irwin Bross, who, after witnessing that demeaning display of scientific showmanship, developed a profound distrust of animal experiments.

Dr. Bross maintains that the dogma that clinical hypotheses must be “proven” by animal experiments dates back to the late nineteenth century. “At that time, the dogma made sense,” he asserts.

That was the heyday of the germ theory of disease, when it appeared as if all diseases were caused by bacteria (or viruses). The analogy between an animal inoculated with a germ and a human being with a germ disease is pretty straightforward. If they absolutely couldn’t find an animal strain that would contract the disease no matter how many times they infected it, then it wasn’t too likely that the germ caused human disease either, although there were many exceptions even at that early date. In the early 1950s, when I was involved in the cigarette/lung-cancer controversy, most scientists still believed in the old nineteenth century dogma known as “Koch’s postulates.” The postulates just don’t have any applicability at all to the noninfectious diseases such as cancer and heart disease. The biochemical differences between human and animal tissues are simply too great. When they started making beagles smoke cigarettes in the late ’60s, I wrote a letter to the Buffalo Courier pointing out how foolish it was. I’m no animal lover, but it was a real waste of money.

The evidence that cigarette smoking caused a kind of cancer in dogs finally convinced most of the skeptics although a few holdouts remain. They still reject the cigarette/lung-cancer theory because the dogs did not contract the human form of lung cancer.

There are still scientists who attribute the discovery that tobacco causes cancer to experiments on beagles. The image of beagles hooked up to smoking machines is certainly indelible, but its dramatic impact should not be confused with its scientific content. Like the earlier rodent studies, the beagle experiments were not performed for scientific but political reasons. Beware of NIH administrators who parrot the old party line that “virtually every medical advance of the past century arose from animal experimentation.” Look out for the songbirds of NIH and NABR.

Dr. Brandon Reines is associate director of the laboratory animals department of The HSUS and author of Masked Men of Medicine, to be published within the year.
It is always difficult to convey through any written report the energy and dynamics that are indispensable to the success of a program such as that provided by The HSUS. Supported by a constituency of more than nine hundred thousand persons and serviced by a staff of approximately 115 persons, The HSUS is actively and aggressively involved in issues affecting literally millions of animals throughout our nation. Through investigations, litigation, education, training programs, public-awareness campaigns, and legislative action, The HSUS is at the forefront of virtually every major concern affecting animals being addressed in our society today. Often single-handedly, but sometimes in concert with various other animal or environmentally focused organizations, we are confident that the battle for animal protection is being won on many fronts.

Most especially is this so as regards the trapping and rearing of wild animals for fur products. Promoted by an industry that makes millions upon millions of dollars annually from one of the most hideous and outrageous cruelties ever inflicted upon animals by man, the wearing of fur in our society may soon be a thing of the past. As people are becoming educated and sensitized to the enormous pain and suffering inevitably accompanying the production of furs, they are joining the ranks of those who are repudiating this symbol of status and style. Among such persons are not only consumers, but creators of fashion, as well.

Another area in which the efforts of The HSUS are making a significant difference is in the reduction of unwanted companion animals. Bolstered by our “Be a P.A.L.—Prevent A Litter” campaign, we are beginning to see a measurable reduction in the numbers of animals passing through hundreds of animal shelters throughout the country. There is no greater challenge facing The HSUS—and our society—than to work for the day when no dog or cat is without a loving and caring companion.

While much remains to be accomplished in the rearing of animals for food, The HSUS is directing major efforts toward the elimination of various practices that frequently serve the interest of the producer but are unacceptable from an ethical and humane point of view. We are encouraged that a number of farmers and farming associations are supportive of our initiatives and recommendations and are joining with us to bring about a change in how agriculture is practiced in our country today. While not formally a vegetarian organization, The HSUS has among its constituency a goodly number of vegetarians and acknowledges the many ways in which this kind of personal commitment undergirds our efforts to eradicate abuse and suffering of these animals.

In the use of animals for research and various testing procedures, we are beginning to see a few encouraging signs. Impatient with the lack of government initiatives, a number of major industries and corporations are beginning to develop and utilize alternatives to live-animal use. This is especially so as regards such procedures as the Draize Eye-Irritancy Test and the Lethal Dose 50 (LD50) Test, but it would be false optimism to imagine that there is a strong commitment to the development and utilization of non-animal alternatives by either industry or government. The challenge to The HSUS at this level remains formidable. Finally, we are all increasingly aware of the threat to the environment which portends serious consequences for humans and other animals alike. Consequently, The HSUS is actively working with various environmental and conservation organizations to preserve both our planet and the life it sustains. Indeed, we believe our commitment to this concern is one of great imperative, for, though the protection of animals from suffering and abuse is our immediate concern, it will be a vacuous victory if, at the same time, the world about us continues to disintegrate.

John A. Hoyt, President
The Humane Society of the United States
In its continuing effort to halt the cruel fur trade, The HSUS launched "The Shame of Fur" campaign in the fall of 1988. Directed at fashion consumers and bolstered by attractive outdoor advertising, this unprecedented effort concentrated on five major fashion centers—New York City, Dallas/Pt. Worth, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Washington, D.C.—and included dozens of communities nationwide. The HSUS held media events in New York City and Chicago which included anti-fur statements by fashion models and other celebrities. These activities, combined with efforts of many other organizations, turned up the heat under the fur issue to the point where top-name designers announced they would stop designing fur fashions. At year end, fur sales were down and the seasonal kill of fur-bearing animals had decreased by 75 to 90 percent, according to trapping industry estimates.

The HSUS filed suit against the U.S. government to force sanctions against Iceland, which is still killing whales in defiance of the international moratorium on whaling. We also convinced the U.S. Department of Commerce to pressure the Reagan administration to apply economic sanctions against Iceland, which was designed to increase the supply of these primates for research but which failed to address adequately numerous humane issues. We also investigated and helped to expose National Institutes of Health (NIH) plans to consider procuring chimpanzees from the wild for use in research overseas. Afterward, NIH stated that it would not resort to taking chimpanzees from the wild.

The HSUS produced more than one hundred new items in support of its programs. These included issues of its periodicals, most notably the HSUS News, the society’s quarterly membership newsletter whose circulation reached almost three hundred thousand; information kits for the general public and press in “The Shame of Fur” and “Be a P.A.L.” campaigns; magazine advertisements; and membership, workshop, and annual conference materials. Almost one hundred reprints of previously published materials on a variety of issues were made available at low cost.

The National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE), The HSUS’s education division, substantially increased the readership of its humane education periodicals in 1988; the circulation of NAAHE’s magazine for teachers, Children & Animals, increased by 90 percent and that of Kind News, NAAHE’s newspaper for children, nearly doubled.

NAAHE’s Adopt-A-Teacher program was responsible for much of the readership growth. The name, address, and logo of any group that adopted one thousand or more teachers was printed on each copy of the adopted group’s gift subscriptions to Kind News.

In 1988, NAAHE kicked off its Kids In Nature’s Defense (KIND) Club program, in which teachers are given a special KIND Club packet with their subscription to Kind News and Children & Animals. With more than 206,000 members, NAAHE’s KIND Club is the largest children’s animal-protection group in the world.

The division’s busy workshop schedule included a presentation to northeast animal-control officers that served as the basis of a program designed to provide shelter personnel with training in humane education methods and techniques. A presentation by NAAHE at an international humane educator’s conference led to the creation of a children’s pet-overpopulation campaign, Helping Hands for Pets.

The higher education programs division of The HSUS provides support on animal-pro-
tection issues to students and faculty at colleges, universities, and professional schools, especially students in medicine, veterinary medicine, and animal-health technology. The division also served as liaison to professional organizations dealing with animal-facilitated therapy, law enforcement, animal control, psychology, public health, and many other areas of human/animal interaction.

