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Part I
Wildlife: A New Perspective

With the coming in the late 1960's of the "Age of Environmental Awareness" (Scheffer, 1980), a new view of wildlife emerged, one which had been evolving over a number of years. Wild animals, as the term "wild" connotes, were once seen as part of "nature red in tooth and claw." They had been regarded as inferior adversaries to be subdued and their lives and habitats remodelled to fit "progressive" human-conceived and human-centered schemes.

When these schemes failed to bring to their creators the peace, prosperity, and happiness promised--indeed, it seemed as though they might result in chaos--animals, as part of seemingly smooth-functioning "natural" schemes, came to be regarded in a more benevolent light. Perhaps human harmony could be realized if the secrets of the apparent harmony of nature could be uncovered. As disillusion with the manipulative sciences which accompanied human technology grew, there grew a parallel interest in the study of nature through observation. The more it was observed, the more people came to identify with animals, and the more they wanted--partly for reasons of self-discovery--to know about them.

In his foreword to Wildlife and America, Russell Peterson (1978) describes the popular manifestation of this new view as it applied to wildlife:

For reasons beyond logic or perceived self-interest, [a growing number of citizens] seem to feel in their bones that there's something unhealthy or just plain wrong with the depletion of nature. The older, pioneering, indiscriminate enthusiasm for "progress" and for "development" has become tempered in this decade by a sceptical questioning of human activities that crowd other species into an ever shrinking corner. If this is environmentalism, it is a seat of the pants variety--one without biological rationale. . . .

Among the human activities questioned by these same "seat of the pants" environ-
mentalists was the removal of animals from the wild to be crowded into sterile cages in zoos. The former fondness for the old museum-style zoos, described by journalist Robert Vanderpoel (1974) as "that special affection reserved for the American flag, hot apple pie, kindly grannies and kindred untouchables," gave way to a new sentiment that there was "something unhealthy or just plain wrong" with putting animals behind bars with nothing underneath them but cement or tile. Vanderpoel was correct in claiming that "zoos have been such an accepted part of life for so long that few people have taken a hard look at the zoo as an institution." When the hard look did come, it was inspired by far-sighted individuals in the zoo world; but the resultant changes came about through the combined efforts of a variety of groups, including many animal welfare organizations. The hard look took two forms: on the one hand, there came a call for modernization of zoos, and on the other, a call for their complete elimination.
The HSUS Recognizes A Problem

The HSUS's interest in wildlife and zoos evolved along lines parallel to those of the general public. The "Age of Environmental Awareness" had to dawn within the Humane Society before zoos were to be tackled as an issue.

From its inception, the HSUS probably received some complaints about zoos from a small percentage of its supporters. In a 1960 Annual Conference presentation made by HSUS' General Counsel Murdaugh Madden entitled, "Additional Humane Society Problems," zoos were included along with performing animal acts among the "outstanding problems of the humane movement," which limitations on time prevented from being included in the discussion. With its very limited resources and staff, The HSUS, understandably, had to work within the rather narrow range of blatant cruelties (such as those in slaughterhouses) for which there appeared to be some promise of rectification through legislation.

As evidence of the shifting focus of the Humane Society's concerns, HSUS Board Chairman Robert Chenoweth reported to The HSUS membership at the Annual Conference in 1966 that the emphasis of the previous decade upon humane slaughter had "shifted to laboratory animals." He also spoke of The HSUS's initiation into wildlife protection by joining the campaign against the non-biodegradable and cruel poison, Compound 1080:

This will be the primary action The HSUS [will take] in the wildlife area. I think it should be mentioned, however, that The HSUS does not intend to strive for prominence among the societies in the conservation field. There are many organizations whose whole program focuses largely on wildlife and its ecology. Others are concerned with redwoods or pure water. But it seems to me appropriate that
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The HSUS should concern itself with these aspects of the problem where the actions of people and government are directly related to painful consequences to wild animals.

Undoubtedly, Mr. Chenoweth must have been thinking of Defenders of Wildlife when he spoke of organizations concerned primarily with wildlife and its ecology.

Defenders of Wildlife Campaigns Against Roadside Zoos

Defenders initiated what grew to be a campaign against "roadside zoos" with the publication of an article by writer Michael Frome in the October 1963 issue of its magazine. The article, entitled "ROADSIDE ZOOS, Exploitation of Wild Animals for Advertising Purposes," was excerpted from Frome's book, Whose Woods These Are: The Story of the National Forests (1962), and had appeared in the November 1962 issue of Changing Times under the title, "America the Beautiful, Heritage or Honky-Tonk?" In his book Frome described the plight of caged bears in roadside exhibits at the entrance to the Pisgah National Forest in Western North Carolina. The book and article apparently created a great controversy, with the Governor of North Carolina receiving letters of protest--at Frome's urging--from all sections of the country. The North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, which had issued permits for the bears and then tried to place the blame on the Cherokee Indians in the area until Frome had pointed out that "bear-displaying souvenir stands invariably are operated by white Carolinians," finally acknowledged that the bears were kept in "deplorable, unsanitary and inhumane conditions" (Frome, 1963).

This little anecdote illustrates two aspects of the roadside zoo issue: public
sentiment could be galvanized against a practice perceived as both inhumane and unaesthetic, and the regulatory agencies responsible for the enforcement of state wildlife laws were beginning to admit, however grudgingly, that captive animals suffered in these establishments. The racial overtones to this particular conflict would be echoed again with reference to zoos as the notion of animal rights which developed in the climate of environmental concerns became entwined with the concept of human rights.

Ironically, if one returns to Frome's book as the primary source (1962), one finds a reference, not to Defenders, but to The HSUS:

I discussed [the caged bears] with The Humane Society of the United States. It considers this frightening handful of gas stations, gift shops and zoo-owning North Carolinians as the worst in the country for mistreatment of wild animals.

Following the short article about Frome's book, Defenders made an appeal to its readers for information regarding the exact location of any similar roadside zoos they might encounter. They were urged to note the condition of the animals and report their findings to local humane societies and law enforcement agencies.

In the January 1964 issue of Defenders of Wildlife News Frome described the origins of roadside zoos in the early 1950's (p.3):

I became interested in roadside zoos a dozen or so years ago. A rash of them arose at the time as gambling blinds. The unsuspecting motorist who stopped with his family 'to see the snakes' shortly found himself in the backroom parting company with his funds in rolling the dice, leaded of course, or at the old fashioned shell game. The animals were devices of enticement employed by some very sharp country boys.

These "sharp country boys," Frome said, were taking advantage of "the desire of
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the traveling public to look wildlife squarely in the face and learn something of its whys and wherefores."

In spite of The HSUS's assessment that North Carolina's roadside zoos were the worst in the country, Frome declared that squalid roadside zoos existed "from coast to coast" and lamented the difficulty of bringing such a fragmented phenomenon into focus as a target for public indignation:

Nobody knows how many animals are caged and corralled at roadside tourist attractions which generously advertise themselves with such polite titles as 'reptile gardens', kiddies 'barnyard', 'prairie zoo' and the like. Nobody knows how most of these creatures are captured. Nobody rightly heeds how they are treated in captivity, or fed, how they live, how they die. Nobody really knows. The question is, does anybody care?

Frome answered his own question with a description of the movement in North Carolina against roadside zoos--thanks in part, no doubt, to his own efforts. He stated that in addition to the pathetically caged, coca-cola drinking bears:

I also found there are Carolinians who do not want their state further disgraced by the exploitation of animals in captivity or the spotlight of national attention upon them. The North Carolina Wildlife Federation, the Carolina Motor Club, the North Carolina Travel Council, and leading newspapers have strongly urged an end to the woeful mistreatment of wild creatures. 'The caging or chaining of game birds and animals as roadside tourist attraction by commercial enterprises,' the Board of the Motor Club declared in a recent resolution, 'creates traffic hazards, causes criticism by tourists for the inhumane treatment of the animals, and in some cases is dangerous to spectators.' The Board calls upon the Wildlife Resources Commission to bring about an end of this practice wherever it may exist.

As a result of the Travel Council's efforts, the Assistant Attorney General of North Carolina prepared a bill prohibiting the possession of game birds or animals
"for the purpose of attracting viewers, visitors or customers to a commercial enterprise, whether [it is] primarily concerned with exhibition of such birds or animals, or with some other activity." The bill passed the Senate in 1963, but was defeated in the House where "bear exhibitors had greater influence." Frome suggested that the bill, with a modification to include nongame animals, would make an excellent model for other states, to be supplemented by a federal regulation "prohibiting the transportation of any animals across state lines for commercial exhibition" (p.4). He also urged that research should be undertaken to determine which states have regulations for keeping captive wildlife, which do not, and which are the most lax.

He further proposed that roadside zoos should be studied to determine how the animals are obtained, how they are sold and for how much, and how they are cared for. The public, he said, should be kept informed and urged not to patronize roadside zoos. At the end of the article, Defenders began its solicitation for funds for the roadside zoo campaign. They promised to add a member to the staff as soon as possible to coordinate "evidence and support for legislative action."

In the May-June 1964 issue of the magazine, Frome condemned roadside zoos for their negative educational influence (p.13):

For youngsters, however, the display of an animal or animals ill-treated in cramped quarters and tawdry surroundings does anything but engender respect and understanding for the natural treasures of America. I have observed children in such places--they become caught in the climate of contempt, not even of pity, at the helplessness of the caged animal. They can twit his tail, feed him popcorn, and deride his vain efforts to escape. . . .

The issue of zoos in general, and roadside zoos in particular, would come to
revolve around the question of public education.

With this beginning, Defenders worked spasmodically over the next few years documenting the appalling conditions in roadside zoos and the gaps in state laws which never seemed to cover all of the species found in these menageries. In response to a query from Defenders in 1964, the Director of the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission stated that his Department's attempts to enforce standards "of care and housing of exhibit animals" had been thwarted by a Supreme Court decision that the Commission had no authority "where such animals were private property lawfully acquired" (Defenders, 1964a).

After this noteworthy commencement of a public awareness campaign, the subject of roadside zoos received uneven coverage in the magazine until Cecile O'Marr was hired in 1969 for the express purpose of traveling around the country to photograph roadside zoos and report on the conditions she found. Mrs. O'Marr had no background with either zoos or wildlife; she was to look at zoos as any tourist might and convey her impressions in the magazine.

The mention of roadside zoos always elicited a good financial response from Defenders' members, according to Mrs. O'Marr (personal communication). Defenders published lists of people who made contributions to its various campaigns and the roadside zoo fund always had contributors. Their ranks would swell appreciably after an expose of particularly bad conditions. O'Marr worked for Defenders until the emphasis upon roadside zoos as an issue was reduced in the mid-1970's (See: Federal Regulation of Zoos & Zoos & Other National Animal Welfare Organizations).
In the late 1960's, the call of "environmentalism" grew louder and it became harder to distinguish between environmental and animal welfare issues. Rear Admiral James Shaw emphasized concern for wildlife in his remarks to the membership at The HSUS Annual Conference in 1968. He called wildlife protection "somewhat of a stepchild" in the animal welfare movement, and suggested that "if The HSUS is to be all good things to all animals, we must enlarge our vision to include every living creature of the animal kingdom, tame or wild, furred or feathered." Unannounced spot inspections of zoos had been included in the long-range plans for the Connecticut Branch of The HSUS, of which Shaw was Executive Director, since 1964 (HSUS News, September 1964).

In his "Report of the President" at the same Conference, Mel Morse claimed:

We have supporters and contributors who feel that we should devote ourselves to wildlife programs, with emphasis on the cruelties of trapping, or roadside zoos, or the importation of wildlife, or a program that would protect the endangered species.

At the same Annual Conference, author and former Miami Zoo Director Julia Allen Field (1968) spoke of the need for "a new perspective [that] would begin with planetary education, with an understanding of our universe," and for "a new education [that] would emphasize feeling and understanding above sterile facts, emphasize the interrelation of all life on earth." Field had become disenchanted with zoos, and in her condemnation of the old style of education, she condemned the attitude which led to the imprisonment of both human beings and animals:

The power structure and accepted thinking which ignored the growth
of ghettos in the last two decades is the same that acclaims zoos as 'educational'. Our [white] society is unaware that the people of Harlem frame their resentment in these terms: 'We don't want Whitey coming up here to look at the zoo'. Out of touch with the main currents of our time, prominent men in the city, the Board of the New York Zoological Society, have planned the first windowless building for wild animals, symbolically named the World of Darkness; a place where they will be imprisoned in glass-fronted cupboards and closets, confined more closely than the occupants of Harlem. And so we see the ways one city plans to brutalize man toward other creatures as it had already brutalized him toward his fellow man.

The close identification with "imprisoned" animals and questioning of the educational value of such imprisonment would become common complaints among the opponents of zoos.

At the next HSUS Annual Conference in 1969, naturalist and conservation writer Leonard Hall described the spread of the environmental movement in America:

There is no magazine in America that doesn't have some article in almost every issue on the environmental problem. There is no newspaper that doesn't have two or three articles every day. . . . Whether it will save us or not we don't know.

Hall, also a Director of Defenders of Wildlife, urged The HSUS to become involved in the protection of wildlife and stated that it, "should certainly join the campaign on a nationwide basis to close the roadside zoos, where I think probably more cruelty to wild animals is practiced than in [sic] anywhere else in America."

The continuing exposé of roadside zoos in Defenders of Wildlife Magazine was having its effect upon the humane movement.

That The HSUS membership made a distinction between roadside and "legitimate" zoos is evident in the wording of a resolution passed at the Conference. It read
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in part:

RESOLVED, that the humane movement at national, state and local levels utilize all appropriate means to stop the extermination of these [endangered] creatures and increase its efforts to preserve the natural ecologies of all wildlife; to prohibit the import, except for the establishment of breeding colonies in zoos, of endangered species. . . .

But it was author and naturalist Roger Caras, speaking at the same Conference, who described the link between the humane and environmental movements which was to determine The HSUS's future concern with wildlife and environmental issues in general and with zoos in particular:

Conservation and the humane movement are Siamese Twins. They are inseparable. . . . there is an explosion coming in the conservation movement. . . . These forces [of impending national and international catastrophe] are bringing to the foreground the absolute necessity for conservation. The humanitarian movement can gain nothing but strength from the association. . . . An era of conservation mindedness has been born and is about to explode into maturity. The humane movement can only benefit from the association, only enrich its own comprehensiveness and effectiveness, only enhance its own following, increase its strength and its power by the association in fact and in image.

His words proved to be prophetic. In the following decade, the ranks of the humane movement grew as did the ranks of the environmental movement (Scheffer, 1980, pp.27-28). In recent years the standing of The HSUS appears to have been improved on Capitol Hill with the Society's inclusion in what is termed the "environmental community."

