HEARTFELT "THANKS!"

The National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE) would like to thank sincerely all of those individuals and organizations that have participated in the Adopt-A-Teacher program this past year. The Adopt-A-Teacher program is NAAHE's primary vehicle for disseminating humane education materials. Through this program, "adopters" provide gift subscriptions of Children & Animals magazine and Kind News, a newspaper for children, to elementary-school teachers nationwide.

Although hundreds of groups and individuals have participated in NAAHE's Adopt-A-Teacher program, space does not permit recognition of all of them here. The following list cites those people and organizations that had, as of November 1, 1988, adopted ten or more teachers in 1988. To these and to everyone who has participated, NAAHE extends heartfelt gratitude:


If you or your organization has not yet participated in NAAHE's Adopt-A-Teacher program, don't delay! For information, contact NAAHE, P.O. Box 362 N, East Haddam, CT 06423.

MEL L. MORSE—AN APPRECIATION

Last June, Mel L. Morse of the Helen Woodward Animal Center in California died of a heart ailment. Mr. Morse was president of The HSUS from 1967 to 1970 and received a Joseph Wood Krutch award in 1977. HSUS President John Hoyt delivered the following remarks at Mr. Morse's memorial service.

Mel Morse was not a unique person, yet neither was he a typical person. He was in ways most of us admire an individualist, for he knew where he was going and what it was he wanted to accomplish.

He was very much a community person, a man whose broad social and political interests were both local and national in scope. He was a leader of exceptional stature, and the warmth and vigor of his personality inspired and motivated those his life touched.

Mel Morse was a crusader, but not in a fanatical or messianic sense. In this respect, he was inherently modest, for neither his character nor the goals he strove for needed the approbation of others. The Mel we met in public was the same Mel we knew in private. He was genuine through and through.

Mel loved animals, but not in a sentimental or frivolous sense. He was deeply concerned for their welfare and protection and he articulated that concern with both conviction and reason. And though perhaps unknown and unread by those who preach the new gospel of animal rights today, Mel's book The Ordeal of the Animals still stands as a hallmark in exposing those whose exploitation of animals was for too long ignored and in prickling the conscience of a nation that permitted such practices to go unchallenged. It was the primer that introduced me to the animal-protection movement in 1969, and the "message." I am sure, that has challenged and motivated thousands of others to seek justice for these, our fellow creatures. Mel loved a challenge of any kind, and none was more dear to him than conceiving and building the Helen Woodward Animal Center, an achievement that will stand as a memorial to him as well as to Helen Woodward. For it was his vision, his perseverance, and his ability to meld together diverse interests into a common focus that caused this institution to come into being. He loved this project passionately, and it bespeaks the spirit and character of Mel Morse more than any of his other works, many and far-reaching though they be.

Mel Morse was not a saint, nor did he ever seek to be one. Yet he was a man of deep religious conviction and profound spiritual depths. Above all, he loved his family, and one could not be with Mel for more than a few minutes without hearing of the deep affection and unparalleled pride he had for every member of that family.

So, it is with sadness that we acknowledge the giving up of one whom we have known and loved, and one who has loved us also. And though we have lost a part of what we once had, we also retain much of what we have lost. And, in the belief that some things can never be lost or taken away, we give thanks with joy for the life and person of Mel L. Morse.
Spreading the Good Word
New HSUS guidelines could help livestock

The widespread confinement rearing of livestock, dairy, and poultry species has become a form of institutionalized cruelty that places the animals' physical and behavioral needs in jeopardy. Animals grow more quickly, mature sooner, breed earlier, and die younger—continually pushed for greater productivity at the cost of their overall health and well-being.

In order to emphasize the basics of good animal-husbandry practices, The HSUS recently developed humane guidelines for raising livestock, poultry, and dairy animals. The guidelines are a first step in our efforts to have minimal humane housing and husbandry standards established for these species, both in the United States and around the world. We have sent our guidelines to animal scientists, animal-protection organizations, university extension agents, and agencies sponsoring livestock-development projects abroad for their information and comments.