The staff of higher education has a special interest in the psychology of kindness and cruelty to animals. Staff members were
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Statement of Financial Position at Year End

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>Unrestricted Funds</th>
<th>Restricted Funds</th>
<th>Endowment Funds</th>
<th>Annuity Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents</td>
<td>$3,060,875</td>
<td>$1,119,126</td>
<td>$439,911</td>
<td>$198,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables, Deposits, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Revenue</td>
<td>311,505</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(26,263)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>5,407,534</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,937,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Assets</td>
<td>2,282,296</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td>$11,062,210</td>
<td>$1,119,126</td>
<td>$439,911</td>
<td>$3,110,074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Liabilities                 |                    |                  |                 |              |
| Fund Balances               | $228,635           | -                | -               | -            |
| Total Liabilities and Fund  | $11,062,210        | $1,119,126       | $439,911        | $3,110,074   |

Statement of Revenue and Expenditures for the Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Unrestricted Funds</th>
<th>Restricted Funds</th>
<th>Endowment Funds</th>
<th>Annuity Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues</td>
<td>$5,044,649</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts and Grants</td>
<td>2,987,405</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>433,374</td>
<td>20,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequests</td>
<td>2,088,844</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Income</td>
<td>344,884</td>
<td>91,939</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>206,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of Literature and Other</td>
<td>273,053</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Income</td>
<td>134,178</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$10,873,013</td>
<td>$91,939</td>
<td>$433,599</td>
<td>$226,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Unrestricted Funds</th>
<th>Restricted Funds</th>
<th>Endowment Funds</th>
<th>Annuity Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humane Education, Membership</td>
<td>$5,807,310</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Program Services</td>
<td>956,828</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruelty Investigation and Litigation</td>
<td>1,064,241</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and General</td>
<td>1,799,448</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Development</td>
<td>659,058</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund-raising</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>160,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to/for annuitants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$10,286,885</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$160,471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excess of Revenue Over Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excess of Revenue Over Expenditures</th>
<th>Un restricted Funds</th>
<th>Restricted Funds</th>
<th>Endowment Funds</th>
<th>Annuity Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$586,128</td>
<td>$91,939</td>
<td>$433,399</td>
<td>$66,102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
asked to assist local and federal officials in legal cases involving animal cruelty in eight states. We wrote training materials on animal cruelty for the one hundred thousand members of the International Association of Chiefs of Police and conducted seminars on the connection between animal cruelty and forms of family violence.

The HSUS’s federal legislative staff worked actively for passage of the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act reauthorizations, the Elephant Conservation Act of 1988, and legislation that would prohibit the use of federal funds for any project that entails procurement of chimpanzees taken from the wild.

The HSUS led supporters of a bill to impose a two-year moratorium on the patenting of genetically altered animals. Although the bill did not pass, it strengthened HSUS relationships with the farm community and religious groups that share our concern on this issue.

The state legislation department launched its campaign to make cockfighting illegal in every state in the Union. Working with local activists, we made significant progress in Arizona and Louisiana, two of the four states in which this cruelty is legal.

Vicious-dog legislation was the hottest issue of the year, with laws enacted in Maryland, Georgia, Minnesota, Michigan, South Carolina, and South Dakota. Many of these laws contained provisions based on HSUS guidelines.

Our Action Alert system notified more than sixty thousand activists of upcoming legislative action regarding approximately thirty-five legislative efforts.

MEMBERSHIP AND PUBLIC INFORMATION

The public-relations department distributed national press releases on a variety of program issues, including the incidental killing of dolphins in tuna nets, efforts to halt the ivory trade, the HSUS “Be a P.A.L.” campaign, and protection for chimpanzees. HSUS staff members were interviewed and quoted extensively in national media, including the Los Angeles Times, television’s “West 57th Street,” and in hundreds of local radio, television, and news programs.

The HSUS data and information department provides research and information services to the society and its members. Staff expertise in offering solutions to urban wildlife problems was of particular value to municipalities, private citizens, and animal-protection organizations alike in 1988.

As part of its service to members, The HSUS sent informational material to its members and provided opportunities to upgrade membership status throughout the year. The HSUS also underwrites the publishing of animalsines, a newsletter addressing the philosophical and

---

**ANNUAL REPORT 1988**

**MEMBERSHIP AND PUBLIC INFORMATION**

The public-relations department distributed national press releases on a variety of program issues, including the incidental killing of dolphins in tuna nets, efforts to halt the ivory trade, the HSUS “Be a P.A.L.” campaign, and protection for chimpanzees. HSUS staff members were interviewed and quoted extensively in national media, including the Los Angeles Times, television’s “West 57th Street,” and in hundreds of local radio, television, and news programs.

The HSUS data and information department provides research and information services to the society and its members. Staff expertise in offering solutions to urban wildlife problems was of particular value to municipalities, private citizens, and animal-protection organizations alike in 1988.

As part of its service to members, The HSUS sent informational material to its members and provided opportunities to upgrade membership status throughout the year. The HSUS also underwrites the publishing of animalsines, a newsletter addressing the philosophical and
ethically of the rights of animals and our responsibilities as humans for their protection.

ENVIRONMENT, FARM ANIMALS, BIOETHICS

The HSUS continued its major effort to end sport hunting and commercial trapping on national wildlife refuges. We worked for formation of the Wildlife Refuge Reform Coalition, which will pursue legislation, notably the Refuge Wildlife Protection Act, to prohibit those activities.

We worked on ensuring the humane shipment of live wildlife, winning a major lawsuit against the U.S. Department of the Interior to force it to implement the humane shipment regulations of the Lacey Act. Those regulations, now in full force, will help reduce the suffering of wildlife in transit, while we continue our efforts to end the commercial trade in live wild animals.

We participated actively in the successful effort to re-authorize both the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act, particularly to protect North Pacific fur seals from commercial slaughter.

Our staff investigated exotic-animal auctions, zoos, menageries, and other animal exhibits. We focused major attention on the abuses that often occur when elephants are maintained in captivity, taking the position that, if elephants cannot be kept without cruel discipline, they should not be kept in captivity at all.

The HSUS also fought for legislation to protect wild African elephants from the ravages of the ivory trade, petitioning the Department of the Interior to list the African elephant as an endangered species.

Increased public concern about diet and health and recognition of the global "greenhouse effect" increased awareness of the need for fundamental changes in animal husbandry worldwide. As a consequence, the HSUS farm animals and bioethics division worked with greater urgency for adoption of principles of humane, sustainable agriculture. We published, as part of this effort, Steps Toward a Humane, Sustainable Agriculture; Recommended Standards for Raising Livestock and Poultry; The Hidden Costs of Beef; and The Production of White Veal as an Animal-Welfare Issue. We contacted farmers and producer and consumer associations that share our concerns and goals and spoke to farm groups, agricultural and veterinary schools, and government agencies, nationally and internationally.

The division assumed a leading role in the debate over the ethical, animal-welfare, and environmental consequences of genetic engineering biotechnology. We provided testimony supporting legislation to place a moratorium on the U.S. Patent Office's decision to permit the patenting of animals that have been subjected to genetic engineering. Better legislative protection for animals used in genetic engineering research was also a concern, since farm animals and mice, widely used in such research, have no adequate protection under the federal Animal Welfare Act.

Following the broad directives of its goals and policies, the HSUS's newly established Center for Respect of Life and Environment cosponsored a consultation with representatives of various Christian denominations on the ethics and theology of genetic engineering biotechnology in April 1988. The center produced a video program based on center director Michael W. Fox's presentation at this conference, entitled "Silent World: Ethical, Environmental, and Animal-Welfare Concerns of Genetic Engineering Biotechnology." A second video program, "Animals, Nature, and Religion," was also completed.

COMPANION ANIMALS DIVISION

The HSUS companion animals division is a resource for hundreds of animal shelters in the United States. In 1988, the division sponsored specialized workshops on issues such as dangerous dogs and responsible shelter management.

The animal sheltering and control department provided animals with better and more humane care through more than thirty shelter evaluations and consulting services to many counties and municipalities on their animal programs and ordinances. The department was also actively involved in successfully prosecuting a case in which hundreds of companion animals starved at the Animals Farm Home in New York.