Roger Caras had also urged The HSUS to become involved with zoos, but unlike Leonard Hall, he urged the Society to take an interest in more than just the roadside zoos. At the Annual Conference the following year, the new HSUS President,
John Hoyt, announced an expansion of the Field Service Department to include the inspection of zoos. This same year, 1970, the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act was amended to include animals in zoos.
The Federal Regulation of Zoos

The public clamor for wildlife protection had already reached Congress: In 1966 The Endangered Species Act was passed to conserve and protect native species of fish and wildlife threatened with extinction. In 1969 it was amended to include foreign species.

Zoo professionals testified in favor of the legislation on both occasions and attempted to counter the opposition of the pet and fur industries. Mrs. Christine Stevens presented testimony for the Animal Welfare Institute (AWI) in support of the 1969 legislation, and HSUS Chief Investigator Frank McMahon submitted a letter expressing the support of The Humane Society. These are the only expressions of support by national animal welfare organizations indicated in the transcript of the hearings (U.S. Congress 1969, pp.64-67, 194-195).

By 1969 the public outcry against roadside zoos had grown so great that the Department of the Interior drafted a model state law to regulate them and submitted it to the Council of State Governments. The HSUS was listed among the various animal welfare organizations that had been asked to make suggestions and endorse the proposed legislation. In the preamble to the proposed model law, the Department of the Interior reported on the extent of public indignation over roadside zoos (HSUS: Roadside Zoos File):

Aroused citizens register numerous complaints every year concerning inhumane and unsanitary conditions existing at many private roadside zoos, menageries, and snake pits exhibiting wild birds and other wild animals. Most complaints center around private exhibitions used as attractions at filling stations, souvenir shops, refreshment stands, and other businesses catering to tourists. The unwholesome conditions have been well documented by photographs and articles published in magazines and other news media. The Federal Government does not have jurisdiction in this field. It is generally accepted that control in this area is the prerogative and responsibility of
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local or State government agencies. Many complainants, nevertheless, have petitioned the Federal Government to establish minimum standards governing the establishment, maintenance, and operation of public exhibitions of wild birds, mammals, reptiles, and other wild creatures.

The preamble also indicates that the agents of the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife verified the complaints through investigation and determined that among the 50 states, only 17 issued permits for zoos or menageries, and among these 17 only 9 prescribed minimum standards.

All of the major national animal welfare organizations endorsed the bill (Defenders, The Humane Society of the United States, American Humane Association, American Humane Education Society, Animal Welfare Institute, Friends of Animals, and National Catholic Society for Animal Welfare). The American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums (AAZPA), however, opposed it, even though its provisions would not apply to any "municipal, county, State or other publicly owned zoo or wildlife exhibit." Based on this opposition, USDI withdrew the bill (O'Marr, 1970).

Defenders of Wildlife was advised (O'Marr, 1970a) by AAZPA President Ronald Reuther that the Association's opposition to the model state law was based upon its "unsuitable specifications" and AAZPA "wished to suggest improvements." Because Congressman Whitehurst's bill, H.R. 13957, had been introduced in the interim, AAZPA felt that it "would do the job better, more effectively, since it would be a national law, as opposed to a state option." Therefore AAZPA proposed to "endorse and support the Whitehurst Bill."

In spite of this avowal of support, no member of the AAZPA appeared at the hearings
The Federal Regulation of Zoos

to testify for the bill. According to a statement which appears in course material from AAZPA's Management School, zoos were taken by surprise when they were included for regulation under the Animal Welfare Act. The Department of Agriculture had apparently created a climate of false security among zoo people when it made known its feelings that "because of the magnitude and implications" of including so many more animals under the Act, the bill's chances for passage seemed very small (Wagner, Personal Communication).

The bulk of the testimony given by several animal welfare organizations during the June 1970 hearings concerned the need to improve the regulations covering animals for research. HSUS's testimony, presented by Murdaugh Madden and Frank McMahon, makes only the briefest reference to the need to regulate zoos. In three full pages of testimony, Madden stated only that, "We fully support the bill's coverage of zoos, pet shops, circuses, and animals used for exhibit purposes. These unregulated operations are a constant source of concern to humane societies because cruelty and exploitation is rampant in them. A law to regulate them is desperately needed" (U.S. Congress, 1970, p.18). McMahon warned that although these operations needed regulating, the Department of Agriculture was already overworked and understaffed, thus Congress should consider the practical need for effective enforcement (pp.20-21).

Christine Stevens (p.34) spoke at greater length about the need to regulate zoos, stating: "Charges of cruelty against both roadside, commercial zoos and municipal zoos are common." She also submitted letters supporting her assertions, including one from the staff member of a city zoo describing deplorable conditions he found in a private zoo in Colorado and asking for the AWI's help in putting it out of
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business.

In the statement submitted by Cecile O'Marr for Defenders (P.92), she described generally the conditions she had found in both roadside and city zoos, and the support of the nearly 2,000 members of Defenders who had contributed to the campaign against roadside zoos. But her statement was, ultimately, an expression of opposition to zoos as a concept:

The ultimate aim [of society] should be to do away with confinement of animals that are designed to roam, for no matter how kindly the caged beasts may be treated, the true fact that they are caged is contrary to their very nature. However, whenever this end cannot presently be accomplished to see that conditions of confinement meet high standards is an important step forward.

That zoos were included under the Animal Welfare Act with a minimum of urging by national animal welfare organizations, and no opposition from the AAZPA is clear. What is less clear is the extent to which there might have been a grass roots movement for their inclusion. Sue Pressman believes that Congress had been primed by years of complaints from citizens about roadside menageries and, additionally, congressmen were urged to support the proposed legislation by Congressman Whitehurst's wife. Mrs. Whitehurst had been interested in zoos for a number of years and felt they needed both regulation and assistance. Despite the interest in roadside zoos which had been growing for a number of years, Mrs. Whitehurst recalls no specific grass roots movement or great public outcry leading to their inclusion under the Animal Welfare Act in 1970 (Personal Communication). Her own influence was probably substantial, but John Grandy of Defenders of Wildlife gives a large measure of credit for the inclusion of zoos under the Act to Christine Stevens.
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Shortly after the passage of the Animal Welfare Act in 1970, Congressman Whitehurst introduced a bill calling for the establishment of a federal board to set standards for the accreditation of zoos and aquariums. The bill also contained a provision allowing zoos to receive federal funds to make improvements in their operations. Similar bills were introduced in the mid-1970's by Senator Hatfield and Congressman Dingell. All of these zoo accreditation bills created great controversy between the zoo world and the humane movement and among national animal welfare organizations within the humane movement. An excellent description of both the bills and the controversy can be found in the Federal Regulation of Zoos published by the Boston College Environmental Law Center (Rosin, 1976, pp. 399-416).
Mounting Criticism of Zoos

A significant call for the reform of zoos had been sounded in 1968 in an article in *Life* magazine by author and zoologist Desmond Morris entitled, "Must We Have Zoos? Yes But . . . ." Morris's article followed an exposé of the cruelties of the wildlife trade and inadequate conditions in zoos entitled, "The Shame Of The Naked Cage." Morris, the Curator of Mammals at the London Zoo, was, according to *Life*, "the world's best known zoologist," after his book, *The Naked Ape*, became a best-seller in 1967.

It is not known what effect this article had upon zoos, but it is not unreasonable to speculate that its effect upon the general public was considerable. It certainly contributed to the concern about zoos growing within the ranks of the humane movement. The HSUS, through Frank McMahon, had been consulted by staff writers from *Life* who were preparing "The Shame of the Naked Cage" which accompanied Morris's article (*HSUS* News, January-February 1969). However, it was Christine Stevens who had the two articles entered into the record during the hearings on the Animal Welfare Act. She introduced them again into the record in 1974 during the hearings on bills to provide federal assistance to zoos and aquariums.

Morris began by describing a growing opposition to the continuation of zoos. He called for zoos to reform in order to survive into the next century. The principal argument he put forth for the continuation of zoos is one which is still hotly debated among the proponents and opponents of zoos (See: *Zoos: Pro and Con*). Morris contended that zoos provide needed contact between human beings and animals for which films and books are not adequate substitutes. He declared: "If zoos disappear, I fear that our vast urban populations will become so physically remote from animal life, they will cease to care about it" (p.78). With wildlife vanishing
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at an alarming rate, more rather than less concern, he contended, was needed to save it.

Having made this pronouncement, he proceeded to describe what amounted to a newly recognized animal welfare problem: the psychological cruelty of the "naked" cage in the traditional museum-style zoo exhibit. He explained that animals can generally be classified as "specialists" or "opportunists." The needs of specialists, "animals which have put all their evolutionary effort into the perfection of one survival trick," are few and can easily be met in captivity. By contrast, opportunists, with which human beings--the most highly evolved specialists of all--most readily identify and thus demand to see in zoos, need outlets for their exploratory urges (pp.78-80).

In the highly simplified environment of the zoo cage, the opportunists' attempts to find outlets for their need for activity often result in aberrant behavior such as stereotypical locomotion, coprophagy, hypersexuality, hyperaggression, or begging for food. In addition to the false impression such behavior conveys to the zoo visitor about the animals' true nature, it constitutes, Morris implied, a kind of suffering. He declared: "There is something biologically immoral about keeping animals in enclosures where their behavior patterns, which took millions of years to evolve, can find no expression" (p.83).

But Morris was not charging zoos with deliberate cruelty. He was charging them with not keeping pace with results of the field research being done on wild animals, and of not applying that information concerning the behavioral needs of animals to their zoo exhibits. More than anything else they were charged with failing to
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evolve at a proper pace.

He cited the tendency to keep too many species "in order to attract enough visitors to pay for the upkeep" as the "major flaw in zoo thinking" (p.83). He warned of the day when "zoos will nauseate our society" as people become increasingly knowledgeable about the normal behavior of animals through their exposure to books, television, and films. He described the result of this recent commercial success of the field work of zoologists and naturalists: "We understand the animals' true problems better and find the old zoo cages more worrying than stimulating, more depressing then exciting" (p.83).

Morris was known for his observations of human as well as animal behavior, and he went on to describe in the article the emergence of two classes of zoo-watchers, a distinction which proved to be of great significance in the humane movement's approach to zoos in the following decade:

The emotional, anthropomorphic approach of the 'bleeding hearts' sees the animals as pathetic, imprisoned humanoids. The increasingly educated and knowledgeable eyes of the new zoo public will see something equally depressing, but this time for the right reasons (p.84).

In describing the future course of zoos, Morris acquainted the general public with objectives which had long been discussed and debated by the leading members of the zoo world. Morris spoke of the need for more captive breeding to reduce the drain on wild populations and perpetuate endangered species. He also called for the intensive study of all zoo animals to contribute to man's total knowledge of them, and for exhibits that are educational for zoo-goers. To be educational, of course, they had to allow the animals to behave normally. To accomplish these
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ends, zoos would have to specialize and keep larger numbers of fewer species. Because people are more mobile and have more leisure time, he declared, they will travel the distances necessary to see these specialized collections. He spoke of the need for more courageous visionaries in the zoo world to commence the necessary revolution. He described exciting prospects for the future and summed up with a call to arms:

The list is endless, the prospects enthralling. Zoos have a choice. They can change drastically and flourish and grow in importance each year, as the truly wild places of the world shrink and decay. Or they can continue along as the scruffy little animal slums they all too often are, and find themselves outlawed and condemned. There are good zoos, even now, but most of even the best zoos are still weighed down by their old fashioned buildings. Their often enlightened officials still carry the burden of the legacy of their well-meaning but ignorant predecessors. They would like to sweep the past away and start again, but it is not easy. Revolutions seldom are (p.86).

Morris was not unique in the zoo world in pointing out the shortcomings of the traditional zoo which had proliferated since the Nineteenth Century (since the mid-19th Century in the case of the American zoo). The eminent Swiss Zoo Director Heini Hediger had been observing and documenting aberrant behavior in zoo animals since the 1930's, as had others (Meyer-Holzapfl, 1968), and had also spoken of the need to improve the "quality" of the captive animal's environment in his book Wild Animals in Captivity, first published in English in 1950, and subsequently in paperback in America in 1964. Hediger had also described the responsibility of zoo professionals to cooperate and communicate more, to collect and exchange information on their animals and, most important, to teach people "a new attitude towards animals" (1964, p.176).
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Others in the zoo world (Van Den Bergh, 1962; Osborn, 1962) had spoken of the need for zoos to improve their methods of exhibiting animals to facilitate both public education and captive breeding, but these pronouncements had not reached a popular audience. The year before Morris's article was published, a popular book on major zoos of the world had appeared (Hahn, 1967) which documented that at least some zoo people were discussing the deficiencies in their institutions among themselves. Although in Animal Gardens mention is made of the need to eliminate bad zoos and make exhibits more suited to the animals' needs, the tone is less urgent and less threatening than Morris's.

Morris's approach to zoo problems was different from that of other people working in zoos in that he took his case to the general public. If zoo professionals alone had been responsible for the fate of their zoos, doubtless many zoos would have more closely approximated the ideals Morris described. But they were not, and the public had to be made aware of the various individuals, practices, and notions which were preventing most American zoos in the late 1960's from keeping pace with the increased understanding of the needs of wild animals and the public's new-found sympathy for their plight in captivity. With zoo people talking primarily to one another about their problems, the public would only be made aware of the zoos' difficulties by "outsiders."
Part II
The HSUS Zoo Reform Program

Without some understanding of the specialized requirements of captive wild animals and relative criteria for judging whether these requirements were being met, it was not possible for animal welfare organizations accustomed to dealing with domestic animals, often housed for short periods of time only, to make credible criticisms of the inadequacies of zoos. One could more easily condemn them all on the basis of the conventional wisdom that captivity is too far removed from "freedom" to be truly humane. This was, essentially, the position that Frank McMahon, HSUS's Chief Investigator, took in 1970 when he was called to Tucson, Arizona, by some HSUS members to reinforce their criticisms of the local zoo.

McMahon avowed his fundamental disapproval of all zoos, a feeling not shared by all of the complaining parties, but he was unable to find the zoo as inadequate as the local people found it. For all his good intentions, McMahon was of little help to the people of Tucson in pressuring the municipality into improving the zoo (HSUS: Tucson Zoo File). It was clear that The HSUS would have to develop some criteria if it were to pursue an effective program of zoo reform.

At the urging of David Claflin, President of the Massachusetts SPCA, and Roger Caras, who had by this time joined The HSUS Board, Sue Pressman met with John Hoyt early in 1971 to discuss a six-month evaluation of a number of American zoos to determine what was causing them to be a source of increasing concern to The HSUS constituents. Sue had a Master of Science degree in Biology from the University of California at Davis and had completed a number of courses toward a degree in veterinary medicine, including some on zoo animal medicine taught by a well-known specialist in wild animal medicine, Dr. Murray Fowler. She had worked in both the animal hospital and the children's zoo of the San Diego Zoo and for
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seven years had been the Supervisor of Animal Health for the three zoos (Franklin Park, Stoneham Zoo, and Trailside Museum in Blue Hills, Massachusetts) operated by the Boston Zoological Society. She had had to pass a set of special tests designed by the Massachusetts Veterinary Medical Association to be considered certified to "practice medicine" as a non-public, non-graduate veterinarian. In her work at the zoo Sue had increasingly become a "spokesman for wildlife" and was eager to reach a larger audience with what she felt was an urgent message.