The guidelines emphasize seven primary conditions for humane operation:
• Livestock and poultry must be provided with general living conditions that respect both their physical and behavioral needs. These include adequate living space, adequate shelter with periodic access to the outdoors, a nutritious diet with an emphasis on organic feeds and forages, good stewardship from responsible caretakers, and better handling and care during transportation and slaughter.
• Housing systems such as veal crates, battery cages for layer hens, and gestation and farrowing crates for swine are not permitted.
• Surgical husbandry procedures such as castration, tail docking, and dehorning must be done using anesthesia. In many cases, these procedures are not necessary if adequate husbandry measures have been taken.
• Animals should generally be maintained in small groups rather than housed individually, since most are social beings and draw comfort from being with others. They need enough space for exercise and to perform basic behaviors such as nesting and rooting.
• The use of antibiotics is not permitted except to treat specific disease conditions in livestock and poultry.
• Transportation stresses should be minimized by purchasing and marketing animals from local producers and thereby bypassing the health hazards and stresses of auction markets as much as possible.
• All animals must be adequately stunned before slaughter.

Although these guidelines seem to include only the most basic requirements of care, the majority of our livestock and poultry are raised in systems that do not meet these standards.

The HSUS guidelines are intended for producers to improve their operations from the perspective of humaneness. There are, however, specific strategies that consumers can adapt to further the humane care of farm animals. We offer the following suggestions:
• Eat less meat. Your health may be improved, fewer animals will be reared under inhumane conditions, and the environment and wildlife populations will be spared considerable harm.
• Transportation stresses should be minimized by purchasing and marketing animals from local producers and thereby bypassing the health hazards and stresses of auction markets as much as possible.

The overconsumption of calories, pro-
tein, fat, saturated fatty acids, and cholesterol has become a serious problem for millions of consumers, and animal products are prime sources of these food components. The average American eats twice as much protein as is needed, with almost 70 percent derived from animal sources. Although the American Heart Association and others recommend that no more than 30 percent of our calories be derived from fat, Americans eat a third more fat than is recommended, and nearly 60 percent comes from animal sources. Virtually all of our dietary cholesterol is derived from animal products. Bacterial organisms such as salmonella and campylobacter are commonly found in beef, poultry, and other meats and can cause serious—even fatal—human illness.

We overproduce, overconsume, and waste meat, all of which, directly and indirectly, increases animal suffering. Less market demand for meat means fewer animals produced.

Any decline in meat consumption benefits the environment and preserves a larger share of wildlife habitat, as well. Many of our soil-erosion, groundwater-depletion, and deforestation problems, which so threaten sustainable food production today, are the result of the livestock industry. Livestock wastes from confinement housing and feedlots have polluted our rivers, lakes, and streams. Damage to the land, water, and air destroys the environment in which wildlife raise their young and poisons their food and water supply.

Modern meat-based agriculture is also a major contributor to the so-called greenhouse effect, a serious global climatic problem.

• Buy meat and dairy products more selectively. Try to find locally or regionally raised and marketed meat and dairy products and patronize these producers and their outlets. You may be surprised to know that 25 percent of the dollar value of our livestock and poultry industries is produced by farms around metropolitan areas, according to the USDA, and the number of these "urban" farms is actually increasing. Consumers, then, stand a reasonable chance of finding locally or regionally produced livestock and poultry. Farmers typically receive only thirty cents of every food dollar that you spend at the supermarket; the other seventy cents are swallowed up in marketing costs. The more you support your local farmers, the more stable this segment of the farm economy will be. Local farms are more likely to be independently owned and less likely to invest capital in confinement housing. They also tend to have fewer animals, so managers can take better care of them. You'll want to confirm this for yourself, however, so ask to see the animals. Locally produced and slaughtered animals are not forced to undergo so much transportation stress as are those reared far from where they are consumed.