The Animal Control Academy, providing the only two-week training program for animal-control and humane society workers, completed a successful tenth year, with five sessions held throughout the country. The academy also offered several two-day sessions on stress management for euthanasia technicians. The academy has trained fifteen hundred students who have gone on to make a difference for the animals in their shelters and communities.

Shelter Sense, our newsletter for professionals in animal sheltering and control, brought suc-
cessful ideas and programs to more than three thousand shelters and shelter workers.

The "Be a P.A.L.—Prevent A Litter" campaign promoted the importance of spaying and neutering companion animals through a successful national grassroots effort. The HSUS provided expertise and many materials, free of charge, to shelters, organizations, and individuals who wished to fight the problem of pet overpopulation in their communities. Such local efforts yielded gratifying results: more than five hundred billboards with the "Be a P.A.L." message sprouted in cities and towns across the country. Two states declared April 1988 as "Be a P.A.L." month, and more than four hundred localities followed suit. Local media publicized "Be a P.A.L." activities in their communities. Most exciting was the cooperative effort of several humane societies and veterinarians; thousands of animals were spayed and neutered through low-cost programs as a result.

CRUELTY INVESTIGATION AND LITIGATION
INVESTIGATIONS, REGIONAL PROGRAMS, AND SERVICES

Thirty-seven states are served through our eight regional offices and a staff of twenty-five directors, investigators, program coordinators, and support personnel. Major investigations in twenty-two states encompassed dog- and cockfighting rings and cruelties in horse and dog racing, auctions, zoos, animal shelters, and animal-sacrifice cults. Puppy mills and pet shops were targets of other HSUS investigative activity. We documented cruel conditions among breeders and shippers in Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. Our statewide investigation of franchised pet stores in California uncovered new evidence of abuses.

We documented use of live lures in training racing dogs in Kansas as well as Florida. We fought bills to legalize dog racing in thirteen states, winning in eleven. The work of collecting data on dog dealers and livestock auctions continued, with visits to operations in Mississippi, Missouri, Indiana, Ohio, Texas, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia.

The regional offices were busy in legislative, educational, and shelter-assistance fields and played active roles in local efforts on the HSUS "The Shame of Fur" and "Be a P.A.L." campaigns. The Mid-Atlantic Regional Office staff worked on more than twenty state bills. Regional staff members participated in protests to ban the Draize Test and to halt hunting in the Great Swamp Wildlife Refuge. Staff visited three zoos and thirty-five animal facilities in the four-state area and hosted two major conferences, on deer management and nuisance wildlife.

Horses and deer were the focus of the North Central Regional Office's most important activities for the year. After we brought to the Bureau of Land Management's attention a dying horse herd in North Dakota, all fee-waived adoptions of wild horses were stopped. Surplus deer were scheduled to be shot in the Ryerson Nature Preserve in Lake County, Illinois, and regional staff began an all-out effort to find alternatives to the plan.

California's full-time legislative session occupied the West Coast staff's attention. Approximately sixty bills with an impact on animals needed review, evaluation, and, in many cases, active support. Regional staff evaluated twelve shelters and participated in eight major meetings or workshops, which brought HSUS programs and policies to the attention of a variety of civic and law-enforcement groups.

In New England, The HSUS was active in educational/communications activities as diverse as preparing signs for use in livestock auction yards warning of anti-cruelty statutes and leading sessions at the National Animal Control Officers annual conference. Legislation regulating horse- and pony-pulling contests, a special interest of the New England office, was introduced in Connecticut and Maine; HSUS staff testified in both instances.

Exotic game hunting ranches, a particular problem in the Gulf States, were exposed by the HSUS office there. We organized a new regionwide group, the Gulf States Humane Educators Association, and its first activity was an annual education symposium.

Major legislative victories in the Midwest Regional Office territory included passage of all-important legislation in Kansas requiring state licensing and inspection of puppy mills and animal-care facilities, which proliferate in Kansas and whose animals are shipped across the country.

The Great Lakes office assisted in closing down an international dogfight operation; an action in which federal officers participated for the first time. It worked to pass differential-licensing legislation in Ohio, which should make spaying and neutering pet animals more attractive to the general public,
and fourteen other pieces of animal-related legislation.

In the Southeast Regional Office, staff took time from the investigative work that resulted in major greyhound-racing and cockfighting raids to offer advice and assistance to struggling humane organizations in Puerto Rico. A prominent lawmaker there agreed to sponsor felony dogfighting legislation as a result of our efforts.

LITIGATION AND LEGAL SERVICES

Throughout the year, the office of the general counsel continued to assist HSUS director O.J. Ramsey’s representation of Jenifer Graham in the suit against the Victor Valley, California, school board, which penalized her for refusing to dissect animals as part of a high school biology course. This case was settled in Ms. Graham’s favor, but, because the trial court refused to enforce the settlement, it was appealed.

The general counsel’s office prepared and filed *amicus curiae* briefs opposing a U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) policy which restricts veterinarians from prescribing needed drugs to their animal patients unless such drugs have been approved by the FDA. Of concern was the fact that there are many animal diseases and conditions for which FDA-approved drugs do not exist and that treatment of animals could be adversely affected by the agency’s policy.

The staff continued to facilitate the work of The HSUS throughout the country, providing advice and guidance on legal issues and problems, assistance to local organizations, and review of materials destined for publication.

SUPPORTING SERVICES
ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT

The HSUS maintains a support staff indispensable in performing the functions necessary to conduct day-to-day operations. The president, who is the chief executive officer of the society, is charged with administering the total effort of the society on behalf of the board of directors. The treasurer and executive vice-president is the chief operating officer and, in concert with the president, prepares the annual operating budget for approval by the board of directors. He has responsibility for all funds and securities of the society and makes disbursements therefrom in payment of expenses in accordance with the approved budget. In this capacity, he is responsible for the maintenance of all financial records necessary to meet the reporting requirements of federal and state governments. Annually, the treasurer’s records are audited by an independent certified public accountant and a report is made directly to the board.

The society maintains a headquarters building in Washington, D.C.; a center in Bethesda, Maryland, where the companion animals division and much of the financial, data processing, and publication operations are housed; eight regional offices; an Animal Control Academy; and the National Humane Education Center, headquarters for NAAHE.

The society has a board of directors consisting of twenty-four members elected by the membership and numerous committees that direct the overall work of the organization. In addition to the efforts by the society in direct furtherance of our animal-protection interests, occasional gifts are made to other organizations that further its philosophy, goals, and purposes.

MEMBERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

The society is funded through annual dues paid by its members as well as from additional contributions and legacies from members and others. Without this generosity and dedication, the work of The HSUS would not be possible. The HSUS produces and distributes information describing its program goals and ongoing endeavors to its constituency of more than nine hundred thousand persons nationwide.

FUND-RAISING

The HSUS raises funds by a variety of means in order to underwrite its animal-protection programs. It is a fact of life that The HSUS, as any other not-for-profit organization, must “earn” the confidence of its members and donors in order to receive the funds required to operate. We do this by educating the public, as potential members and contributors, about the numerous activities and programs conducted by the society on behalf of animals and the ways in which our actions have made a difference. This is done through the *HSUS News*, quarterly *Close-Up Reports*, and other direct-mail communications. Through these various vehicles, as well as through selecting and encouraging deferred giving, endowments, and legacies, The HSUS has been successful in enlisting the support and participation of an ever-increasing number of persons who share our concerns and objectives.
or decades, the human species has chosen to live in ways that pollute the air, soil, and water; destroy rain forests and other wildlife habitat; and threaten the fragile existence of many species with which we share the earth. Can we restructure our way of living in order to preserve the integrity of our planet and safeguard the well-being of all creatures?

In Houston, Texas, this October, we invite you to confront crucial ecological issues and explore ways in which our attitudes and actions can change the destructive pattern of human stewardship.