In March of 1971 Sue began for The HSUS a "fact finding" tour of a number of zoos, many selected at random and others discovered along the way. By the summer of 1971, Sue Pressman had examined 44 municipal and 27 private zoos. The worst of them, 17 in all, in what she would later call the class 3 zoos, received letters from The HSUS stating their deficiencies and pledging the Society would "take such action as is necessary to achieve the establishment of proper and humane conditions" (HSUS zoo files).

Sue reported to The HSUS Executive Staff and Board of Directors that many municipal zoos shared a number of problems which were causing them to become the focus of public concern for the welfare of the animals they held captive. The "meddling" of municipal officials in decisions that should have been made by zoo professionals was impeding the evolution of zoos: municipal bid systems might insure that animals got cheap food rather than food which met their dietary requirements; municipal maintenance systems were not always adequate--or prompt enough--to keep exhibits in good repair; and civil service practices might guarantee that woefully inadequate employees kept their jobs caring for animals about which they knew little and, in some cases, cared less. The professionals had insufficient autonomy. Their ideas,
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based on information of recent vintage from the field or from the work of the few zoo professionals who did have autonomy, were often not understood by the parks and recreation departments or other municipal bodies that regulated many city zoos and determined what money and resources the zoos would have. In many cases, zoos were under the direction of amateurs who had more parks experience than scientific training. Others had some "seat of the pants" experience as former keepers, but had not kept up with the growing body of information on the needs of wild animals and how best to meet those needs in captivity.

Archaic structures was the second major problem of municipal zoos that Sue reported to The HSUS officials. Many municipal zoos had been either built or renovated in the 1930's as projects of the Works Progress Administration before much was known about the behavioral needs of animals and the deleterious effects upon them of close, sterile confinement. Little was known at that time of zoo animal medicine; consequently, simple concrete and tile enclosures were preferred because frequent cleaning was the primary means of disease prevention available. Limited municipal funds were used to repair the old structures rather than to create new, more interesting, and as Hediger would say, more "biological" exhibits.

The third major problem in the municipal zoos as reported by Sue was the communications "gap" between many zoo directors and the general public. Some directors defended their exhibition of small numbers of a great many species on the grounds that the public demanded a large assortment in general and certain popular species in particular. Sue charged that the director should be shaping the public's changing opinions about captive animals rather than simply following its alleged whims.
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Hediger had described the changing relationship of the zoo to the public in his book, Man And Animal In The Zoo: Zoo Biology (1969):

"Today the wild animal is considered to have cultural value; it is regarded as part of our heritage, to which the whole of mankind and particularly future generations, have a legitimate claim. Zoological gardens, to which these living items are entrusted, therefore represent cultural institutions. As such they are required to serve as recreation for human beings, particularly those in large cities, by preserving and stimulating their creative faculties. It is obvious that a zoo has to serve the needs of the great mass of the public for recreation and relaxation. But it is by no means generally recognized that a great deal remains to be done to put this into effect. A Zoological garden which contributes nothing to the promotion of the important subjects of education, research and conservation is just not a zoo in the modern sense, but only a garden with animals--and that is something completely different (p.8).

John Perry, the Assistant Director of the National Zoo, had expressed the shift in public interest slightly less academically in The World's A Zoo (1969):

"What does entertain zoo visitors? Not individual animals lying listlessly in small cages. They want action, animals behaving as they do in nature or, of not that, animals demonstrating their physical and mental capabilities (p.263).

It was clear that some zoo directors were not attuned to this new view of "recreation". Still others were hampered by a tendency--increasingly unfortunate in the light of diminishing wildlife--to compete among themselves.

Although most comprehensive books about zoos make reference to this tendency, (Hahn, 1967; Perry, 1969; Hediger, 1964, 1969; Meyer, 1979), perhaps the best description of it is found in Sheldon Campbell's book, Lifeboats to Ararat (1978):

"What was business as usual? For most zoos until the 1970's it was the continued reflexive response to two unwritten and seldom talked
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about rules of operation that had governed the zoo world for years. First, display as many animals of as many species and subspecies as possible, even if you have only one of a kind; and second, try to have some rarities. . . . that few other zoos have or can get. . . . The most virulent strain of this competitive bug caused some zoo managers to be more concerned about the opinion of their peers than they were about the reaction of the public that supported them or the health and happiness of the animals they displayed (p.36).

With the advent of The HSUS into the zoo world, this tendency would become known to a wider audience and thus less easy to perpetuate, and the "health and happiness" of zoo animals would become a national animal welfare issue.
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To facilitate the distinction between what Hediger had called a "zoological garden" and a "garden with animals," and to further distinguish those two categories from the squalid menageries which, though called "zoos," bore no similarities to gardens of any sort, Sue developed a simple 1-2-3 system of rating zoos according to their approach to exhibiting animals.

Class 3 zoos were at the bottom of the scale, and Sue contended there was no justification for their continued existence. Into this category fell all "roadside zoos," privately operated by individuals who had neither the necessary knowledge of wild animals to exhibit them adequately, nor, in most cases, the concern to do so. These were the squalid exhibits so frequently photographed and described the preceding decade by Defenders of Wildlife, and generally found adjacent to gas stations, gift shops and other like enterprises to attract customers.

But Sue also placed a number of municipally operated zoos in this class, among them America's first zoo, the Central Park Zoo in New York City. Even though there was evidence of a movement to improve the zoo from within, Sue felt that it was too close to the class 1 Bronx Zoo to justify its continued existence. Had it been in a community without a better zoo near, she explained, it would have been classified as a class 2 zoo and thus worth the effort and expense it would take to improve it.

Of the class 3 zoo, Sue stated in her presentation to the Western Regional Workshop of the AAZPA in 1972:

In my mind the Group 3 zoos do nothing, serve no one, and indeed, give the whole profession a black eye. . . . In plain language, the third rated zoo is a ghetto for animals with no professional staff,
The HSUS System for Rating Zoos

little thought given to display and a cancerous growth rate. These zoos must be stopped (HSUS Files).

She considered these zoos to be a waste of wildlife and, in the case of municipal class 3 zoos, a waste of public funds. Whether public or private these zoos desensitized the public to the needs of animals by blatantly ignoring those needs, often resulting in cruelty.

The second and first class zoos differed from the third in that their continued existence was not challenged. Both classes of zoos were needed by the people in their communities. But the first and second class zoos differed widely in the extent to which they provided a "positive view" of wildlife.

The second class zoos' inadequacies stemmed from the fact they were largely under the control of municipalities. They had qualified professional staff members as well as veterinary services and some education programs, but they were hampered in their progress by municipal systems or bureaucratic interference.

In these cases, Sue felt, the professional staff could not be blamed for the zoos' failures. They were victims themselves. Zoos in this group such as those in Tucson, Arizona, and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, were most in need of help from outside the zoo to untangle the red tape and insure that decisions affecting the health and well-being of the animals were made by the people with the best qualifications and judgment. Many zoos in this class had been started by accident and had failed to develop the objectives, policies, and funding necessary for a modern zoo. Their problems were compounded if they happened to be managed by a director who considered that the zoo's primary purpose was entertainment rather
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than education or conservation.

Although lack of adequate funds was a problem common to the class 2 zoos, Sue felt that money would not always bring about the necessary improvements. If the zoo had no philosophy of operation, or the director's vision was limited to a newer, cleaner version of the old-fashioned "stamp collection" type of zoo, then money would only make things worse.

The few zoos which fell into the first class were able, Sue said, to "instill in the public the need for wildlife and its meaning to the world." This class included the New York Zoological Park; the Houston, Texas Zoo; the Brookfield Zoo in Chicago; the National Zoo in Washington, D.C.; and the San Diego, California Zoo. The smaller, privately operated class 1 zoos such as the Gladys Porter Zoo in Brownsville, Texas, and Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum near Tucson were also meeting the criteria of zoos in this class to "cater to civic pride," and contribute substantially to the preservation, understanding and appreciation of animal life.

Sue was quick to point out that even these zoos, as their directors would doubtless acknowledge, were not perfect. These zoos were often saddled with archaic buildings, and their plans and desires outstripped their available funds, even when these funds numbered in the tens of millions of dollars for the annual budget of one zoo alone. Exhibits could be found in first class zoos which were worse--in terms of meeting the animals' needs or educating the public--than some which could be found in third class zoos. All of these zoos were characterized, Sue emphasized, by the autonomy of the professional staff to determine the zoo's philosophy and future direction. They were generally under the control of zoological societies.
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These zoos led the way in conservation and education programs. Under the direction of William Conway, the New York Zoological Society (NYZS) "bucked the trend" in collecting large numbers of species and began, in the 1960's, to "change the collection in the Bronx Zoo to emphasize breeding groups rather than singletons or pairs" (Campbell, 1978, p.36). The NYZS also sponsored the study of mountain gorillas which led to the publication of a scientific book on the characteristics of these little known and much maligned animals, as well as the popular book, The Year of the Gorilla. The author of these works, Dr. George Schaller, became the coordinator of the NYZS's Center for Field Biology and Conservation, and would continue to study the behavior of animals in the wild and publish both scientific and popular accounts of his observations under the Society's sponsorship.

It also seems that the revelations about the shortcomings of zoos emanated primarily from the class 1 zoo. Hence it is not surprising to find Schaller reporting in The Mountain Gorilla:

The most reprehensible shooting of gorillas is being done by some zoo collectors, who usually slaughter the female, and even the whole group, in order to obtain the infants for export. That such a drastic collecting technique is unnecessary has been shown by Cordier, who has safely netted whole groups, and by Rhyiner (1958), who has captured infants unharmed by using tear gas.(p.321)

Although the criticisms offered by zoo people of their profession and its shortcomings have been intended to inspire improvements, they have been used as arguments for the elimination of zoos (See: Zoos Pro and Con). But The Humane Society of the United States, although it has veered very close to an anti-zoo position from time to time, has officially maintained a position supporting the efforts of good
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zoo, the improvement of mediocre zoos, and the elimination of bad zoos. The rating system was created as a means to distinguish among them, and while it is perhaps a rather simplistic means of doing so (See: Conclusions and Recommendations), it has effectively prevented the Humane Society, its constituents, the general public, and the news media from lumping together in one indistinguishable mass such radically different operations as the New York Zoological Park and the gas station with a caged bear simply because they are both referred to by the all-purpose term "zoo."

Sue expressed to the Board of The HSUS the hope that class 3 zoos would be eliminated by the USDA when it began to inspect and license exhibitors under the Animal Welfare Act. As a former staff member of a zoo, she expressed disappointment that the Federal Government had been forced to regulate zoos (HSUS Files):

I think of qualified zoo people in the same way as I do a doctor. A highly skilled professional who must maintain professional standards. To have the federal government forced to set guidelines was a great disappointment to me. I feel the zoo professional has not been careful of the company he keeps. He has done very little to regulate and accredit his contemporaries. A small handful have a deep moral commitment but they are rare. The HSUS should be a conscience plus a sounding board for the public on zoo matters.

The focus of The HSUS Zoo Program became the elimination of the class 3 zoo and the elevation of class 2 zoos to the level of their class 1 counterparts. To accomplish this, public awareness and sympathy were essential.

Sue stressed that she judged zoos from the perspective of the informed and concerned citizen. She urged the general public and humane societies to do the same by asking certain questions of themselves as they visited zoos. She described
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this approach in a speech to The HSUS New Jersey Branch and urged the members of the audience to ask themselves if the zoo appeared to have a "social conscience." To make that determination one must first ask: what does the zoo do for the community? Does it have programs for school children? Does it provide an education service for the school system? Does it have a staff of professionals who are willing and able to speak out on conservation issues and give advice about specific problems relating to either indigenous or exotic animals in the community? Are there significant and farsighted breeding programs underway at the zoo? Do the zoo's staff members give testimony on legislation to protect wildlife? Do the keepers have adequate training and concern for their animals? Do you as a visitor to the zoo get anything positive out of your visit?

Sue maintained from the earliest days of the Zoo Program that zoos belong to the community and the citizens have just as much responsibility as the municipality to insure that the zoo functions as it should. A bad zoo, she contended, is reflective of an apathetic community. Enlightened, concerned citizens can improve zoos. To generate the necessary concern The HSUS made its findings public.
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When the results of Sue Pressman's random look at zoos were made public, the emphasis was upon those conditions most in need of reform. Although such an exposé-approach was offensive to a number of people in the zoo world—and not merely those whose zoos were sub-standard (Wagner, Personal Communication)—a less dramatic approach would probably not have gotten the attention necessary to make the needed changes.

From the time that Sue Pressman's findings about class 3 zoos were reported in Jack Anderson's Washington Merry-Go-Round column under the heading "Some Zoos Called Dens of Horror," the Zoo Program made "good copy." Anderson lent credence to Sue's findings when he declared that he and his associates had reached 15 of the 17 zoos that had been deemed "ghettoes for animals" and that only one of them denied all of the Humane Society's charges. Even the Manager of the Norristown, Pennsylvania Zoo who, according to Anderson, called the description of the zoo's inadequacies "an exaggeration," acknowledged that the "cages and buildings in the zoo [were] in poor repair and . . . animals [had] almost no exercise." From her observations, Anderson reported, Sue was able to estimate that "25 percent of U.S. zoos [needed] immediate reform."

Over the years Sue has been quoted in such publications as The Wall Street Journal, New York Times, Washington Post and Los Angeles Times, as well as countless other papers from the Detroit Free Press to small town weeklies and college campus newsheets. The Zoo Reform Program has also been covered in Town and Country and New York magazines; the Christian Science Monitor; Ranger Rick, the children's publication of the National Wildlife Federation; and in the Defenders of Wildlife Magazine. Sue's analyses of zoos have also appeared in Roger Caras's syndicated
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column, "Pets and Wildlife," and were mentioned on his radio program.

Television and radio stations have proved to be as interested in the Zoo Program as newspapers and magazines. In addition to the dozens of local radio and television news programs which have covered the criticisms made of their local zoos, Sue has appeared to discuss zoo problems on the "Dick Cavett Show" and on "Bill Burrud's Animal World."

The rating system is discussed in some detail in a book entitled, Zoo: Animals, People, Places (Livingston, 1974). The Zoo Program is also referred to in Living Trophies: A Shocking Look at Conditions in America's Zoos (Batten, 1976), though no mention of the rating system is made (See: Criticisms and Praise of The HSUS Zoo Program).