• Specifically ask for humanely raised meat at your supermarket. Consumers have tremendous clout in the marketplace. Market research shows that people are willing to try new products even when priced at a premium, and the food industry, though conservative in nature, will offer consumers whatever is needed to protect its market share and profits. The July 1988 issue of the Penn Ag Journal reports, "If the public demands and is willing to pay for chickens to be raised outdoors, someone will step forward to meet the demand." Two large East Coast supermarket chains have made tentative steps to offer concerned consumers a choice in their meat buying: Grand Union is marketing humanely produced beef and chicken products, and two Giant stores near Washington, D.C., are test-marketing humanely produced eggs called Nest Eggs.

Your grocer needs to know that you want the meat you buy to be humanely produced and that the large-scale confinement housing systems are not humane. Emphasize that you want to support local and regional livestock and poultry producers, if possible, and suggest any names of producers that you know about. If the manager wants more information, have him or her contact The HSUS or the Organic Foods Production Association of North America (P.O. Box 31, Belchertown, MA 01007). Since Americans spend more than $50 billion a year on meat and poultry products, the opportunity is ours to see that this staggering amount of money does not support inhumane animal-rearing practices.

Some consumers will feel that no measures taken to support the humane raising of livestock and poultry can be enough and may choose the path of vegetarianism. At this time, however, most people do eat meat. We believe the measures outlined above can help Americans shift to a more humane and sustainable agriculture.

For a copy of The HSUS's Recommended Humane Guidelines for Raising Livestock, Poultry, and Dairy Animals, contact the Farm Animals/Bioethics Department of The HSUS, 2100 L St., NW, Washington, DC 20037.
MARINE LIFE

Great Walls of Death
Driftnet expedition exposes destruction

A six-member volunteer expedition funded, in part, by The HSUS and several other animal-protection organizations, returned in October from a dangerous North Pacific Ocean voyage, bringing with it the first documentary footage of the devastation wreaked upon marine life by the world's largest driftnet fishery.

The video footage, which was shot underwater, aboard and alongside vessels of the Asian red-squid driftnet fleet, reveals the senseless suffering of countless ocean animals and the massive, rapid destruction of the marine ecosystem inherent in the driftnet method of fishing.

Drowned dolphins, rare turtles, and seabirds were videotaped entangled in driftnets. Some animals still alive and feebly struggling are shown being hauled in by fishermen along with vast, ecologically unsafe amounts of squid.

Fishermen interviewed by the environmentalists admitted that their nets routinely sweep up, drown, and discard huge numbers of these animals and birds, as well as young whales, sea lions, seals, and other marine life, in the quest for commercially valuable squid.

There is increasing concern among scientists that driftnets may be implicated in the disappearances of juvenile humpback whales that migrate between Hawaii and Alaska during the height of the driftnet season. Indeed, it is feared that two adult grey whales that captured the world's attention during their fight for survival in the Alaskan ice pack in October may become fatally entangled in driftnets during their migration south.

The environmentalists' exposé of the red-squid driftnet fleet began fifteen hundred miles north of Hawaii aboard the forty-foot sailboat Sea Dragon, the research vessel of the Honolulu-based wildlife-protection group Earthtrust. Among the six crewmembers was marine biologist Sam LaBudde, who, while on board a Panamanian tuna seiner in 1987, secretly videotaped the drowning of thousands of dolphins during four months of tuna-fishing operations. Release of the tape set off a storm of international protest and resulted in substantial changes in U.S. marine mammal protection law in 1988.

Environmentalists have known for some time that the deployment of driftnets is a highly destructive, unsustainable method of fishing. Although driftnet operations have been banned from the coastal waters of several countries, including Japan, Australia, and the United States because of their overwhelming destructive effects, governments have been slow to react to the impending environmental disaster in the open ocean. Their position has been that not enough is known about high seas driftnet fishing to address the problem. Animal protectionists and environmentalists will be using the documentary evidence accumulated on this latest mission, then, to convince nations that immediate controls are needed.