Our pre-conference symposium, "Humane Sustainable Agriculture," offers a cross section of philosophers, practitioners, and promoters of innovative strategies for providing food in the 1990s. The outspoken John Robbins, author of *Diet for a New America*, will be our luncheon guest speaker for the symposium.

Author, activist, and philosopher Jeremy Rifkin is our conference keynote speaker. Dr. Amy Freeman Lee is our program moderator. HSUS Vice President Michael W. Fox and the Rev. Dr. Andrew Linzey of the Centre for the Study of Theology at the University of Essex (England) will examine the interrelated issues of environmental stewardship and living in harmony with the natural world.

A special slide presentation by whale biologist and whale-song expert extraordinaire Roger Payne and our perennially popular awards banquet will be the highlights of the conference’s evening activities.

Houston’s gracious Galleria complex offers some of the city’s finest attractions. Why not come to the great Southwest with us in the fall? We’ll want to see you there.

1989 ANNUAL CONFERENCE
OF THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES
THE WESTIN GALLERIA, HOUSTON, TEXAS
OCTOBER 26-28
REGISTRATION FORM

1989 Annual Conference
The Humane Society of the United States

The conference registration form is for one person or a couple. If more than one individual or couple are attending, please copy this form and fill out additional copies for each registrant/couple to ensure proper preregistration.

Please check appropriate box

☐ HSUS Annual Conference
  Oct. 26–28 .............................................. $60 $ ___
  Includes general sessions, workshops, and
  awards banquet. (Select meal type below.)
  ☐ Fish ☐ Vegetarian __ ___

☐ Symposium on Humane Sustainable Agriculture
  Wednesday, Oct. 25 .............................. $25 $ ___
  Includes luncheon

If you are unable to attend the entire conference, the fees per day and for the awards banquet are as follows:

☐ Thursday, Oct. 26 .................................. $20 $ ___
☐ Friday, Oct. 27 .................................... $20 $ ___
☐ Saturday, Oct. 28 .................................. $10 $ ___
  (Awards banquet not included)

☐ Awards banquet, Saturday evening ................ $30 $ ___
  (Select meal.)
  ☐ Fish ☐ Vegetarian __ ___

Total Enclosed $ ___

(Make checks payable to The HSUS: U.S. funds only. Cancellation fee of $10 will be charged after Thursday, October 19.)

A hotel registration form will be mailed upon receipt of this form. You must make reservations directly with the hotel prior to Tuesday, October 3, 1989.

Name ____________________________ PLEASE PRINT
Address __________________________
City __________ State ___________ ZIP code ___________

Complete and return this form with payment to HSUS Conference,
2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.

HSUS 1989 ANNUAL CONFERENCE SCHEDULE

TUESDAY, OCT. 24
7:30 p.m.–9:00 p.m.
REGISTRATION

WEDNESDAY, OCT. 25

Pre-Conference Symposium
8:00 a.m.–Noon
REGISTRATION

9:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m.
HUMANE SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE:
Animal, Environmental, Health, Economic, and Social Concerns
A day-long symposium featuring representatives from the animal-
protection, environmental, and agricultural communities. Program
moderators: Dr. Michael W. Fox, HSUS vice president, and Gail Black,
coordinator, Humane Sustainable Agriculture Program

9:00 a.m.–9:30 a.m.
Welcome/Introductory Remarks
Dr. Michael W. Fox

9:30 a.m.–10:30 a.m.
ADDRESS: Practicing Sustainable Agriculture
Susan Rieff, assistant commissioner for agricultural resource protection, Texas
Department of Agriculture

10:30 a.m.–10:45 a.m.
Coffee Break

10:45 a.m.–11:15 a.m.
Certified Organic Foods
Can Make the Difference
Thomas Harding, Jr., president, AgriSystems International

11:15 a.m.–11:35 a.m.
The Marriage of Ecology and Agriculture: Agriculture Research
with Nature as the Measure
Wes Jackson, The Land Institute
11:35 a.m.–11:50 a.m.
The Role of Livestock in a Sustainable Agriculture
Larry Krcil, Center for Rural Affairs

11:50 a.m.–12:10 p.m.
Vexing Nature: Biotechnology from a Sustainable Perspective
Gary Comstock, Western Rural Development Center

12:10 p.m.–12:30 p.m.
Questions from Audience to Speakers

12:30 p.m.–1:30 p.m.
Luncheon Speaker: John Robbins
Diet for a Humane World

1:30 p.m.–2:00 p.m.
Sustainable Farming: Hope for a Humane Agriculture
Ron Kroese, The Land Stewardship Project

2:00 p.m.–2:30 p.m.
Is Agricultural Policy Humane and Sustainable to the Family Farmer?
Howard F. Lyman, legislative analyst, National Farmers Union

2:30 p.m.–3:00 p.m.
From Farm Animals to Animal Farm: Towards a Humane Sustainable Agriculture
Terry Gips, Alliance for Sustainable Agriculture

3:00 p.m.–3:30 p.m.
Practical Implementation: Market Place Realities
Gail Black, HSUS coordinator, Humane Sustainable Agriculture Program

3:30 p.m.–3:45 p.m.
Afternoon Break

3:45 p.m.–4:30 p.m.
Panel Discussion and Questions from Audience to Speakers

4:30 p.m.
Adjournment

4:45 p.m.–6:30 p.m.
Post-Symposium Videos

WEDNESDAY, OCT. 25

Annual Conference Program

4:00 p.m.–6:30 p.m.
REGISTRATION

8:00 p.m.
Get Acquainted Social/Cash Bar

THURSDAY, OCT. 26

8:00 a.m.–3:30 p.m.
REGISTRATION

9:00 a.m.
OPENSING REMARKS
Dr. Amy Freeman Lee, program moderator
K. William Wiseman, chairman, Board of Directors, HSUS
John A. Hoyt, president, HSUS

9:30 a.m.–10:30 a.m.
KEYNOTE ADDRESS:
Global Politics: A New Ecological World View for the 1990s
Jeremy Rifkin, president, Foundation on Economic Trends; founder, the Global Greenhouse Network

10:30 a.m.
Coffee Break

11:00 a.m.
PANEL DISCUSSION:
What You Can Do: Individual and Organizational Action to Protect Wildlife
Dr. John W. Grandy, HSUS vice president, moderator
Noon–1:30 p.m.
Book Sale
Humane Education Materials

1:30 p.m.–3:00 p.m.
WORKSHOPS

1. Making Your Newsletter More Effective
Deborah Salem

2. Trapping and Furs: The Impact on Wildlife
Richard L. Randall, Dr. John W. Grandy, Pat Ragan

3. Alternatives to Animal Uses in High School and College Biology
Dr. Randall Lockwood, Patty Finch, Dr. Julie Dunlap

4. Puppy Mills and Pet Shops: Problems and Solutions
Robert Baker, Kurt Lapham, Gail Eisnitz

5. Live Wildlife Trade: An International Focus
Dr. Susan Lieberman

3:00 p.m.
Afternoon Break

3:30 p.m.–5:00 p.m.
WORKSHOPS

1. Living Humanely and Ethically: Incorporating Activism into Our Daily Lives
Carol Grunewald, Gail Black, Guy R. Hodge

2. Government Abuse of Predators and Wild Horses
Dr. John W. Grandy, Richard L. Randall, Frantz Dantzer

3. Animal Welfare Act: Priorities for the Coming Decade
Dr. Susan Lieberman, Dr. Martin Stephens, Robert Baker

4. Euthanasia: Attitudes, Methods, and You
Phyllis Wright, William Hurt Smith

5. The HSUS in Partnership
John Walsh, John Hoyt, Alvaro Posada-Salazar, Gerardo Huertas
8:00 p.m.
FILM FESTIVAL
John J. Dommers, moderator

FRIDAY, OCT. 27

8:00 a.m.-3:30 p.m.
REGISTRATION

9:00 a.m.
GENERAL SESSION: Perspectives on Harmonizing Humanity and Earth’s Creation Dr. Michael W. Fox