The HSUS constituency welcomed with enthusiasm the Society's foray into the zoo world. At the Annual Conference in 1971 a resolution was passed by the membership directing the Society to continue the program and "encourage other humane organizations on a local level to involve themselves with zoo institutions and their programs, societies and management policies. . . ."

At the Annual Conference the following year, according to John Hoyt, a proposed resolution calling for the abolition of zoos was defeated. Instead, a resolution was passed calling for continued reform:

Whereas The Humane Society of the United States is the first major national humane society to show a real concern about the current condition, the future and the entire philosophy of zoos; and Whereas, investigations have disclosed gross inadequacies and a need for correction; and Whereas, the rationale for the continued existence of zoos requires that all zoo animals be provided with
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habitat appropriate to that species and that each exhibit have significant educational value, be it Resolved, that The Humane Society of the United States continue to maintain and expand a working relationship with the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums, with particular emphasis on development and implementation of their accreditation program. . . . and be it further resolved, that [The HSUS] encourage broad public participation in zoo reform through establishment and support of local zoological societies. . . .

Both years the resolutions concluded with particular emphasis on the need for adequate enforcement of federal legislation governing the welfare of captive animals.

More than 150 respondents to a questionnaire on the back of the July 1971 HSUS News expressed their observations about zoos all over the country. A minority indicated disapproval of zoos in general, while others compared the "bad" zoos with "good" zoos they had visited on other occasions. Still others expressed approval for a particular zoo, but their revelations indicating an absence of educational programs were construed by The HSUS as indicative of a zoo not living up to its responsibilities to the community. Most people complained of unclean conditions, sterile cages, lethargic animals, and overcrowding. A recurring complaint was the absence of keepers or other zoo staff members to whom questions and criticisms could be directed.

Initially, the official response of the AAZPA to The HSUS's criticisms of zoos was positive. At the Association's Annual Meeting in 1971, outgoing AAZPA President Gunther Voss "cited The HSUS for bringing zoo problems to public attention and urged zoo directors to cooperate with the Humane Society to improve their circumstances."
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In the same issue of The HSUS News (November 1971) which carried Voss's comments, there appeared a letter from Peter Crowcroft, Director of Chicago's Brookfield Zoo. He said:

I want to congratulate you on your publication of Mrs. Pressman's article on zoos in your July issue. We are trying to change people's attitudes to animals and to zoos, but it is a long haul, usually hampered by the completely emotional attitudes of animal lovers. Mrs. Pressman's objective and sensible approach to our problems is a refreshing improvement. I hope that you will continue to publish such material about our problems.

The HSUS did continue to publish the results of its investigations of zoos and in July 1972 published its first "Special Report on Zoos" which compared the HSUS's efforts to those of Ralph Nader. The report emphasized the need for zoos to have an educational purpose and criticized the drive-through parks for not being sufficiently educational in spite of the additional space they provided for animals in more naturalistic settings than those provided by old-fashioned cages. The report had one shortcoming: It made no mention that the call for reform had been sounded long ago by members of the zoo profession, however few in number they might have been. This would not really prove to be a problem, however, until the next special report was published in 1975 and zoo people would take umbrage at The HSUS's "arrogance."

It is not surprising that the report made no mention of the positive work of the few progressive zoos in the country, since The HSUS believed it was necessary to draw attention to the worst conditions in zoos in order to inspire a meaningful movement for reforms. The AAZPA was obviously not getting the message across to a large enough audience--including many of its own members. As Sue responded to
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the Supervisor of the Children's Zoo in Houston, Texas, who had criticized the report of The HSUS's investigation as it had appeared in Jack Anderson's column (HSUS Houston Zoo File);

What the investigation is meant to do is to make it impossible for an employee to ever say again what you said in the middle of your third paragraph, 'almost every zoo has areas which should change but cannot. . . .'

Sue continued to urge the members of the AAZPA to make use of The HSUS's attention-getting abilities to achieve the mutual goal of the Humane Society and the modern zoo to inspire in the zoo-going public a respect for animal life and desire for its preservation. She stated to the audience at the AAZPA's Western Regional Conference in 1972 (HSUS files):

You can look at The HSUS as a service. We are in a position to help your zoo, to communicate with people outside your circle who often are unreachable through other means, and to emphasize the reasons for zoos. . . . Use us, use the concerned public, the news media, and other groups organized to lobby for just such causes as yours.

The Assistant Director of the Oklahoma City Zoo was so favorably impressed with Sue's remarks that he asked for a copy of the speech to share with his staff members.

But not all members of the zoo world welcomed The HSUS's involvement or agreed with its philosophy concerning zoos. Zoos were different as the rating system indicated, and The HSUS was striving to make them more alike. The substandard zoos were generally resistive to change.

By 1975, The HSUS had developed a written statement of policy concerning zoos.
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It states:

The Humane Society of the United States acknowledges two broad categories of institutions that are identified as zoos. The first is the true zoological garden, often municipally owned and operated, though sometimes administered by a zoological society composed of citizens of the community in which it is located. Some within this category are run by a commercial enterprise. Both have the potential to provide a unique opportunity for conservation and wildlife education. Additionally, some such zoos may serve as survival centers for endangered species that would otherwise be extinct.

For the potential good that The HSUS sees in such zoos, it is forced to state that too few institutions have come close to realizing that potential. The fault often lies in the concepts and purposes for creating such zoos, in antiquated caging and housing, in the lack of sufficient and often inadequately trained personnel, and especially with the community or commercial enterprise that fails to support and finance such institutions in order that they may be maintained with the highest degree of humaneness and care toward the animals and function educationally for the benefit of visitors who attend in extremely large numbers.

The HSUS feels that any community or commercial enterprise that fails to provide adequate financial support to insure these objectives does not deserve to have a zoo and should be denied the opportunity. No presumed educational potential can justify an institution in which animals are maintained under inhumane conditions. Indeed, it is the position of The HSUS that inhumane conditions in the zoo when seen by an impressionable public provide a negative educational experience by seeming to condone cruelty and indifference. The HSUS does not find these qualities of any merit and certainly does not see them as justification for maintaining a zoo at all.

The second category of zoos is the so-called "roadside zoo," seldom more than permanently substandard menageries whose sole purpose is to attract people to other facilities such as diners, gift shops and motels. The HSUS finds no justification or merit in these latter institutions and calls for their immediate and permanent closing.

In summary, The HSUS acknowledges the value of some zoos in this country by reason of their achieved excellence; it recognizes the potential of others now believed to be making strides in the areas of our concern; and at the same time recognizes that there are zoos for which little hope can be expressed. With this in mind, The HSUS pledges itself to constant efforts toward improvement of conditions of all zoos and the eradication of those that will not or cannot improve.
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By 1973, The HSUS had visited 267 zoos, and in the nine years since Zoo Reform was made a program issue of The HSUS several hundred zoos of all three classes have been inspected by Sue or by The HSUS Regional Directors and their Investigators acting under her direction (See Appendix A). Some zoos have received considerable attention, such as the Tucson, Kansas City, San Antonio and Little Rock Zoos. Others such as Atlanta, and the Topeka and Wichita, Kansas Zoos, for example, have received very little. Some zoos have obviously improved and the improvements can be attributed in part to The HSUS's efforts; but because zoos are generally complex institutions it is seldom possible to attribute changes exclusively to any one individual or organization. In many cases The HSUS's criticisms of zoos have been extensively publicized, and the changes, when they came, have often been in keeping with HSUS recommendations--but it is still not always possible to attribute these solely to the intervention of The HSUS. In some cases, zoos have remained essentially the same in spite of the Society's repeated criticisms and offers of assistance.

It is neither possible nor desirable to examine in detail all of the zoo "cases" represented in The HSUS files, but a few examples of certain aspects of specific cases will serve to illustrate HSUS's approach to zoos, the relative strengths and weaknesses of that approach, and some of the circumstances which have reinforced or undermined the Society's efforts.

One of the first zoos to receive considerable attention from The HSUS was the Randolph Park Zoo in Tucson, Arizona. Complaints from citizens had continued since Frank McMahon had been there the year before. The zoo was only a few years old, but like many city zoos it had been started by accident when the Parks Director
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began to take in "pets"—such as monkeys—that people could no longer keep. Soon the common tendency to collect "popular" species led to the acquisition of a polar bear, elephants, and leopards with no apparent understanding on the part of the Parks Department of the increasing demand of the public that they be displayed in more naturalistic surroundings than simple barred cages. While the zoo did have a concerned staff trying to make the best of the circumstances, there was no professional director to provide the necessary leadership.

Sue recommended, as she would on many occasions over the next nine years, that a knowledgeable director be hired immediately. She also said that the number of animals had to be reduced to relieve the stress of overcrowding. She spoke of the need for the zoo to have a greater purpose than the mere exhibition of assorted creatures, and she expressed her opinion that the zoo violated the provisions of the newly enacted Animal Welfare Act. The HSUS along with the AAZPA, Defenders of Wildlife, The American Humane Association, and others had submitted comments to USDA as the regulations were being drawn up. Sue felt she understood the intent of the regulations, but the comments of the USDA veterinary inspector indicated the Animal Welfare Act was not to be the boon to zoo reform that animal welfare workers, progressive zoo people, and, doubtless, Congress had hoped it would be.

Not only did the USDA inspector, who came to Tucson in response to Sue's complaints, pronounce the zoo not in violation of the Act, he went a step further indicating it was "fine." An editorial in the Tucson Daily Citizen entitled, "Will The Real Zoo Please Stand Up", compared Sue's comments with those of the USDA inspector: "A person does not have to be a doctor of zoology to see that the Randolph Zoo
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cages too many animals in overcrowded, unnatural, inhumane conditions." Although Sue agreed with the USDA veterinarian that the cages were generally clean and the animals in good physical health, she said:

We have completely different interpretations of the law, completely different ideas on what a zoo should be. The Animal Welfare Act is a whole new philosophy on zoos. . . . [the law] requires that an animal be able to move and act in a natural way, to live in a normal social environment. The law is not a check off list for cleanliness, cage size and feeding schedules. Tucson's zoo violates all that the law was trying to do.

The response of the USDA veterinarian was simply, "How do I know what an elephant's needs are? How does anyone know?"

Fortunately, the Parks Department took Sue's suggestion to hire a professional director. The Director, James Sweigert, understood both the needs of captive animals and the public's desire to see them displayed in more naturalistic surroundings. By the end of his first year, Sweigert had reduced the inventory from nearly 1,000 animals to less than 300. He also renovated numerous exhibits to make them more comfortable for the animals and more aesthetic and educational for the visitors. The elephants were moved from a sterile, barred enclosure to an outdoor paddock with trees and a pond. Sweigert expressed the view of a growing number of progressive zoo directors when he stated to the Tucson Daily Citizen (July 12, 1973): "A zoo that is uncomfortable and unnatural for the animals is a meaningless place. It has no function, no reason for being." Another indication that Sweigert represented a "new breed" was his refusal to accept the city's offer of a mere $60,000.00 to build a new exhibit for the polar bear. He knew that an adequate exhibit could not be built in the Arizona climate for that amount.
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Sue's response to Sweigert's actions also came to be typical of her approach over the next nine years: she offered praise and encouragement and indicated a willingness to "calm folks down" if the local citizens would not give him time to make the needed changes. Some of them by this time had become so skeptical of the zoo that they could not be satisfied with anything less than instantaneous change. The question of time has proved to be a problem of varying degrees in getting changes made in zoos. In Tucson's case, it was 1978 before Sue could inform the director who followed Sweigert that she had reclassified the zoo from a 3 to a 2.

One of the inherent problems with arousing a community's interest in its zoo centers around the question of what constitutes a reasonable amount of time in which changes should be made. On several occasions Sue has had to urge the local citizens, as in Tucson, to give the zoo's staff time to make changes. In other cases, the local people have been lulled into complacency with news of appropriations and professionally designed master-plans (as is the case with the Des Moines, Iowa, and Buffalo, New York Zoos) which never seem to be executed. Often Sue has given zoos specific periods of time in which to make requested changes. Sometimes, depending upon the municipality's perception of HSUS's strength and determination, this has proved to be effective. Getting action from the chronically uncooperative, however, has proved to be a major stumbling block in the Zoo Program.

If the municipality proved unresponsive to suggestions and offers of assistance, and the published accounts of the zoo's inadequacies failed to generate sufficient public pressure, and the pressure from within the zoo generated by the staff
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seemed inadequate to sustain the movement for improvements, Sue has threatened a number of municipalities with legal action. The possibility of a lawsuit against a recalcitrant municipality has long been considered by The HSUS as a means of demonstrating the seriousness of its intent to have substandard zoos either improved or closed. Some of the municipalities which have been threatened with legal action are Miami, Florida; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Lafayette, Indiana; Springfield, Massachusetts; Akron, Ohio; and Trenton, New Jersey. In his testimony before the Senate subcommittee considering bills to provide federal assistance to zoos and aquariums, HSUS President John Hoyt alluded to the possibility that the Society would take legal action against a zoo with the statement that: "The HSUS has moved to force the closing of certain zoos already and has put others on notice that unless substantial improvements are made immediately, we shall take action to bring about their termination" (U.S. Congress, 1974, p.73).

Yet despite these claims, The HSUS has never filed suit against a zoo in order to bring about closure or extensive changes. Cruelty charges were filed against the Director of the Birmingham, Alabama Zoo in 1977, but these charges were related to a specific incident and not due to the kind of sustained apathy which appears to characterize the class 3 municipal zoo (See: Criticisms and Praise of The HSUS Zoo Program). The Birmingham case will not be discussed in this paper because, as a result of a countersuit for malicious prosecution filed by the Director against The HSUS, the case is still under consideration in the courts.

The local news media have often supported The HSUS's criticisms of a zoo. An editorial in the Akron Beacon Journal in October 1974 expressed the sentiment that Sue had been firm but fair in her criticism of the Akron Children's Zoo. It stated:
Mrs. Pressman's visit should be welcomed, not only by citizens who had been concerned about cruelty since a black bear died at the zoo in May, but by those who have been working hard to stir public interest in the zoo. The things Mrs. Pressman criticized deserve criticizing. There is a need for a qualified director who can help the zoo grow. The cages are archaic. The exhibits need to be more than 'little cages of animals' that just stand there.

The editorial writer seemed to be impressed with the fact that she found no deliberate cruelty and considered the staff to be praiseworthy (HSUS: Akron Zoo File).

In an October 1978 article in the Detroit Free Press entitled "Detroit Zoo Critic Wounds Some Feelings," the reporter appeared to take both sides, both agreeing and disagreeing with Sue's criticisms, but she concluded: "Listen Mrs. Pressman, it's still a super zoo. But maybe you're right: Maybe it's too good not to try for better" (HSUS: Michigan Zoos File).