Driftnets are huge, nonbiodegradable plastic mesh nets, twenty-five to forty miles long and twenty-five to forty feet deep, that are stretched across the water, with weights at the bottom and floats at the top, to create impenetrable, great walls of death which, in effect, "strip mine" the ocean. The 1,000 to 1,500 vessels that comprise the Asian
Jim Logan, one of the expedition's volunteer members working from an observation vessel, attempts to free a dead dolphin from a driftnet.

red-squid fleet have used driftnets to fish for squid in the Northern Pacific seven months out of every year for the past ten years. Each night, these vessels set some thirty thousand miles of net across the Pacific—more than enough to encircle the earth.

This deadly method of fishing is cheap, easy, and effective. Unfortunately, driftnets are too effective. Every living creature that encounters them becomes entangled and drowned.

Every year, hundreds, perhaps thousands, of miles of driftnets are discarded or lost at sea. These “ghost nets” randomly entangle and collect marine life until they sink with the weight of their decomposing cargo.

In 1983, American environmentalists documented the devastating effects of Japan’s driftnet salmon fishery, which was operating in the U.S. waters of the Bering Sea. At that time, it was determined that the Japanese fleet was responsible for the deaths of some 14,000 dolphins and 750,000 sea birds in only one year of operation. Release of dramatic film footage of some of these animals led the United States to ban the 172-vessel fleet from U.S. waters three years later. The same film footage caused Australia to ban Taiwanese driftnets from Australian waters.

There are no laws and few treaties governing fishing operations in international waters. However, as part of a package of marine environmental measures that became U.S. Public Law 100-220 on Dec. 30, 1987, the United States will begin to address the problem of driftnet fishing in the North Pacific.

The law requires that the secretary of commerce, acting through the State Department, enter into negotiations with nations that fish with driftnets in order to establish driftnet monitoring agreements, including placement of onboard observers. In addition, the secretary is required to negotiate enforcement agreements with these nations. If an agreement with any nation fails, the new law stipulates that the United States can embargo imports of fish from that country.

Although precedented setting, the new law, if enforced, will simply provide a mechanism for negotiating some controls on the wanton destruction of marine life in the international waters of the North Pacific. The new law may reduce the destruction but will not stop it entirely.

The public must let Congress know how it feels about the driftnet issue. Only then will the three million dollars authorized to implement the law be released and agreements negotiated.

The American fishing industry has spoken out strongly several times, warning that the continued use of driftnets in the North Pacific will cause the fisheries to collapse there. Perhaps having Goliath on the side of environmentalists, for a change, will force the U.S. government finally to use its economic clout against the Japanese and its driftnet-fishing neighbors in order to save the animals—and us all—from this looming environmental disaster.—Carol Grunewald, whale/dolphin campaign coordinator

INVESTIGATIONS

Cockfight Crackdown Succeeds

HSUS help crucial to Hialeah raid

Friday, September 16, 1988, 2:00 p.m.: Investigators with the Dade County (Florida) state attorney’s office hold a confidential briefing to prepare law-enforcement officials for a massive cockfight raid scheduled to take place in Hialeah the following day. Present at the Miami briefing are agents from the Metro-Dade Police Department, Miami SWAT team, and The HSUS. A diagram is distributed to familiarize agents with the layout of the cockfighting establishment and individuals are instructed as to who will make the initial arrests and secure the premises.

Saturday, September 17, 1988, 1:00 p.m.: An estimated one hundred law enforcers gather in the stifling heat inside the Metro-Dade police helicopter hangar at Hialeah Airport, northwest of Miami. A helicopter lifts off to conduct aerial surveillance of the cockfighting operation to ensure that fights—which routinely take place on Saturday afternoons—are in progress. Upon the helicopter’s return, police of-
officers give the go-ahead. SWAT team members armed with a variety of automatic weapons, police officers, and investigators from the state attorney's office, The HSUS, and the Humane Society of Greater Miami depart from the hangar and drive in a carefully planned procession that will lead to the fighting pit.