10:00 a.m.-10:15 a.m.
Coffee Break

10:15 a.m.-10:30 a.m.
Helping Hands for Animals Campaign Patty Finch

10:30 a.m.-11:30 a.m.
ADDRESS: The Interrelated Issues of Environmental/Planetary Stewardship The Rev. Dr. Andrew Linzey

11:30 a.m.-12:00 noon
ADDRESS: Caring For The World’s Animals Gordon Walwyn, director general, World Society for the Protection of Animals

Noon-1:30 p.m.
Book Sale
Humane Education Materials

1:30 p.m.-3:00 p.m.
WORKSHOPS

1. The Wildlife Refuge Reform Coalition: Are Refuges True Sanctuaries? Jane Scheidler

2. Lobbying Basics: Getting Results on State and Federal Levels Elizabeth Dribben

3. Agriculture Practices In Transition Dr. Michael W. Fox, Gail Black

4. Trends In Legislation: New Ideas Nina Austenberg, Ann Church,

5. Stay Out of Court Murdaugh Stuart Madden, Roger A. Kindler

3:00 p.m.
Afternoon Break

3:30 p.m.-5:00 p.m.
WORKSHOPS

1. Living in Harmony with the Earth Dr. Michael W. Fox, Patricia Forkan, Dr. John W. Grandy

2. Reaching the High School Student Patty Finch

3. Cults and Animal Sacrifice: A Growing Menace Dr. Randall Lockwood, Marc S. Paulhus

4. Successful Campaigns: How to Launch One in Your Community Deborah Reed, Pat Ragan, Kate Rindy

5. Pound Seizure Update Dr. Martin Stephens, Barbara Cassidy

8:00 p.m.
FEATURE PRESENTATION:

“Voices from The Sea”
Dr. Roger Payne

SATURDAY, OCT. 28

8:00 a.m.-11:00 a.m.
REGISTRATION

9:00 a.m.-10:30 a.m.
WORKSHOPS

1. Wildlife in Peril: Elephant and Chimpanzee Update Dr. Susan Lieberman, Dr. Martin Stephens

2. Killing with Kindness Dr. Randall Lockwood, Barbara Cassidy

3. Humane Education: A Round Table Discussion Patty Finch

4. Cruelty Investigations and the Criminal Justice System Eric Sakach, Kurt Lapham


10:30 a.m.
Coffee Break

11:00 a.m.
HSUS Annual Membership Meeting Presentation of Resolutions President’s Report

2:00 p.m.-5:00 p.m.
On Your Own

6:30 p.m.
Reception/Cash Bar

7:30 p.m.
AWARDS BANQUET
John A. Hoyt, master of ceremonies
Presentation of the James Herriot Award Presentation of the Joseph Wood Krutch Medal

Adjournment of Conference
You Can Help the Animal Shelter in Your Town... Even if you never go there.

You can help your local animal shelter care for unwanted animals even if you don't work or volunteer there.

Buy a subscription to Shelter Sense for the shelter staff. Shelter Sense gives shelter workers the information they need to provide the best care for the animals.

YES! I'd like to help the animal shelter in my community. Please send a one-year subscription to Shelter Sense.

How? Use this handy coupon.

BE A P.A.L. T-SHIRT ORDER FORM

YES! Please send my BE A P.A.L. T-shirt right away. I enclose $____ for ___Small ___Medium ___Large ___X-Large T-shirt(s) at $7.00 each. Make check payable to The HSUS. Do not send cash in the mail.

Name ____________________________
Address __________________________
City __________________ State ______ Zip ______

Please allow 4-6 weeks for delivery. We ship UPS; please include a street address. Send payment and order form to:

The HSUS, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037
MY NAME IS ORANGE BAND

By Robert J. Waller

The thought is a haunting one. It comes to me at odd times, unpredictable moments. I might be playing my guitar, or reading, or just driving along in the car. And suddenly I'm thinking about a fellow named Orange Band. I never met him, and I never will.

His name resulted from a small strip of plastic around his leg. I used to think he deserved a better handle. In Latin, he was *Ammodramus nigrescens*, but that seemed too coldly scientific and species-like, in the same way I am *Homo sapiens*. What was needed, I thought, was a name that captured in a word or two his unique place in the scheme of things. Something that identified him as being the very last of his kind, that succinctly conveyed the isolation of his existence. A name that somehow reflected the infinite loneliness that must accompany a state of undiluted unity. For he was perfectly and unalterably alone.

But, in the end, I decided that Orange Band was a good name for him. He was plain, and he was gritty, and it suited him well. Besides, the simplicity of such a name is more than fitting if you are the only remaining dusky seaside sparrow and there is no one left to call it out. If I were the last of *Homo sapiens*, I think I would take such a name. And, I would sit with my back against a granite ledge, near a river in a distant twilight-colored blue, and say, “I am Orange Band,” listening to the words come back to me through the trees and along the grass.

How do we measure loneliness? If the counting bears any relationship to the number of your species still around, then Orange Band was lonely. It had not always been so. The duskies were common once in the marshes of Merritt Island, Florida. They were six inches long, blackish above, with a yellow patch near the eye, streaked in black and white lower down, and sang a buzzy song resembling that of a red-winged blackbird.

That was before we slowly pitched our faces skyward and murmured, “Space.” Along with the mathematics of flight and the hardware to take us there, we had to deal with the nasty problem of mosquitoes that plagued the Kennedy Space Center. For reasons known only to people who conjure up such things, flooding the Merritt Island marshlands nearby seemed to be the answer to the mosquito problem. The water rose and took with it the nests of the dusky seaside sparrows.

There was one other place, just one, where the duskies lived. Propelled by conservationist pressures, the federal government lurched into action and spent something over $2 million to purchase 6,250 acres along the St. John's River. There were two thousand of the little songbirds living there. Ah, but highways came. Always, the highways come. They come to bring more people who will need more highways that will bring more people who will need more highways. The marshes were drained for road construction, and fire swept through the dry grass of the nesting grounds. Pesticides did the rest.

By 1979, only six dusky seaside sparrows could be found along the river. Five of them were captured. None was female. The last female had been sighted in 1975.

The *New York Times* duly noted the problem in the August 31, 1983, edition under a headline that read: “Five Sparrows, All Male, Sing for a Female to Save Species.” And just below the *Times* article, in one of those ethereal juxtapositions that sometimes occur in newspaper layouts, was an advertisement for a chi-chi clothing store called “Breakaway.”

The copy above a photo of a smartly turned-out woman went like this:

You strive for spontaneity
To take life as it comes
The perfect complement to your
dynamic lifestyle
Our natural silver fox jacket
Now during our Labor Day celebra-
tion save $1,000.00 off the original
price
Originally $3,990.00
Now $2,990.00

In the swamps of Florida, spontaneity was on hold. So were dynamic lifestyles. The five male duskies were brought to Disney World’s Discovery Island, were pensioned off and made comfortable. Orange Band was about
eight years old.

So it was, not far from the place where we launch for other worlds, that a different kind of countdown began. By 1985, there were three of the little males left. Then, one died in September of that year. On March 31, 1986, a second one died. That left Orange Band, by himself.

Now and then, I would think of Orange Band alone in his cage. The last member of the rarest species known to us. He became blind in one eye, became old for a sparrow, and yet he persisted, as if he knew his sole task was to sustain the bloodline as long as possible. I wondered if he wondered, if he felt sorrow or excruciating panic at the thought of his oneness. Surely, he felt loneliness.

Charles Cook, curator of the zoo, issued periodic bulletins: "As far as we can tell, for a little bird like that, he seems to be doing fine."

Still, it was inevitable. On June 18, 1987, a Washington Post headline said: "Goodbye, Dusky Seaside Sparrow." Orange Band, blind in one eye, old and alone, was gone. He died by himself on June 17, with no one, either human or bird, around.