The Tulsa World expressed a sentiment in a February 1975 article about Sue's criticisms of the Tulsa Zoo that has often been expressed about The HSUS's zoo investigations: that while no deliberate cruelty may be found, the report is still not considered to be a "whitewash." In this respect The HSUS has had an advantage over zoo evaluations conducted by zoo professionals. Sue had been called to Tulsa in the wake of a "keeper revolt" in which employees had charged the zoo's administration with cruelty and mismanagement. One article in the Tulsa World in January 1975 stated:

Sometimes, it is surprising how simple a much-ballyhooed public problem can appear when the emotionalism is stripped away, the facts examined intelligently and placed in perspective. This is exactly what Mrs. Sue Pressman has done with the big fuss over animal care at the Tulsa Zoo. Mrs. Pressman made a number of sensible recommendations for improving the zoo. . . . [her] report was no whitewash,
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but she turned up no villains either. [She] seems to have given
City Hall a blueprint for solving zoo problems if it can find the
money and the will to follow through.

An article in the Tulsa Tribune on March 15, 1975, revealed that a number of her
recommendations--similar to those made by the zoo society which had asked for her
help--were being carried out (HSUS: Tulsa Zoo File).

Typical of The HSUS approach to zoos have been Sue's recommendations to munici­
palities to get in touch with zoo professionals in neighboring cities. She has
also suggested on numerous occasions that zoo directors be permitted to attend
AAZPA meetings so they could keep up with developments in the rapidly evolving
zoo world. Her most consistently made recommendation, however, has been for
municipalities to consult professional zoo planners before renovating or enlarging
their zoos. Zoo planning is a highly specialized field, requiring extensive
knowledge of animal behavior as well as of materials and concepts. Too many
exhibits designed by local architects have simply repeated the mistakes of the
past.
The Effects of Municipal Interference

Since the inception of the Zoo Program, Sue Pressman has stressed to animal welfare advocates and the general public that problems in zoos are often the result of interference by municipal officials. Everything from vandalism due to inadequate security, to deaths resulting from insufficient veterinary care or equipment, to aberrant behavior caused by sterile exhibits can be traced to the unwillingness of municipal officials to follow the recommendations of the zoo's professional staff. In a letter to an HSUS member Sue stated her belief that "we have some of the most capable zoo professionals in the world working under impossible conditions in American zoos" (HSUS files).

A newspaper article in 1973 drew attention to the municipal constraints causing problems with the San Francisco Zoo (Lublin, 1973):

In 1965, San Francisco's Zoo had an estimated 846 animals and 28 keepers. Eight years later, the zoo has approximately 400 more animals and the same number of keepers. . . . requests for additional keepers 'have been steadily turned down for the last several years.'

The same article revealed that, until recently, the zoo's staff did not have control over the funds generated by the sale of surplus animals. Those funds went back into the city's general fund while "new animals [were] purchased on a lowest bid system, [and] frequently arrived deformed and maimed."

One of the original zoos inspected by Sue in 1971 was the Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania Zoo. Half of the zoo was operated by the zoological society and received a rating of 2; the other half, operated by the municipality, was rated 3. She referred to it as a "Jekyll and Hyde establishment" and told the Director of the municipal half, "we can show you antiquated zoos stymied by municipalities and
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zoos that are true learning facilities managed by zoological societies. . . .
Pittsburgh Zoo is the epitome, for it shows the differences in one place and in one zoo" (HSUS: Pittsburgh Zoo Files).

The zoo became the scene of a political struggle between the zoo society and Pittsburgh's Mayor Flaherty. Flaherty blamed The HSUS's criticisms on the Zoo Society. He revealed his own lack of understanding of the zoo's function when he publicly criticized the Zoo Society for spending its money on new exhibits. He stated to the press, "We don't need exhibits, we need a better zoo." He never explained how the zoo might be improved without better exhibits.

The Zoo Society also asked for assistance from the AAZPA. Fred Zeehandelaar, an animal dealer and one of the trio sent by AAZPA to assist the Zoo Society in its struggle, stated that the society had changed its part of the zoo from one of the worst in the country to one of the best. He also stated he knew of five other zoos around the country that were locked in similar battles with their municipal officials, and he compared the situation to the AAZPA's own struggle for autonomy:

[Zeehandelaar] said a trend is developing across the nation for greater control of zoos by agencies such as the [zoo] society and added in no uncertain terms that municipal officials, despite the best of intentions don't know how to handle a big-city zoo. . . . Only six months ago, the AAZPA managed a divorce [from the National Recreation and Park Association], the purpose of which was to concentrate exclusively on the zoo profession--the conservation of animals, the education of the public, the enjoyment of the children and the improvement of zoo exhibits--without the burden of interference and supervision by well-meaning but unqualified public officials (HSUS: Pittsburgh Zoo Files).

After battling the Mayor for several years, the Zoological Society finally withdrew altogether in 1975, charging the city and the Mayor with harassment by failing
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to provide adequate police protection, lighting, and other essential services for the society's half of the zoo. The entire zoo has been under municipal control since that time and, according to Sue, has remained stagnant.

On two other occasions since the Zoo Program was initiated, The HSUS has been asked to enter a conflict surrounding a zoo at the same time that a panel of zoo professionals was asked to make an evaluation. The Los Angeles Zoo in 1973 was in the midst of a struggle after a group of disgruntled keepers issued a 45 page report complaining of, among other things, overcrowded conditions; poorly designed exhibits which were difficult to clean and dangerous to animals, keepers, and the visiting public; lack of concern on the part of the zoo's administrators; consistently poor communications between management and staff; and insufficient equipment for handling animals. They also complained that management tended to accept temporary solutions to permanent problems, and city maintenance crews caused problems because they were only answerable to the city.

The three zoo directors called in to make an evaluation of the problems stated frankly that there were both management and design problems. They suggested the zoo be established as a separate department of the city government with the zoo director as the department head. Further, they recommended that a new policy making board devoted exclusively to the zoo be established, and sufficient funds be allocated to enable the zoo to function properly.

The panel of directors declined to refer to themselves as investigators, and suggested that the zoo staff would be the best source of information concerning improperly housed animals. Their responses indicate a certain ambivalence
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about the task of evaluating a zoo which was "under fire." If they proved to be too critical of the specific inadequacies of the zoo, they might be charged with professional jealousy or of "throwing stones" while living in "glass houses," since inadequacies could doubtless be found in their own zoos. If, on the other hand, they were not sufficiently critical, they would be charged with a "whitewash" and simply protecting the members of their own profession. Some of the keepers and one of the zoo's veterinarians did, in fact, charge the panel with "whitewashing" the zoo's problems, but the charge was probably unfair in light of the rather extensive criticisms and recommendations the panel actually made.

The panel did acknowledge that the zoo had extensive problems and referred to it as a "professional graveyard" (i.e., it was unable to retain professional staff members due to its reputation for municipal interference). But at the same time they declared that "the citizens of Los Angeles and the news media should realize what a fine zoo they have and what an asset it is to the community" (HSUS: Los Angeles Zoo File). Perhaps Dr. Charles Schroeder, one of the panel members and the Director Emeritus of the San Diego, California Zoo, said more than he realized when he stated to the Los Angeles Times (Goodman, 1973): "If there's a crisis in the L.A. Zoo, there's a crisis in zoos across the country."

The HSUS position was more reflective of the keeper's position than that of Dr. Schroeder and the panelists. The keepers and the zoo directors had both submitted lengthy, detailed reports to the city. Sue's remarks were more brief, and with one or two exceptions, were of a general nature. They were in keeping with The HSUS's usual approach to zoos: to draw attention to specific conditions of an urgent nature, but otherwise to defer to the professional staff or professional
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zoo planners for changes in program or exhibit design. She recommended that the zoo needed: both a director and a business manager; improved health care and diets; a lightening of the inventory; and for the city to follow the actions suggested by the zoo staff in its list of "high priority zoo projects" which had already been submitted to the Zoo Board.

Sue's report differed from that of the panel in that she placed part of the blame for conditions in the zoo upon the Zoo Society. She charged that its membership was "stagnant" and that it had "failed to reach out to the . . . community and the community [had] failed to respond to the zoo." She contended that "the Zoological Society, much like a humane society, should represent the public, its needs, and its desires for conservation and [education about wildlife]."

Unlike Mayor Flaherty of Pittsburgh, Mayor Bradley of Los Angeles welcomed constructive criticism. He concluded that the city was hindering the zoo's progress and took steps to rectify the situation. Mayor Bradley expressed his thanks to The HSUS for its help, hired a professional director and gave him the autonomy necessary to operate the zoo properly.

In 1979 Sue was able to change the rating of the Los Angeles Zoo from a class 2 to a class 1. She also reported that the Greater Los Angeles Zoo Association (GLAZA) has increased its membership very dramatically and is now functioning as an effective intermediary between the community and the zoo.

On one other occasion Sue has been asked to investigate a zoo at the same time as a panel of zoo professionals: In Kansas City in 1978. Though the Mayor welcomed The HSUS's intervention saying it was "supremely qualified to carry out an investi-
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gation," the Parks Board ultimately was unhappy with Sue's criticisms because they were of a general nature. Sue, however, felt it important that the Parks Board not become so involved in details that they lose sight of the larger issues. She stated to one Kansas City newspaper that the Parks Board "must identify the disease and attempt to fix the entire body . . . they can't keep on with their policy of fixing little wounds."

The Parks Director indicated his ignorance of modern zoo management when he stated his reluctance to honor Sue's request to "lighten the inventory by 30%," because people "want to see lots of animals."

A number of the zoo's keepers had charged that animals were mishandled and kept in crowded, filthy surroundings. As has often been the case when zoos have been investigated by The HSUS in the wake of a "keeper revolt," Sue found that the substandard conditions were the result of the Parks Board's interference with the ability of the Zoo Director to do his job. She also found that the Director lacked administrative ability and tended to be somewhat old-fashioned in his overall approach to the zoo, but she found no evidence of deliberate cruelty or neglect. She explained her view of the keeper's charges in an internal HSUS memorandum: "One way of looking at these things is not to respond necessarily to [a] particular charge but to look at it as a symptom and find out how that particular fester got there."

The panel of three zoo professionals, including again Dr. Charles Schroeder, made extensive recommendations and cited numerous specific problems; but, they added, many of the problems could be corrected within two or three days. Dr. Schroeder,
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the spokesman for the panel, stated to the Kansas City Times that "most of the complaints [that had appeared in the newspaper] are legitimate . . . on the other hand, they're no different from any other zoo, our own [San Diego Zoo] included." Although they seemed to be trying to give as objective an analysis of the zoo's problems as possible, the panel was accused by one of the Parks Commissioners of being biased because of "close, personal ties" between two of the panel members and the Parks Department Director.

When the evaluations of the panel of zoo professionals, The HSUS, and the USDA were compared and found to be similar in many respects, the Parks Board began to make some changes at the zoo. The Board, having been stung by Sue's criticisms, appeared to defer more to the recommendations made in the evaluations of USDA and the zoo professionals. The keepers, however, attributed improvements to The HSUS's intervention. They even named one of the zoo's new baby animals Sue Ann after Sue Pressman and Ann Gonnerman, stating: "Because of those two women, a lot of changes are being made [in the zoo]" (HSUS: Kansas City Zoo Files).

Most people in the zoo world would probably be surprised to learn that complaints about zoos have often come from within the zoo's own staff. The "keeper revolts" which prompted The HSUS's investigation of the Los Angeles and Kansas City Zoos were not isolated phenomena. The HSUS files indicate similar charges of cruelty and mismanagement have been levelled against zoo administrations by keepers or other staff people in zoos in San Francisco, California; Tulsa and Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Buffalo, New York; Rio Grande, New Mexico; and Bloomington, Illinois.
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The relationship between zoos and humane organizations became markedly more adverse in 1973 and 1974. All of the major national animal welfare organizations had begun to criticize zoos, with some indicating their opposition to any continuance at all of zoos and aquariums. The zoos blamed the criticisms of the animal welfare organizations, to varying degrees, for the increase in restrictive legislation. By this time, zoos were subject to federal regulation under the Endangered Species Act, the Animal Welfare Act, the Lacey Act, and the Marine Mammal Protection Act. In this negative climate zoo officials and humane society representatives began to regard each other with mutual suspicion: Animal welfare advocates appeared to suspect there was more cruelty in zoos than was readily apparent, and some zoo people feared that all humane groups were, in spite of pronouncements to the contrary, opposed to zoos altogether.

Animal welfare organizations no doubt contributed to the adversity with the testimony they submitted in 1974 to the Senate Subcommittee considering two bills to provide federal assistance to zoos and aquariums. Although the testimony presented by HSUS President John Hoyt was more favorable to zoos than that presented by Bernard Fensterwald for the Committee for Humane Legislation or Christine Stevens for the Society for Animal Protective Legislation, it was ultimately incompatible with The HSUS's own rating system. All three organizations had indicated their common belief that federal funds should not be used for the enlargement of zoos or for their proliferation. Only The HSUS indicated an understanding of the problems facing zoos in the form of municipal interference, antiquated structures, and lack of funds, based on its inspection of more than 250 zoos of all sizes since 1971.
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Mr. Hoyt stated that:

The HSUS believes that certain types of zoos do indeed have a place in the ecological and educational systems of our society and culture. However, we believe quite strongly that there are few zoos in the United States today that can justify their continued existence, based on current philosophy and rationale (U.S. Cong., 1974, p.69).

This statement presented a far more negative view of zoos than The HSUS's rating system which revealed that most American zoos--other than the "roadside" menageries--were considered to be in class 2, and though not living up to their potential, should not be considered as fit subjects for elimination.

Like the other organizations presenting testimony, The HSUS felt that the proposed Federal Zoo Board should not contain a majority of members representing zoological interests, but acknowledged that zoo professionals should certainly be included. Mrs. Stevens had gone so far as to say "we do not believe any zoo director should be on a board where decisions are being made, either about the level of standards or about the provision of funds to zoos" (U.S. Cong., 1974, pp.61-62).

Where Fensterwald had suggested that all "commercial zoos" be eliminated from eligibility for federal funds under the bill, The HSUS recognized the necessity for distinguishing between such good commercially operated establishments as Busch Gardens and the "unprofessional roadside zoo" (p.60).

All of the humane organizations stressed the need for the bill to specify that no research could be conducted in zoos which was not directly beneficial to the health and welfare of the animals in the collection. John Hoyt went so far as to assert
that The HSUS had not accepted as fact the charges that "the bill is a front for providing animals for research facilities, and providing extraneous research possibilities" (p.70).

It is worthy of note also that although Mrs. Stevens entered a number of newspaper articles about zoos in the record along with Desmond Morris's 1968 Life magazine article, only The HSUS Special Report on Zoos appears in the transcript of the hearings.