Saturday, September 17, 1988, 4:00 p.m.: Eluding armed guards equipped with walkie-talkies, SWAT team members enter the rear of the building where the fights take place, scaling the fence and storming the arena. Inside, nearly two hundred people are eagerly betting and cheering on two roosters in the center of the pit. With assistance from police, the SWAT team handcuffs all spectators and participants and secures the facility. Not until 1:00 a.m., however, will all those present be processed and charged for their involvement in illegal activities. Fifteen people will be charged with felonies and another 175 spectators with misdemeanors. Forty-three fighting cocks and $11,000 will be confiscated.

For years, cockfighting has been a widespread problem plaguing both urban and rural areas throughout southern Florida. Not until 1986 were The HSUS and other animal-protection groups successful in gaining passage of legislation declaring cockfighting (and dogfighting) a felony offense. Despite enactment of this strong legislation, law-enforcement officials have done little to crack down on cockfighters operating openly in the Miami area.

The September raid occurred only after the HSUS Southeast Regional Office received a letter providing startling details about the elaborate cockfighting club located in Hialeah. So open was the pit owner about his "business" that he had a sign advertising his activities permanently displayed outside: "Los Amigos Private Club, For Conference, Exhibits, Training Techniques, Practices, And Sale Of Cockfighting."

Once Southeast Regional Director Marc Paulhus received the anonymous letter, he set up a meeting with the governor's staff to demand an investigation of the club. As a result of that meeting, the Dade County state attorney's office sent undercover agents to gain information about the illegal operation. Soon after, the state attorney's office coordinated the raid, with assistance from the Metro-Dade Police Department.

On September 16, Southeast Regional Program Coordinator Laura Bevan, Frantz Dantzler, director of the HSUS North Central Regional Office, and HSUS Investigator Gail Eisnitz from the Washington, D.C., office traveled to Miami to provide assistance during the raid and to participate in identifying and cataloging evidence. Working with investigators from the Humane Society of Greater Miami, they seized one dead and two seriously injured birds and another forty fighting cocks and transported them to the Miami Humane Society. There, the maimed birds were euthanatized and the others held as evidence.

Cockfighting is a felony in fourteen states and is currently illegal in all but four.* Before enactment of Florida's felony law in 1986, cockfighting was not specifically outlawed and pits in Miami were actually licensed by Dade County. In fact, during the hearings that led to passage of Florida's "Animal Fighting Act," one cockfight-pit owner actually flaunted to committee members his operational permit and sales tax records!

The HSUS feels that the success of the September raid and the large number of individuals arrested will both encourage law enforcers to initiate further crackdowns against Florida cockfighters, and, at the same time, send a clear message to those involved that cockfighting will no longer be tolerated in the Sunshine State.

* The HSUS is working in those four states—Louisiana, New Mexico, Arizona, and Oklahoma—to eradicate cockfighting as a legal activity.
CAMPAIGNS

The HSUS Fights Fur in Five Cities
Print ads, press conferences focus attention on "The Shame of Fur"

On October 3, The HSUS kicked off its "Shame of Fur" campaign. Left, an HSUS billboard brought the "Shame of Fur" message to freeway commuters in Los Angeles. Similar billboards were outside the Holland and Lincoln tunnels in New York City and in high-traffic areas of Dallas/Ft. Worth, Texas. Below, HSUS bus ads in Chicago and Washington, D.C., neighborhoods were also part of our campaign.

At the Chicago press conference, HSUS Vice President John Grandy said, "Each year, the fur industry ultimately is responsible for the deaths of approximately 27 million animals...we hope to make the wearing of furs as unacceptable as is the smoking of cigarettes in elevators." Right, Shirley Riley of Illinois mounted an HSUS poster on her car, part of a grassroots effort to discourage buying and wearing furs.
Above, HSUS President John A. Hoyt (second from right) and cover girl Yolanda Boot (next to him) were joined by Mid-Atlantic Regional Director Nina Austenber (right) and board members Gisela Hunicutt and Regina Bauer Frankenberg at a press conference in front of New York's Saks Fifth Avenue department store. Our "Shame of Fur" ad popped up on many of the city's telephone kiosks during the campaign's early weeks. Left, the Times Square electronic billboard in New York ran our anti-fur message on holiday weekends.