But the day Orange Band died there was a faint sound out there in the universe. Hardly noticeable unless you were expecting it and listening. It was a small cry, the last one, that arched upward from a cage in Florida, ricocheted along galactic highways and skimmed past the scorched parts of an old moon rocket still in orbit. If you were listening closely, though, you could hear it... "I am zero."

Extinct. The sound of the word is like the single blow of a hammer on cold steel. And, each day, the hammer falls again as another species becomes extinct due to human activity. This is about four hundred times the rate of natural extinction.

In open defiance of the International Whaling Commission, Japan and Iceland continue to slaughter whales under the guise of "research." The real reason, however, is to supply the inexhaustible Japanese appetite for whale flesh. The great California condors are all in cages now. Less than twenty of the black-footed ferrets remain. The number of mountain gorillas has declined to under 450. The black duck is in serious trouble; nobody knows just how much trouble for sure. Over six million dolphins have been killed accidentally by the Pacific tuna fleet in the last thirty years. And have you noticed the decline of songbirds in Iowa?

The count rises, year after year. Roughly eleven hundred plants and animals specifically are identified on the endangered and threatened species list at the present time, but nobody really knows for sure how long the list should be. The reason is that science has not yet determined exactly how many species exist, and the job of identification is a long way from completion. With the clear-cutting of the tropical rain forests throughout the world, the numbers could be astronomical. For example, Brazil is losing forest at a rate of five thousand square miles per year, and some estimates of species yet unknown in the tropical forests range as high as one million.

But we press on. With highways and toxic waste and all-terrain vehicles and acid rain and pesticides and the straightening of pretty creeks to gain an extra acre or two on which to grow surplus crops. In the name of progress and something called "development," we press on, though we seem reluctant to define exactly what it is we seek. That definition, you see, likely is too frightening to contemplate, for the answer along our present course might be nothing other than "more."

More of what? Nothing in particular. Just more. We must have more, always more, for if we stopped, we would have less of that nothing in particular.

So the citizens buzz over blood and money around the boxing rings of Atlantic City and worry, ludicrously, about holding wine glasses properly and titter in a breathless way over Cher's ruthlessly libidinous gown at the Academy Award ceremonies. And each day, the hammer falls again. And, each day, another small cry arches upward; slowly and forever, it arches upward. And sometimes I sit with my back against a granite ledge, near a river in a distant twilight-colored "blue, and say, "I am Orange Band," and the words come back alone through the trees and along the grass.
NO CONTEST

The former owner of a Docktor Pet Center in Sacramento, Calif., has been found guilty of failing to provide adequate nutrition and humane treatment for animals in his care.

Warren Ruben pleaded no contest to three counts of misdemeanor pet-store code violations, the result of a year-long investigation by West Coast Regional Investigator Kurt Lapham and the Department of Consumer and Environmental Affairs of the Sacramento County District Attorney’s Office. Mr. Ruben was fined $1,500 and sentenced to perform 150 hours of community service. He is prohibited from dealing in pet sales, including breeding his own animals, for three years.

NEVADA RAID

A suspected major dogfighting operation was shut down in mid-April when Pershing County, Nev., sheriff’s deputies, assisted by local, state, and federal law-enforcement and narcotics agents, executed a search warrant on the property of James A. Hand, of Imlay.

The raid was the first of its kind in Nevada. It resulted in one of the largest seizures of fighting dogs in the nation to date. Assisting in the action were agents from the Tri-County Narcotics Task Force, Pershing County sheriff’s office, the HSUS West Coast Regional Office, the Nevada Humane Society, the Humboldt County sheriff’s office, the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration, animal-control officers from Pershing and Humboldt counties, and the Nevada State fire marshall’s office.

The agents seized thirty-six pit-bull terriers, a permanent dogfighting pit, scores of underground dogfighting publications, and other paraphernalia as evidence. Mr. Hand was arrested for keeping a place where illegal dogfights are staged, keeping dogs for the purpose of fighting, and other violations.

Investigators believe the raid in Imlay will yield a gold mine of information on dogfighters all over the country. “We found leads on key players in other states,” said West Coast Regional Investigator Eric Sakach, who assisted in the raid. “Nevada is one of the few states where dogfighting is still just a misdemeanor, which makes it particularly attractive to dogfighters fearful of felony penalties.”

IN THE NORTHWEST

Kurt Lapham recently conducted a workshop on investigation techniques for about fifty officers at the Oregon Animal Control Officer’s Conference in Eugene. From there, he went to the Annual Conference of the Washington Federation of Humane Societies in Kennewick, where he met with association members.

TAKE YOUR PICK

The HSUS’s Animal Control Academy will be coming to the Red Lion Inn/Sea Tac in Seattle, Wash., July 10-21, 1989. The Nugget Courtyard Lodge will be the site of another session October 9-20, 1989, in Reno/Sparks, Nev.

Interested in attending either session? Contact Bill Smith at The Animal Control Academy, 5126-A McFarland Blvd., East, Tuscaloosa, AL 35405 or call (205) 752-0058.

THERE OUGHTA BE A LAW

A bill in the California legislature has been amended to make the eating of dogs or cats a misdemeanor. A.B. 1842 would make it illegal to import, own, possess, buy, sell, or kill a dog or cat with the sole intent of using it for food. This legislation arose from a Long Beach, Calif., case which a judge dismissed, suggesting that the issue be addressed legislatively.
APRIL PROTEST

About thirty members of The HSUS, Humane Society of Greater Kansas City, and People for Animal Rights picketed the University of Kansas Medical Center (UKMC) in April to bring to public attention the unnecessary suffering of animals in biomedical research.

The primary goal of this group, which included Midwest Regional Director Wendell Maddox, was to gain access to the UKMC research labs and representation on the facility’s animal care and use committee, which reviews protocol for animal research.

The group vowed to continue to work towards gaining access to the facility and representation on the committee.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

In Missouri, efforts to legalize pari-mutuel dog racing continued when bills were introduced by Rep. Ronnie DePasco and Sen. Henry Panethiere. For the fourth straight year, due to strong opposition from The HSUS and other animal-protection groups, these bills were defeated.

Unfortunately, other defeated measures included legislation to require convictions for those involved in cockfighting, a new law to require state licensing and inspection of commercial breeding operations (puppy mills), and a measure which would limit sources for research animals to purpose-bred only.

In Iowa, an effort to reduce the state’s expenditures for controlling illegal drug use and veterinary care for race horses, requested by the Iowa Racing Commission, fortunately, met with defeat. The bill would have eliminated the present law requiring horses racing on drugs to be so listed in the racing program; eliminated the need for a veterinarian to test for the presence of other drugs if Lasix were found; and dropped the requirement to keep records on horses determined to be sick, unsafe, unsound, or unfit to race.

In Nebraska, a bill was passed that creates a statute requiring registration and proper confinement of dogs determined to be dangerous or vicious.

FOX SPEAKS

Michael W. Fox, vice president of The HSUS, spoke at the third annual “Animal Awareness Dinner,” sponsored by the Capitol Humane Society, in Lincoln, Neb.

Mr. Maddox, who also attended the gathering, praised the Capitol Humane Society’s work and its Lincoln operation.

STUDENT’S CHOICE

New Jersey Assemblywomen Maureen Ogden and Lisa Randall are sponsoring A. 4129, a bill that allows students to choose an alternative to classroom dissection.

Representatives of the Associated Humane Societies, the New Jersey Animal Rights Alliance, and The HSUS testified in favor of the bill.

In the first New Jersey case of its kind, Maggie McCool has asked education commissioner Saul Cooperman to stop her school board from lowering her marks in biology because she refused to do dissections. Ms. McCool is a vegetarian who believes killing or dissecting animals is wrong.

SEE YOU IN SEPTEMBER

A workshop sponsored by the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office is planned for September 11 and 12 at the Allentown Hilton in Allentown, Pa. Sessions on rabies, shelter procedures, New Jersey’s spay/neuter program, fund-raising, and satanic rituals are planned. For further information, contact the HSUS Mid-Atlantic Regional Office, Bartley Square, 270 Route 206, Flanders, NJ 07836.
The Southeast Regional Office is finding widespread legislative support in Florida for a number of bills, including one that would make Florida the third state in the country with felony penalties in its general animal-cruelty law. The proposal calls for those who torture an animal with intent to cause intense pain, physical suffering, or death to face a maximum sentence of five years in jail and/or a $5,000 fine.