After the publication of the second HSUS Special Report on Zoos in 1975, the relationship between The HSUS and the AAZPA deteriorated even further. By that time a number of AAZPA members had gotten together to form the Zoological Action Committee, or ZOOACT, to lobby against legislation and regulations seen as unduly restrictive. In a presentation to the April 1975 Regional Conference of the AAZPA, ZOOACT's Executive Director George Steele, Jr. criticized The HSUS along with the other "protectionists-for-profit" which were trying to close all exhibitions of all wild animals in this country" (HSUS Files).

Steele charged that the March 1975 HSUS Special Report contained "false and perhaps libelous statements." One of those statements was the assertion that the AAZPA had hired a lobbyist to fight restrictive legislation. The zoos were very sensitive about the issue because the AAZPA was subject to the same restrictions upon lobbying as humane societies. Steele stated that the distribution of the report had been temporarily halted by the AAZPA, and that the report condemned all zoos "through guilt by association" and misinterpreted the motives of the "zoological community." He made what was undoubtedly intended to be a most damning charge
against The HSUS: that it was starting to look like a radical rather than a reasonable humane organization. He said:

Until recently, many of us representing zoological institutions went out of our way to separate The Humane Society [of the U.S.] from those radical, extreme humaniac organizations who oppose zoos. It would appear that perhaps we were wrong. It is becoming as difficult to separate humaniac organizations as it is to distinguish boys from girls at a unisex convention. Unfortunately, and regrettably, this latest publication by The Humane Society is uncomfortably reminiscent of some of the statements made by Alice Herrington and the Committee of [sic] Humane Legislation and the Friends of Animals (HSUS Files).

Steele also referred to the threat against zoos from restrictive state legislation. He cited the Animal Protection Act pending in the state of Texas, "aided and abetted" by The HSUS's Gulf States Regional Office, which, Steele claimed, "could be far more restrictive and damaging to zoos in the state than the current existing and pending federal legislation." He neglected to say, and perhaps he was unaware, that HSUS Regional Director Doug Scott had asked for the assistance of several zoo people, with whom he had worked closely and cooperatively on numerous occasions, in drafting the proposed act. To Scott's dismay, he found that not only did no one respond, after he had taken the time to keep them informed of the progress of the legislation--intended to eliminate roadside zoos--and solicited their comments, but those whom he had considered as allies with mutual humane interests showed up to testify against the bill (Scott, Personal Communication). In this climate of mutual distrust, zoo professionals and humane societies could not work together to realize their common goals.

Sue Pressman, George Steele, and some members of the AAZPA believed it was essential to break this nonproductive impasse. ZOOACT had indicated as one of its
objectives the intent "to establish a rapport with the opposition" (Todd, 1976, p.4); so, in 1976 a series of "Zoological/Environmental" conferences was begun. The purpose of these meetings was to enable the parties to discuss their differences civilly, and to agree on legislative matters where possible in order to present a "united front" to Congress. Only those "responsible conservation and environmental organizations" were invited to participate. It was felt that no progress would be possible if humane organizations were included which opposed zoos altogether, and only The HSUS and the Animal Welfare Institute have been consistently included in these meetings over the years.

In 1979 when he was asked to represent animal trainers, George Steele agreed to do so only if the trainers would accept the minimum standards drawn up by The HSUS.
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The HSUS made no major effort to have zoos and aquariums included under the Animal Welfare Act of 1970, but it has more than made up for this initial lack of involvement by its participation in the formulation of the regulations and by making the general public aware of the existence and intent of the Act. Additionally, at the request of officials of the Department of Agriculture, Sue Pressman has given instructions to USDA's field inspectors on several occasions since 1971 to enable them to interpret the Act's inexact provisions for the benefit of the animals rather than the convenience of their owners. Sue has repeatedly insisted that the USDA has the authority to interpret the minimum standards within a certain flexible range and should "flex up" instead of down. Exhibits which are barely above the minimum have less distance to fall and minor mishaps can result in suffering for the animals.

The claim that "Zoos [are] in Peril of Padlocking by U.S.", as a headline declared in the *Pittsburgh Post* in 1972, expressed the hope of many people including animal welfare advocates, members of Congress, and segments of the general public and the zoo profession. When Dr. C.O. Finch, the Senior Staff Veterinarian for USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Services (APHIS) stated that "we would prefer not to padlock zoos . . . but there may be no choice if we want to relieve the suffering of neglected and maltreated animals," he was expressing a commonly held aspiration which USDA has never fulfilled (Bernstein, 1972).

Late in 1971 before the AWA minimum standards had been established, USDA requested that The HSUS investigate Scalf's Menagerie in Tennessee. Upon discovering filthy, overcrowded cages with some animals actually sealed inside them, The HSUS demanded, and got, immediate improvements. Unfortunately for many zoo animals, the
USDA did not pattern its approach on The HSUS's example, and the Department's willingness to cooperate gave no indication of the trouble that The HSUS would have with USDA over the next nine years.

USDA has never been charged with the task of judging a zoo from the standpoint of its overall philosophy, adequacy of professional staff, or education and conservation efforts. The HSUS, on the other hand, has consistently maintained that without these larger considerations, adequately sized cages, frequent cleaning, and potable water, while immediately important for the individual animal, do not justify the continued existence of a zoo or aquarium. In a letter to a member of a local humane society, Sue expressed The HSUS philosophy:

We do not feel that any park or zoo is justified by simply caging or containing wild or domestic animals in a safe, clean situation. Wild animals don't need that kind of help. They need understanding which in turn leads to preservation of not only their species but [of] their environment (HSUS Files).

She expressed the philosophy even more fully in the November 1971 HSUS News:

Mrs. Pressman warns that zoos will not be accomplishing long-range improvements purely by making checklist corrections of present inadequacies. If a zoo is buried under a layer of archaic administrative structure, political problems, and public demand for specific types of animals, piling anything good or bad on top of it will only make matters worse . . . The first step should be a thorough evaluation of the concept of the zoo in question. Is it doing anything to help the children and adults of the community understand how animals live in their natural environment? If it isn't, forget the cage-by-cage improvements . . . it would be better to tear the zoo down and start a new one from scratch.

Unfortunately, some zoos have used the USDA license or registration under the Animal Welfare Act to justify their continued stagnation. A typical example of
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this kind of response came from the Manager of the Beaver Park Zoo in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. HSUS Regional Director Ann Gonnerman and representatives of the local humane society had investigated the zoo and found old-fashioned, unsafe, overcrowded exhibits; a general lack of knowledge on the part of the zoo's staff; and inadequate planning for future exhibits. Zoo visitors were not prevented from throwing litter into the cages—many of which were not even labelled with simple signs—or from prodding and harassing the animals. When Sue wrote to the zoo's manager that he was offering the public "nothing more than a collection of imprisoned animals," his reply was: "We must be doing something right . . . we are inspected by the U.S.D.A. and their reports are excellent" (HSUS: Iowa Zoos File).

Whether the USDA inspector actually indicates that a zoo is "excellent," or whether his finding that it is "in compliance" is interpreted as "excellent" by the zoo's staff, the municipality, or the local news media is not always easy to determine. But the fact remains that such qualifying language repeatedly finds its way into public reports of USDA's inspections of zoos. Because the AWA regulations do not address the questions of institutional philosophy and responsibility to the community, USDA inspectors should be strictly prohibited from giving the impression that their reports can be used to assess the overall quality of a zoo.

In 1975, a local paper in Lafayette, Indiana proclaimed "Ag Inspector Rates Zoo OK," even though the inspector cited a number of inadequacies in the zoo. He had pointed out that the drainage was "very inadequate," the interior of a main building needed repair to make it possible to clean it properly, and the fence around the buffalo compound was dangerously weak. The interpretation that he
found the zoo "OK" may have come from the local journalist who compared these findings with those of Sue Pressman. She found the same problems and others besides. She stated the zoo needed a full-time director, a reduction in the total number of animals to reduce overcrowding, and the complete draining of the duckpond to correct obviously unsanitary conditions. She told the part-time director that: "[The zoo is] a non-functioning menagerie that is one of the most wasteful I've seen--wasteful of [both] public space and tax money."

The municipality took umbrage publicly at her charges, but it also began to take action. A local newspaper article in 1976 stated: "The zoo improvements are partly the result of criticism leveled at the zoo last March by Sue Pressman" (HSUS: Columbian Park Zoo File).

In 1978, the Kansas City Star proclaimed that "USDA Cites Minor Violations at Zoo." The inspector had, in fact, reported violations of the AWA which were potentially dangerous to both the animals and the public, as well as being detrimental to the health of certain animals. It is not clear to what extent the inspector was responsible for his findings being interpreted as "minor violations," but this kind of interpretation has often detracted from the efforts of The HSUS, local humane societies, zoo societies, zoo staff members, and the general public to convince municipal officials that their zoos have serious deficiencies which need immediate attention.

On several occasions it has been necessary for the Society to request that a second inspector or team of inspectors examine a zoo. The second inspection, from The HSUS's perspective, has not always proved to be of more help than the first.
In the case of the Manhattan, Kansas Zoo, the second inspection did help. The first inspector found the zoo to be in compliance with the AWA, but HSUS's Midwest Regional Director Ann Gonnerman found several violations of the minimum standards. Gonnerman also declared that the inspector had pointed out some of these violations to the zoo's director but had not indicated them on the official inspection form. This zoo was also criticized by the local humane society and its membership in the AAZPA was suspended; but it was Gonnerman's criticism which resulted in a second inspection by the USDA.

On this inspection, Dr. Keith Sherman, one of USDA's more effective Animal Welfare Act inspectors, found numerous violations of the Act's provisions and gave the zoo a period of months to make the necessary changes. Dr. Sherman's report was so well-prepared that Gonnerman incorporated it into her presentation before the City Commission--an apparently unique occurrence in The HSUS's relationship with the USDA. Local sources credited Ann with convincing the Parks Commission to take action to improve the zoo (HSUS: Sunset Zoo File).

When a second inspection of the zoo of Arkansas (formerly called the Little Rock Zoo) was requested by The HSUS, it proved to be less helpful than in the Kansas Zoo case. The visit by a second team of USDA inspectors confirmed the findings of the first that there were only a few--far fewer than Sue Pressman found--violations of the Animal Welfare Act. Fortunately, on this occasion, municipal officials listened to The HSUS rather than USDA. This zoo had many of the problems that The HSUS has found to be associated with municipally operated zoos: The Zoo Director resigned in frustration over the interference of the Parks Department; the knowledgeable individuals on the zoo staff and in the Zoo Society were being
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ignored by the municipality; some of the exhibits were seriously overcrowded; and the zoo's veterinarian was too reluctant to perform euthanasia on aging or ill animals. Those individuals who knew what needed to be done to improve the zoo were powerless to take the necessary action. In this case, The HSUS was able to break the impasse through Sue Pressman's public criticisms. Undoubtedly, one reason for The HSUS success in this case was that dedicated zoo society members and an enlightened City Director were able to reinforce Sue's criticisms and monitor the city's progress in making the needed improvements.

If The HSUS found informed, cooperative citizens and officials in Little Rock, it found just the opposite in Dayton, Ohio. The live animal exhibit in the Dayton Museum of Natural History had been a source of complaints to The HSUS for some years. Great Lakes Regional Director Sandy Rowland wrote to the Director of the Museum after an inspection and urged him to give more consideration to the philosophy the Museum was projecting with its exhibit. Sandy felt that nothing positive could be conveyed by the overcrowded, sterile "stamp collection type display." She and Sue Pressman were also particularly concerned about a fox and coyote which were kept chained to a wall and constantly subjected to the stress of being surrounded by large, noisy groups of visiting children. They were also disturbed by the generally unsanitary conditions of some of the exhibits and the lack of potable water for some of the animals. The Director's response was hostile and he professed not to understand what Rowland meant by her suggestion that the museum examine its philosophy.

The USDA inspector reinforced HSUS's suggestion that the fox and coyote be un­chained and moved to more suitable quarters. The Director flatly refused to do so
unless forced by law, and the USDA inspector claimed he had no power to effect the requested change. He stated to the Dayton Journal Herald on 10 July 1979 that the Animal Welfare Act's provision for animals to be allowed to make "normal postural and social adjustments" meant only that they should be able to "sit, stand, and turn around." Sue Pressman disagrees vehemently with this interpretation and considers it to be one of the major stumbling blocks to the adequate enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act's provisions (HSUS: Dayton Museum File).

Some USDA inspectors have interpreted the vaguely worded provisions more strictly and have even threatened some zoos with closure if they failed to comply within a given period of time. The Audubon Park Zoo in New Orleans was one zoo so threatened. USDA's Dr. C.O. Finch had said of it in 1972 that it was "probably the worst [U.S.] zoo," and declared that it was "one of those places we're going to have to spend a lot of time on" (Bernstein, 1972). The USDA gave the zoo a time schedule for needed changes and the schedule was met.

The only zoo to be formally charged by USDA with violating the AWA is the Children's Zoo in Akron, Ohio. This zoo has also received considerable attention from The HSUS--including the threat of legal action, in addition to having its membership suspended by the AAZPA. In 1979 the zoo's Director stated he felt the USDA's forceful approach had had a very salutary effect upon the zoo. Sue feels it still has a long way to go, however; and its membership in the AAZPA has not yet been reinstated.

The unevenness of USDA's enforcement is also reflected in the experiences of The HSUS's other regional directors and investigators. Jack Inman, HSUS Regional
Director in the New England area, reports that USDA's staff people are "very receptive to [The HSUS's] efforts, and have specifically asked for ... assistance in correcting bad situations." The HSUS West Coast Regional office has had a similarly good rapport with USDA. Eric Sakach, Investigator for the West Coast Regional Office, indicates that "The WCRO enjoys a sound rapport with USDA/APHIS in this region and their personnel have been extremely cooperative in assisting in problematic areas" (Personal Communication).

The Southeast Region, by contrast, has repeatedly had problems with USDA in that area. Investigator Bernie Weller declares that "veterinarian inspectors [are] issuing compliance reports on many non-compliance exhibits." Even more serious is the fact that "cases have been tried and lost because compliance reports from USDA stated the place was in compliance and/or the place had a USDA license." Weller attributes many of the problems to the inspectors' lack of knowledge or their unwillingness "to offend" or get "involved." Weller has found USDA to be far more of a hindrance than a help in attempts to prevent cruelty to captive wildlife (Personal Communication).

Whatever unevenness exists in the enforcement of the AWA at the level of the inspectors working in the field, the blame must be placed upon those at the top of the USDA hierarchy. The adequacy of enforcement appears to depend upon the conscience, knowledge and enthusiasm of the individual inspector. It should not.

USDA's Changing Approach to The Animal Welfare Act

Dale Schwindaman, the Senior Staff Veterinarian in charge of animal care for USDA/APHIS, freely acknowledges that USDA's enforcement of the AWA has been very uneven.
Schwindaman, whom some have accused of being too cooperative with animal welfare organizations, attributes the unevenness, in part, to an unsatisfactory beginning in 1971 (Personal Communication). When USDA inspectors began to judge exhibits for captive wild animals they did not have the training necessary to make the subjective judgements required to interpret the regulations. Nevertheless, they were directed by the Senior Staff Veterinarian in charge at the time to license or register the majority of the known exhibitors before the end of the fiscal year in 1972.

As a result, exhibitors were registered who should have been licensed and both licenses and registrations were issued to exhibitors before they were forced to comply with the regulations. In spite of the opinion of USDA's legal counsellors that any individual who "bought, sold and transported animals for purposes of exhibition" was subject to be licensed under the Act, those exhibitors who purchased animals for the sole purpose of replacing ones that died and sold only the offspring of animals in their collections were permitted to be registered. In 1972, some 700 exhibitors were registered and approximately 300 were licensed, compared with 215 registered and 1,050 licensed today.

The distinction between the two classes of exhibitors is important because there are greater legal sanctions which can be brought against licensed exhibitors found in violation of the Act's provisions. They are subject, in addition to suspension or revocation of their license, to civil penalties, a jail sentence, or a cease and desist order. Registrants are subject to cease and desist orders only. Before 1976, cease and desist orders had to come from the Department of Justice; now they can be issued by the USDA General Counsel. In addition, reg-
istered exhibitors pay no annual fee, while licensed exhibitors pay an annual fee based upon the number of animals in their collection.

Peggy Morrison, who monitors the Animal Welfare Act for The HSUS, requested a current definition for both licensed and registered exhibitors in November 1979 and received the following reply from the Freedom of Information Coordinator for USDA/APHIS:

Section 2(h) of the Animal Welfare Act ... defines an exhibitor as '... any person (public or private) exhibiting any animals, which were purchased in commerce or the intended distribution of which affects commerce, or will affect commerce, to the public for compensation, as determined by the Secretary [of Agriculture], and such terms includes [sic] carnivals, circuses, and zoos exhibiting such animals whether operated for profit or not. ... In general, anyone who purchases or sells such animals, transports them over public roads, or exhibits them to the public, must license as an exhibitor. A registered exhibitor then is a person who has not obtained the animals in commerce (donation, etc.), does not routinely transport them over public roads, and does not exhibit them to the general public (HSUS Files).

In describing the initial response of exhibitors to licensing or registration by USDA, Dr. Schwindaman divides them into three classes corresponding roughly to The HSUS's 1-2-3 rating system. The few major zoos at the top were sympathetic to the purposes of the Act. They had knowledgeable and concerned staffs, many exhibits which exceeded the minimum standards, and were easily able, generally, to comply with the regulations. A second, rather sizable group of zoos met some of the requirements but not others and their staff members made their feelings known that they considered the Animal Welfare Act to be an imposition upon them. The third and largest group, even less cooperative than the second, did not meet the minimum standards, but were licensed or registered anyway--before they were
forced to comply in many cases--according to the directive previously described.

In response to the question whether the USDA has ever closed any zoos, Dr. Schwindaman replied that a recent check of the records revealed that 176 exhibitors have, since 1972, given up their businesses voluntarily. He feels that in most instances no new operations sprang up to replace them. The larger number of exhibitors listed by USDA in 1980 reflects, Dr. Schwindaman believes, a number which have existed for a long time before being "found" by USDA, rather than a growth trend. Sue Pressman estimates that there are probably an additional 500 or more small operations (of one or two animals) which USDA inspectors have not yet found.

Dr. Schwindaman also feels that the changes in senior staff veterinarians over the years have created an enforcement "nightmare" because there was no one on the staff consistently to insure the uniform interpretation of standards or regular training of inspectors. Field people who did get "fired up" by training sessions would find their enthusiasm waning upon returning to their regions to be confronted with myriad other responsibilities in addition to the AWA. The upper echelon of USDA had no one person in charge over the years who worked at sustaining the level of enthusiasm generated by the training sessions.

Since 1978, Dr. Schwindaman says, the USDA has changed its approach to the AWA. The Department is trying to put people in responsible positions who have a genuine commitment to the enforcement of the Act. It has also decided to insure that the regional staff people receive the training necessary to ensure adequate enforcement. Previously, the emphasis had been upon the training of field inspectors only.
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Also, another layer has been added to the hierarchy of the USDA staff with the addition of "Animal Care Specialists" to assist Veterinary Medical Officers (VMO's) with the AWA exclusively.

Dr. Schwindaman feels that the time has come when "compliance" must insure that exhibitors are "well above" the minimum line so that they cannot easily fall below it. This appears to be Dr. Schwindaman's version of the concern with "flexing upward" that Sue Pressman has been stressing to USDA for so long. Dr. Schwindaman is also confident that the minimum standards can be raised by improving the attitude of the inspectors.

In spite of the shortcomings in the Act's enforcement over the years, Dr. Schwindaman believes that it has been of "tremendous value" in improving zoos. Without it, The HSUS could not have accomplished as much as it has with respect to zoos. He also feels the AAZPA could not have gotten its Accreditation Program underway without the AWA--and, he adds, The HSUS's Zoo Reform Program.

In fact, Dr. Schwindaman gives The HSUS considerable credit for USDA's new commitment to the enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act. The HSUS alerted people to the existence of the AWA and urged them to express their complaints about sub-standard operations and inadequate enforcement directly to USDA. Unlike others who have spoken disparagingly about The HSUS's "media-oriented" approach to zoos, Dr. Schwindaman believes the negative statements The HSUS has made publicly about USDA have resulted in the Act's enforcement being given a much higher priority by the Department's upper echelon. USDA/APHIS was in no position to tell the public of the problems it was having, and The HSUS filled a vital need by describing the
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trouble with the "system."

Regarding the efforts of other national animal welfare organizations, Dr. Schwindaman says that American Humane is communicating with USDA again after a period when very little was heard from them. Overall, he feels they have always been more oriented toward education than advocacy, and have never been involved with zoos in the same way as The HSUS. The Animal Welfare Institute has been in constant touch with USDA and has generally been very helpful. The Fund for Animals and other "wildlife-oriented organizations" have only been in touch with USDA regarding specific cases. Friends of Animals and the Society for Animal Rights, which Dr. Schwindaman has some difficulty in keeping separate, have been exclusively critical and of no help to USDA at all, he feels.

Problems Still Remain

Despite USDA's new attitude toward the enforcement of the AWA--the results of which remain to be seen--there are some very basic problems with the Act itself. One problem is the absence of a definition for "roadside zoos," in spite of the fact USDA lists the term as a classification on its 18-8 form, in use since 1975. The applicant may check this term if he feels it applies to his operation, but the Department has no definition to aid him in making that determination. This makes the 18-8 form of little use in determining how many zoos exist which The HSUS would consider as "roadside," and exactly where they can be found. The "how" and "where" would have to be ascertained before Congress could be persuaded to legislate class 3 zoos--"roadside" or municipal--out of existence.

Peggy Morrison believes that if the USDA inspectors were more informed and kept better records it would be possible to determine just which of the 1,050 licensed
and 215 registered exhibitors would actually fit The HSUS definition of the term. Presently, in order to estimate the number of "roadside zoos"—assuming The HSUS could come up with a definition for them—one would have to examine each of USDA's 18-8 forms for the location, name of the establishment, and size of its collection. Only by this means, Peggy feels, could the Society even arrive at a "guesstimate" of the scope of this particular problem. While USDA is willing to permit its forms to be examined, it is not willing to perform the task.

As long as USDA is prohibited from making any judgement regarding the benefit the public derives from a zoo, amateur operations which make no pretense of serving the purposes of education, conservation, or research will continue to function with what is still seen by many people as government approval.

The Zoo Profession's View of the AWA

Some members of the zoo profession are convinced that the AWA has put many, or even most, "roadside zoos" out of business; others are equally convinced that it has not. Robert Wagner (personal communication) concurs with the second viewpoint, but contends that some USDA people have "bragged" that a lot of roadside zoos have been put out of business. Wagner further states that the AAZPA Accreditation Program was designed with emphasis upon uniformity of standards, because AAZPA has been concerned with the unevenness of USDA enforcement. He considers the vagueness of the regulations to be a major stumbling block in effectively enforcing the Act, and contends that no major improvement in the law will be forthcoming until a definition of a "minimum zoo" can be written (i.e., what is the least a zoo can have in terms of exhibits, etc., and still be call a zoo?).
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Dr. Philip Ogilvie and Dr. Wayne King concur with Wagner's opinion that the Animal Welfare Act has had no appreciable effect upon roadside zoos. Ogilvie's opinion is that USDA's effect upon zoos generally has been minimal. King agrees and goes so far as to contend that some state laws have been more effective in bringing improvements. King feels The HSUS should sue the Department of Agriculture to make it enforce the Act. He feels this action could well result in the closure of roadside zoos. Both he and William Conway (personal communication) feel The HSUS and the AAZPA should join forces in this endeavor (not necessarily a joint suit, but certainly a joint effort). Conway feels that government regulation is essential for the elimination of roadside zoos.

While some zoo people have had problems with overzealous USDA inspectors whose suggestions for improvement have been unnecessarily stringent (Wagner and Graham, personal communication), USDA has been less of a problem to zoos than USDA, because they "fill in their own paper" (Reed, personal communication). Earl Baysinger of the Department of the Interior agrees. He does not feel there are any laws actually causing zoos to improve and contends that USDA has always been regarded by many people as "client oriented." He feels that "bureaucrats function only under duress" generally, and there is always a need for apolitical public interest groups such as The HSUS to "oversee the regulators" when the interest subsides which led to the passage of the regulations in the first place (personal communication).
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A number of people have expressed their gratitude for The HSUS's assistance in publicizing the problems of a particular zoo or in persuading a municipality to make improvements. The Vice-President of the Friends of the Zoo of Arkansas stated in a letter that Sue's efforts had made a great deal of difference in the community:

I can hardly begin to tell you how much your inspections have helped our zoo. For the first time in a long time we have gotten the publicity necessary to get some changes made and have begun to realize where our priorities lie. . . . Without your help we wouldn't even be started on a better path--whether we ever get there is yet to be seen. . . . if it weren't for you and The Humane Society of the U.S., this part of the zoo world would still be living in the dark ages. . . . I will keep you posted on our progress and hope that your next inspection will be in a completely different atmosphere (HSUS Files: Little Rock Zoo).

The publicity given to zoos whose ratings have improved has seemed to improve the zoo's standing in the community. The re-rating of the Salisbury, Maryland Zoo from a class 3, to a class 2, and then to a class 1 zoo, brought not only an expression of appreciation from the City of Salisbury--Sue Pressman was presented with the Key to the City--but the zoo received the official congratulations of the House of Representatives of the Maryland State Legislature.

The recent re-rating of the Woodland Park Zoo in Seattle, Washington has apparently had a very positive effect upon both the public and municipal officials. The Director, David Hancocks, wrote:

It has been interesting to note the impacts of your decision to grant a #1 rating to us. The Seattle Times wrote a glowing editorial on this "Coup for the Zoo", so the word was certainly widespread. . . . [The Mayor] called personally to offer congratulations. I think it is difficult to locate specific benefits that have accrued since the rating change, especially since they are
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so diverse. But there is, clearly, a new attitude to the zoo. Civic pride has increased, for one thing, and Seattle's politicians are looking at us with different eyes. More funds were added to our 1980 budget at the last moment, for example, for interpretive graphics and education programs. Also, the fact that we have achieved a standard worthy of official HSUS recognition means that my plans for more keepers now have more clout, and I'm optimistic for the future. I still delight in the knowledge that we have been so honored by The Humane Society: and I still am determined to get a 1+ rating! (HSUS Files: Seattle Zoo)

News of the concrete effects of the re-rating reached Portland, Oregon, prompting zoo officials to inquire: "Due to the positive response stemming from this action, we would like to know what chance our Zoo has of receiving such a designation" (HSUS Files: Oregon Zoos).

While it is not yet known whether the re-rating of the Los Angeles Zoo produced a favorable response from the municipality, the news media responded overwhelmingly to a call for a press conference at which the improved rating for the Zoo was announced.

One of the several professional zoo planners Sue has recommended to municipalities over the years recently acknowledged her contribution to the improvement of zoo design concepts. Robert Everly, of McFadzean, Everly and Associates added to a solicitation of Sue's "critical comments" for a new project the comment:

There can be little doubt but that the efforts of people like yourself and many concerned organizations have had [sic] in changing the concepts, purposes, and operation of zoological parks. The enclosed material will indicate that after having had to do with 75 or 80 zoos, we, too, have changed our planning techniques as well as objectives. Again, I would appreciate your appraisal and suggestions for improving any future planning projects (HSUS Files).

Without doubt, one of the most significant testimonials to The HSUS's effective-
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ness is expressed in a recent letter from Robert Wagner, the Executive Director of the AAZPA, to the President of the Des Moines, Iowa Zoological Association. Explaining he felt the information requested concerning the AAZPA's Accreditation Program would not really solve the zoo's problems, Wagner said, "It occurs to me that your association needs some outside assistance, and needs such assistance quickly." He suggested:

You may wish to consider retaining the services of zoo directors (two or three) to come into your zoo and make recommendations for the operation and management of the facility. Another suggestion you should consider is requesting Ms. Sue Pressman of The Humane Society of the United States to inspect your facility and make recommendations (HSUS Files: AAZPA).

When interviewed, Wagner acknowledged that The HSUS has been relatively effective overall in its dealings with zoos and helpful to a number of them. He stated his belief that while some zoo people think Sue is "great" and some think she is "awful," AAZPA members generally feel that she understands "what they are up against." He personally acknowledged that Sue has done an "excellent job" generally. He also believes that, with the exception of The HSUS, other animal welfare organizations have merely used zoos to raise funds. He stated that those members of the zoo profession who have "kept up" with humane organizations know the difference between The HSUS's approach and that of the "protectionists for profit"; those who have not kept up are likely to believe that all humane groups are alike.

Wagner did, however, have some criticisms of The HSUS's actions in the case of the Birmingham, Alabama Zoo. He believes HSUS made a serious mistake in not filing cruelty charges against the zoo's veterinarian. He implied the Society did
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not have the nerve to file the charges because it would have been more "risky" (since it would have involved malpractice) than simply charging the zoo director. Wagner said he had no argument with the charges that were filed, but indicated he found it distressing "The HSUS had a chance to do something right and blew it."

The current President of AAZPA Dr. Don Farst (Director of the Gladys Porter Zoo in Brownsville, Texas) stated in a recent letter to Phyllis Moore, the AAZPA Humane Association Liaison:

I would agree with you that The HSUS is the only active humane association watch-dogging the care of animals in zoos but some of the others take uninformed pot shots at us from time to time. I feel that if you work closely with Sue Pressman that she can represent us to the other humane associations and they look to her as the recognized expert in the field (HSUS Files: AAZPA).