We developed and lobbied extensively for another bill that greatly expands health requirements for dogs and cats purchased from pet stores and in-state breeders. Yet another bill would clarify and strengthen the current law regulating the use of animals in grades kindergarten through twelve and limit the dissection of dead animals to a select number of advanced students. A student could be excused from participating in any dissection with a written note from a parent or guardian.

**BOYCOTT TUNA**

A campaign is underway in Florida to publicize the killing of dolphins by tuna fishermen and promote a boycott of tuna products. The HSUS’s southeast office joined the Tallahassee Earth Island Center in May in a rally at the state capitol. More than sixty people participated, asking the governor to stop the purchase of tuna products by all state institutions.

Supporters of a tuna boycott rally at the Florida State Capitol to save dolphins from needless death.

**DEATH IN VERMONT**

New England Regional Program Coordinator Frank Ribaudo responded in April to a report that twenty-eight veal calves had been found dead behind a barn in Richford, Vt. The calves, part of a franchised veal-calf farming operation, had died over a six-month period. He found evidence of antibiotics, used to keep animals raised in small stalls and almost total darkness from becoming sick.

The owner of the veal farm had started his operation following the federal government’s dairy farm buy-out program several years ago. He attributed the high mortality rate of the calves to his inexperience in the business. Local officials did not file charges against the owner, who plans to phase out his veal-calf business.

While investigating the veal-farm deaths, Mr. Ribaudo was asked to assist local and state officials on a pig farm cruelty case.

At the “Hog Heaven” swine farm in Highgate, Vt., authorities discovered 21 dead pigs among 139 living in overcrowded pens. Many animals were eating the carcasses of dead animals. One pig with a broken leg had to be euthanized.

Mr. Ribaudo photographed both live and dead animals as evidence in the cruelty case brought against owner John Reynolds.

Mr. Reynolds was charged with twenty-one counts of cruelty for letting his pigs starve to death. Mr. Reynolds, too, plans to close his operation.

**USING OUR PULL**

Oxen, horse, and pony-pulling contests are the subject of an ongoing investigation by the New England Regional Office. Working in cooperation with humane society agents, state officials, veterinarians, and informants throughout New England, the regional staff has documented serious problems that have been addressed by legislators and state fair leaders in all six New England states.

The HSUS’s New England Regional Office offers a $1,000 reward for information leading to the arrest and conviction of anyone who cruelly treats any animal in pulling contests.
After seven years of effort, animal protectionists in West Virginia have succeeded in making pound seizure illegal. They prevailed against opposition from West Virginia University and a lobbying group called the Animal Research Information Committee. The committee had its own bill introduced which would have made pound seizure mandatory. That bill died quickly when public opinion showed overwhelming opposition to the release of pets for research.

The Great Lakes Regional Office, in conjunction with the Kanawha Action for Animals and other groups, worked intensely on passage of the legislation.

The Great Lakes staff monitors conditions such as those in Jackson County, Ohio, where this building serves as the shelter.

REWARDS IN INDIANA

We gained another victory when the Indiana legislature failed to pass legislation that would have legalized gambling on greyhound racing. Hoosiers wrote letters, placed ads in newspapers, and attended a protest at the state capitol. Past experience in other states has shown the issue will again surface, and Hoosiers are already making plans for future legislative battles on the issue.

RECORD ATTENDANCE

More than one hundred cruelty investigators attended the workshop, “A Professional Approach to More Effective Cruelty Investigations,” on May 10 and 11 in Bowling Green, Ohio. Sponsored jointly by the Great Lakes Regional Office and the Bowling Green Police Division, the workshop stressed the importance of instruction and education for offenders, saving prosecution as a last resort.

The HSUS’s Pat Parkes (left) and Michigan’s Ann Sullivan join Dr. Dale Griffis at the cruelty investigator’s workshop in May.

SPREADING THE WORD

James Noe wrote to 317 shelters giving them guidance on permits for sodium pentobarbital euthanasia. Many shelters still use T-61 and other cruel methods for euthanasia; we hope to educate them in more humane methods.
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**APPROPRIATIONS MATTERS**

Congress holds the purse strings for federal agencies, including those of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), two agencies that address laboratory animal testing and alternatives. With this in mind, The HSUS has played a key role in reminding Congress of the importance of including specific language on alternatives in its appropriations bills.

Recently, former senators John Melcher and Paul Tsongas testified on behalf of The HSUS before congressional committees on NIH and EPA appropriations to discuss alternatives issues. Sen. Melcher, focusing on NIH, told Senate and House committees that adequate funding was critical to ensure laboratory compliance with the Animal Welfare Act amendments, including the Melcher amendment, which addresses the psychological well-being of chimpanzees. He also underscored the importance of NIH emphasis on alternatives. In senate EPA appropriations hearings, Sen. Tsongas focused on the EPA's failure to meet a congressional mandate to be a leader in the alternatives issue and to provide the Congress with an annual report specifically outlining what it has done in alternatives research and development.

**EFFORTS FOR ELEPHANTS**

Rep. Frank Horton of New York has recently introduced H. Con. Res. 129, which expresses the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of the Interior should list the African elephant as an endangered species. We worked closely with the congressman's office on the resolution's wording and his remarks on the floor of the House, and we will also assist in efforts to gain cosponsors for the bill.

Meanwhile, President George Bush has announced a total U.S. ban on the importation of ivory, at least until CITES meets. Nevertheless, while this is welcome news, it does not provide the African elephant with the highest level of protection—endangered species status. Banning ivory is a critical first step, but only full endangered status will also end interstate commerce in elephant ivory.

Our government has been joined by the European community, including the United Kingdom, France, Spain, Belgium, Germany, and Italy, in banning all ivory imports.

The Department of the Interior has proposed placing the African elephant on Appendix I of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). With this announcement, the United States joins seven other nations in working to declare the elephant endangered under the CITES agreement. However, the proposal may not pass CITES and, even if it does, the elephant would not be placed on the list until January 1990. Thousands of elephants would die before the proposal goes into effect. To strengthen our position in having the elephant placed on Appendix I, we should be able to show that we have already moved to take domestic action on this critical issue by placing the elephant on our endangered species list. Passage of the Horton resolution could provide that proof. Urge your representative to support H. Con. Res. 129.

Placing the elephant on Appendix I of CITES is an important step forward, but we must stand firm nationally by placing the elephant on our own endangered species list.

This rising groundswell in support of the African elephant reflects the importance and power of public pressure in achieving animal-protection victories.

**WELCOME REINTRODUCTIONS**

Rep. Barbara Boxer of California has reintroduced H.R. 1676. The Consumer Products Safe Testing Act would prohibit the use of the results of the painful LD-50 Test by federal agencies; phase out the Draize Eye-Irritancy Test; and require the use of non-animal toxicity tests by companies unless federal agencies found, in a specific situation, that only an animal test could be used to establish human safety. Under such circumstances, the federal agency would be required to publish in the Federal Register its intentions to permit the use of an animal test in a specific situation and would have to permit public comment on its plans.

The LD-50 is an inhumane and scientifically weak test which uses forty to two hundred animals per test, (usually rats, mice, guinea pigs or, less frequently, rabbits, dogs, and primates). The goal is to determine how much of the substance will kill half the test group. The advancement of alternatives and clear evidence that alternatives are both more humane and better science make the continuation of the LD-50 Test unsupportable.

H.R. 1676 has been referred to the House Subcommittee on Health and the Environment. Last year, the house bill had more than two hundred cosponsors. Although hearings were held, it did not make it out of committee.

Traffic in ivory trinkets spells doom for African elephants unless stringent protective measures are taken. President Bush's action in June, while most welcome, was not enough.
Many rabbits would be spared the Draize Test under H.R. 1676.

This year, a similar bill has been introduced in the Senate by Sen. Harry Reid of Nevada as S.891 and sent to the Senate Commerce Committee. It has not yet been referred to a subcommittee.

The HSUS has been lobbying legislators to move this bill and has met with key staff aides to discuss possible hearings. Please write your house and senate members, ask for their cosponsorship of the bill, and request house members to have House Health and the Environment Subcommittee chairman Henry Waxman move the bill out of subcommittee as quickly as possible. Senate subcommittee hearings will also be very important, so contact senate members urging them to seek hearings as well.

With growing concern over pesticides and toxic substances in cosmetics and food, the public deserves more emphasis on alternatives, which hold the key to better human health and can produce results quickly, at less cost, and more effectively than tests like the LD-50 and Draize.

NEW BILL ON VEAL

In June, the House Agriculture Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry Subcommittee (Rep. Charles W. Stenholm, chairman), and the House Department Operations Subcommittee (Rep. George E. Brown, chairman) were scheduled to hold a hearing on H.R. 84, the Veal Calf Protection Act.

H.R. 84 specifically prescribes an expanded minimum space for a calf in an enclosure. It provides for an appropriate amount of physical contact and requires calf feed to include some solid food and meet certain USDA standards.

The HSUS supports H.R. 84 as providing minimal standards for calf rearing. HSUS Vice President Michael W. Fox was scheduled to testify in support of the bill on behalf of The HSUS.

Please write Rep. Charles W. Stenholm (226 Longworth House Building, Washington, DC 20515) thanking him for his interest in a hearing on H.R. 84 and ask him to mark up the bill and report it to the House Agriculture Committee as soon as possible. Write your legislator and ask him or her to join with Rep. Bennett as a co-sponsor of the bill. Finally, write to Rep. Charles E. Bennett (2107 Rayburn Building, Washington, DC 20515) thanking him for taking such a courageous step in introducing a bill to protect veal calves.

SUPPORT FOR REFUGES

Rep. Bill Green of New York recently reintroduced H.R. 1693, The Refuge Wildlife Protection Act of (now) 1989, which would prohibit killing wildlife for sport, recreation, or commercial purposes on national wildlife refuges. It would also establish clear guidelines that would have to be followed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for handling wildlife-management problems.

The HSUS is leading coalition efforts with a number of other groups, including the American Humane Association and the Massachusetts SPCA, to see this bill passed. You can help by requesting that House Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment Subcommittee chairman Gerry Studds (237 Cannon House Building, Washington, DC 20515) hold hearings on this key bill.

Please note: letters to senators should be addressed: The Honorable __, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510.

Letters to representatives should be addressed: The Honorable __, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC 20515.
PROBLEMS AFTER CRUELTY TRIALS

Some of the more exasperating aspects of prosecutions of defendants charged with cruelty or neglect can occur after the trial—the stage of the proceeding when a sentence is imposed and the court decides upon the disposition of the animals involved. In the worst-case scenario, even if a conviction is obtained, a judge feels constrained by a statute limiting punishment to fine or imprisonment and actually orders the return of the animal to the convicted defendant, a disposition that usually makes little sense from the point of view of the animal’s welfare. In other cases, similar perceived constraints often prevent the judge from prohibiting future ownership of animals by the defendant or thwart more creative sentencing, such as allowing the defendant to keep animals but under the official supervision of a local humane society, which would have the right to enter and inspect the defendant’s premises at will.

The cost of keeping the animal prior to and during the trial can also be problematic. Frequently, the local society or authorities must maintain the defendant’s animal at considerable cost for several weeks—or even several months—pending trial. At the conclusion of the trial, in the absence of a statute allowing the court to levy such costs directly upon the defendant, the animals often become a kind of financial football—mere collateral which are sold or auctioned off, to an unknown fate, in order to satisfy such costs.

While these problems vary in severity from state to state, depending upon the post-trial procedural statute under which a given state’s courts operate, the number of disturbing incidents reported to the HSUS general counsel’s office suggests a need for a model post-trial procedural statute centered upon the welfare of the animals involved. Under no circumstances should an animal be returned to a defendant actually convicted of cruelty or neglect. The post-trial procedural statute should provide for forfeiture of not only the animals that were the actual victims of cruelty or neglect, but also, arguably, all animals kept by a convicted defendant. Such animals should be placed with a local humane society for adoption, other placement, or, when circumstances warrant, euthanasia. If the defendant is allowed to keep animals other than the ones involved in the prosecution, the court should be empowered to order that the defendant’s keeping of such animals be subject to the supervision of a local humane society or other knowledgeable authority.

The costs of maintaining the animal during the prosecution should be levied directly against the defendant’s income and assets other than the animals involved, and procedures should ensure that the animals do not become mere collateral or end up in the hands of dealers during an auction or other forced sale to satisfy the case costs.

Ideally, even an acquittal should not end the court’s intervention on behalf of an animal. An acquittal may simply mean that the state has not met its burden of presenting enough evidence to prove each element of the offense beyond a reasonable doubt. There may still have been substantial evidence of abuse or neglect even when the defendant is found not guilty of the charges against him or her. Consequently, a progressive statute should provide for a post-acquittal custody hearing in which the court would determine, in light of the best interests of the animal, whether the defendant is a fit person to have custody of the animal. In so determining, the court should take into account a variety of evidence, including testimony not admissible in a criminal trial, and should have the power, if the animal is returned to the defendant, to impose conditions or to order supervision or monitoring by humane officials.

Such provisions would amount to a minor revolution in the interaction of criminal procedure and animal-welfare law in that the proceedings would focus less on the punishment of the defendant and more on the overall, long-term welfare of the animals involved. In providing for a post-acquittal custody hearing and not making the ultimate fate of the animal automatically depend upon the outcome of the criminal trial, a progressive statute would signal a shift away from regarding animals merely as property or evidence and more toward a concept of animals as, in the words of the Court of Appeals of Georgia, “the special watch and ward” of the state, similar to the status minor children currently have in law.

The general counsel’s office would welcome receiving reports from local societies or humane activists who have experienced similar or different problems after trials of cruelty cases, so that we may be able to take such information into account in completing the drafting of the model statute.

The Law Notes are compiled by HSUS General Counsel Mur­dough Stuart Madden and As­sociate Counsel Roger Kindler.
We are pleased to offer HSUS members two winter scenes to carry their 1989 season's greetings. The Chickadees perch on a mailbox decorated with holiday greenery, while the Kittens with Wreath seem to find themselves in the midst of a predictably feline bit of holiday mischief. Each card is 7" x 5" and in full color. Both contain the message “Peace on Earth/Goodwill to All Creatures.”

Each package of twenty-five cards and envelopes costs $7—$6 each if you order four or more packages of any assortment. Supplies are limited, so make your selection early!

---

Greeting Card Order Form

Please send me:

| Packages of Kittens with Wreath |
| Packages of The Chickadees |
| TOTAL packages ordered |
| ($7 per package for 1–3 boxes; $6 per package for 4 or more boxes) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Quantity</th>
<th>Cost per Package</th>
<th>Total Amount Enclosed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–3 x $7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more x $6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please send the cards to:

Name __________________________
Address ________________________
City ___________________ State ___ Zip _____

(Use the label provided on the back of this magazine or write your name and address in the space above. Please provide a street address since we cannot ship to P.O. boxes.)

Make all checks or money orders payable to The HSUS and send with this coupon to HSUS Greeting Cards, 2100 L St., NW, Washington, DC 20037. All orders must be prepaid.
We often assume that all children love animals. Unfortunately, that's not always true. Children have to be taught to care, especially if they are to grow up to be caring, concerned adults.

That's why humane education is so important. You can help make it happen in our schools by participating in the HSUS "Adopt-A-Teacher" program. It's quick and easy!

For more information, write to The National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education, a division of The HSUS, P.O. Box 362G, East Haddam, CT 06423.