Most of the members of the zoo profession interviewed in the course of preparing this report (See: Appendix C) seemed to share the opinion that The HSUS alone among all the humane organizations claiming national status is recognized as having an active Zoo Program; that the program has had some positive effects upon zoos; and that Sue and The HSUS, having been feared and mistrusted initially by a number of AAZPA members, over the years, have come to be regarded generally as "fair" and "reasonable." That neither The HSUS nor Sue is universally praised by zoo people is probably the best indicator of the Zoo Program's success and certainly attests to the diversity of both the attitudes and the specific programs and policies which can be found in American zoos.

Dr. Philip Ogilvie, the former Director of several major zoos (See: Appendix C), believes that no other humane organization has taken the same "direct" approach.
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with zoos as The HSUS. He cited the Fund for Animals for being so extreme as to "make Sue look reasonable." Unlike some others who have charged Sue and The HSUS with using zoos as a means of seeking publicity, Ogilvie claims that Sue has avoided publicity in some cases where she could have easily gotten it in order to allow time for changes to be made. He feels her direct contact with zoo directors has been important and she has made them aware of how they were being perceived by the public. He further believes she has supported the progressive moves made by the AAZPA while opposing the regressive ones. Ogilvie avows that Sue's efforts "cannot be overestimated."

In spite of his complimentary remarks, Ogilvie believes The HSUS has not yet done enough to tell the public what to look for in zoos. He feels that the public education campaign still has far to go. He also implied The HSUS should be even harder on the substandard zoos that it has been up to now.

Nicole Duplaix, The Director of TRAFFIC (U.S.A.), the independent group set up by the World Wildlife Fund and others (including the New York Zoological Society) to monitor the trade in wildlife and wildlife products, believes that humane societies have brought important pressure to bear upon zoos to make them "pull up their socks." But she has found that many humane organization representatives do not always understand what they are looking at in the zoo: not everything they see is inhumane, she says, and there are some bad things in zoos they do not see. Because Sue has a background in zoos, according to Duplaix, she is able to interpret correctly what she sees in a zoo and distinguish between conditions which are truly inhumane and those only apparently so.

Dr. Ted Reed, Director of the National Zoo, recently expressed to a number of his
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colleagues his feeling that Sue had handled herself very well in the difficult and controversial case involving the Birmingham, Alabama Zoo. Dr. Reed feels that generally Sue has been very responsible, but acknowledges she has been very irritating to some people in the zoo world.

Tim Anderson, Director of the Boston Zoological Society, feels that Sue's effectiveness is due to her understanding of the management problems of zoos.

An interesting appraisal of HSUS efforts came from Mr. Walter Kilroy, Vice President of the Massachusetts SPCA. Mr. Kilroy serves on the Board of the Boston Zoological Society and volunteered the information that he had "indeed heard members of the zoo profession acknowledge the influence of The HSUS on attitudes and practices in their field." He said that while he could not specifically recall the origin of all such comments since they had generally been made during informal discussions, he did recall that Mr. Russell Silva, formerly Executive Director of the Boston Zoological Society, had "expressed the opinion that it was efforts then underway by The HSUS that had caused the zoo profession to take a very close and serious look at its shortcoming and failings." According to Mr. Kilroy, Mr. Silva had gone on to assert that "the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums' Accreditation Program was rather directly attributable to the zoo inspection activities of The HSUS." Mr. Kilroy also expressed his own view that, "The HSUS has had, to be sure, a positive influence and [he is sure] there are those within the field who have not only welcomed this influence, but who have made use of it to secure needed changes in their own facilities." He also stated that "there are those who dismiss the role of The HSUS as misguided and meaningless. In all probability, with few if indeed any exceptions, these are individuals who
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feel criticized and threatened by The HSUS's Zoo Reform Program."

Earl Baysinger of the Department of the Interior (See: Appendix C) believes that aside from The HSUS—which is perceived as having a large grass roots constituency—the Animal Welfare Institute's Christine Stevens, and a few other individuals, there is no one to whom the government can turn for "the other side of the issue," meaning, a view other than AAZPA's, of USDI's regulation of the importation of wild animals. Baysinger does not believe there really is any "industry self-regulation" where zoos are concerned. He thinks the government is assuming that zoos are "good guys" and giving them the benefit of the doubt. He says that the "bolts are being loosened" on the Endangered Species Act—referring to the lessening of ESA restrictions to allow zoos to move their captive-born endangered species with Captive Self-Sustaining Population (CSSP) permits—and consequently there is a need for public interest groups to monitor the ESA and other similar legislation closely to make sure that it is not weakened even more. He also feels there is a need for someone to continue to keep an eye on the zoo's consumption of wildlife and The HSUS is in a good position to fill that need.

The HSUS and its Zoo Program are broadly criticized in a book entitled, Living Trophies: A Shocking Look at Conditions in America's Zoos, written by Peter Batten, former Director of the San José, California Zoo. The book, published in 1976, purports to expose extensive cruelty, neglect, and incompetence in more than 100 major zoos. Ultimately, however, Living Trophies is an obviously biased work, as reflective of Mr. Batten's personal prejudices and grudges as of reality. He does make some accurate and defensible criticisms of the inadequacies to be found in many zoos, but the verifiable statements are so entwined with sweeping, unsupported
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assertions; half-truths; snide, non sequiturs; outright contradictions; and apparent fabrications that the casual reader cannot easily disentangle the accurate statements from the specious ones.

Batten's conclusions are reported to be the results of a tour he and a research assistant made between January and May of 1974 after he became concerned that a small group of animals he sent to the Gladys Porter Zoo in Brownsville, Texas were not being properly cared for. Batten is as vague about the fate of these animals as he is about so many of the charges of cruelty and incompetence he makes in the book, assuming apparently that the reader should simply take his word for it that the animals suffered needlessly from "poor husbandry" (p.ix).

Batten's sweeping, unsupported statements cover everything from the "disgracefully high" mortality rate in zoos (p.2) to the curious assertion that "few U.S. zoos" have commercial blenders to liquify foods for certain species of animals (p.138). The book is pitifully documented for a work which makes such broad claims to expert knowledge of everything from captive propagation, to knowledge of animal behavior, to exhibit design. He implies that much of his information was gleaned from (disgruntled) keepers, "often at the risk of their jobs" (p.2). His list of 49 references includes 23 publications from zoos (guidebooks, folders, brochures, newsletters, and directors' reports) and 10 special reports or bulletins from humane organizations (5 from The HSUS, 1 from the Golden State Humane Society, and 4 from United Action for Animals). By comparison, Hediger's *Man and Animal in the Zoo*, which also criticizes the deficiencies in zoos, cites 176 references including numerous scientific studies of various species of animals in the wild and many aspects of the captive environment.
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Batten's criticisms of The HSUS Zoo Program are selectively documented or not documented at all. He makes no attempt to describe the program in detail, explain The HSUS rating system, or to justify with evidence his contention that Sue Pressman's visits to zoos are "followed by demands for change that often involve needless major investments or are impossible to meet" (p.175). He also claims that "Mrs. Pressman's statements with regard to zoos are not always accurate and sometimes reveal a dearth of professionalism," (p.175) but gives no examples. His assertion that she was "formerly an apprentice keeper in Boston's old zoo" (p.174) is patently false, as is his claim that John Hoyt--who denies the assertion flatly--"expressed surprise that [Batten] should wish to donate the research material" accumulated from his tour of zoos (p.178).

Batten makes snide references to The HSUS's "well-paid staff," "plush offices," and "lavish budget" for programs, implying that The HSUS's interest in zoos is largely self-interest. Although Batten contends that other organizations "with far less working capital have been saying for years that zoo animals are badly kept, but were far less concerned with personal publicity," he neglects to recognize their altruistic efforts by mentioning their names (p.176). He also fails to explain how these organizations, lacking an effective public awareness campaign, managed to get their message across to the public.

The one specific example he gives of The HSUS's poor judgment concerns the relocation of a bear from a riding stable in Ohio to Orphans of the Wild in Buellton, California. Batten does not mention that the bear was crippled and would not have been able to survive in the same naturalistic surroundings into which other bears had been relocated by The HSUS. He implies that The HSUS typically moved caged
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animals from one bad situation to another.

Although both of The HSUS Special Reports on Zoos are cited in his reference list, Batten uses a quote out of context from a 1974 article in the Philadelphia Enquirer to support his contention that Sue Pressman expressed unqualified support for drive-through wild animal parks. He then cites the 1975 Special Report as evidence that The HSUS came late to an awareness of the shortcomings of these parks. He ignores the extensive criticisms of drive-through parks in general and the West Palm Beach, Florida Lion Country Safari in particular which appeared in the 1972 Special Report on Zoos.

A minute examination of the book's other unsupported assertions, inconsistencies, half-truths, and misstatements would fill a volume almost the size of Living Trophies itself. Many of these are discussed elsewhere in this paper.

Evidently Batten's shortcomings as a writer were apparent to the general public. Zoo people claim his book had no effect upon their profession other than to annoy the few members who bothered to read it (Wagner, King, Conway, Graham, Personal Communications). William Conway believes that Batten's lack of knowledge is evident to anyone with even a slight understanding of zoos or animal behavior. Possibly the American public was unwilling to believe that zoos, although definitely in need of improvement, were as uniformly atrocious as Batten claims (Graham, Personal Communication).

In any case, Living Trophies produced no serious wave of criticism or questioning of The HSUS by its constituents. The only readership the book seems to have is among those who oppose zoos altogether. The Society for Animal Rights has purchased
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the remaining copies from the publisher and is making them available to its members at a special reduced price. SAR is using the book to support its contention that all zoos should be "phased out" (SAR Report, February 1980). That the book should be used for this purpose is ironic since Batten opposes phasing out zoos, claiming: "Phasing out zoos would not eliminate [zoo animals] problems. . . . It is better to accept the fact that zoos are here [and] take steps to improve them and protect zoo animals from additional human ignorance or neglect." (p.184). Anyone who attempts to criticize zoos armed only with Living Trophies is likely to find himself easily disarmed by the first knowledgeable zoo person he meets.

Among the individuals interviewed in the course of preparing this paper only two were more critical than complimentary of The HSUS or its Zoo Program. Their criticisms are somewhat surprising because, among the many diverse members of the zoo profession, their apparent philosophy concerning zoos and animal welfare in general seems most closely and consistently akin to that of The HSUS. One of these critics is William Conway, the undisputed leader in articulating the ethical obligations of the zoo profession. For years Conway (1973, 1977, 1979; see also Hahn, 1967; Hediger, 1969; and Campbell, 1978) has been pointing out the major shortcomings of zoos and how they might be rectified. Conway's commitment to professional standards of operation and devotion to worldwide conservation and the preservation of endangered wildlife are widely acclaimed.

While acknowledging that The HSUS has been of some help in alleviating the suffering of animals in bad zoos, Mr. Conway contends that The HSUS's efforts have been "beside the point." He does state that The HSUS has taken a more responsible position with respect to zoos than such organizations as United Action for Animals,
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the Society for Animal Rights, and Friends of Animals, but he believes that, generally speaking, humane groups (and The HSUS is included by implication) have hurt the fundraising efforts of zoos, making it difficult for them to make necessary improvements. He believes that major reforms in zoos will only come about from within the profession as "good examples" are created; but without funds these good examples will not come into being.

Conway contends that The HSUS should have insisted that "American zoos be the best in the world," but by dwelling only upon bad conditions in zoos, failing to recognize the good work many zoos are doing, and conveying an attitude of mere "tolerance" towards zoos generally, The HSUS has impeded the efforts of zoos to foster a strong national commitment to the preservation of wildlife. Such a commitment is vital, he contends, to stop the wanton destruction of both wild animals and their habitat. He believes The HSUS does not recognize that the human-caused extinction of animals is the "greatest cruelty of all." He considers humane societies to be short-sighted, stating that, as long as they are more concerned with whether "an individual animal dies well than whether a species lives at all," they will never be of any help to wildlife.

While acknowledging that Sue and The HSUS have been helpful in certain instances (with the Central Park Zoo and the preparation of the AAZPA Surplus Committee Report, for example), he charges that The HSUS has used zoos primarily as a "fundraising gimmick" (See: Conclusions and Recommendations/The Zoo Program's Potential for Funding).

If Mr. Conway is correct in his charge that The HSUS's approach to zoos has hurt
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their ability to raise funds then the Zoo Program would have been counterpro-
ductive at the least. The modernization of exhibits and hiring of professional
staff which Sue Pressman has consistently urged upon inferior zoos has generally
required a commitment to more rather than less money. There are numerous indica-
tions in The HSUS Zoo Files of municipalities which have loosened their purse
strings after The HSUS drew attention to the zoos' inadequacies. However, to
insure that the "good examples" rather than the bad are copied, Sue has frequently
warned of the danger of pouring money into a zoo without careful planning first.

Conway's criticisms of The HSUS seem to stem from what he perceives as an ambi-
valence toward the concept of zoos. In spite of the official statement of policy
which declares that The HSUS "acknowledges the value of some zoos in this country
by reason of their achieved excellence," and the recognition of the "potential"
of others to achieve that same excellence, other statements have indicated a more
negative view of zoos. The statement in the cover letter which accompanied the
1975 Special Report on Zoo Reform to the effect that "The HSUS believes there is
little justification for perpetuation of zoos in most instances" doubtlessly
contributed considerably to Conway's belief that The HSUS is, beneath the surface,
"anti-zoo," and worse, that The HSUS's interest in zoos is really self-interest.

Conway suggests that if The HSUS truly recognizes the valuable contribution good
zoos make to American culture, it should clarify its position and make more public
statements in support of this acknowledged contribution. Where zoos are concerned,
Conway says, The HSUS should either "fish or cut bait."

Neither Wayne King nor Robert Wagner agrees with Conway's assertion that humane
organizations have hurt the fundraising abilities of zoos, nor do they agree that
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improvements in zoos will come about only from efforts made within the profession. King does contend, however, that while Sue has praised the work of good zoos as an individual The HSUS, as an organization, has not.

Sue has made such public statements as: "We are basically a pro-zoo organization. They are institutions necessary for the survival of wildlife" (Anable, 1975); and "there are lots of things we're for, and one of them is good zoos. We think the zoo is a most important institution" (Livingston, 1974, p.234). She has even gone so far as to state that "we've gone from saying, 'zoos are ethically bad--let's make them better,' to wondering if we wouldn't be worse off without them" (Van Slambrouck, 1978). These statements are more consistent with HSUS's official policy statement than the statements made in some HSUS publications.

These perceived inconsistencies in The HSUS's stance regarding zoos have undoubtedly led some members of the zoo profession to feel The HSUS cannot be trusted, and have done some measure of harm to the organization's credibility (See: Conclusions and Recommendations).

The other very outspoken critic of The HSUS among those interviewed was Stefan Graham, the Director of the Baltimore Zoo and former Director of the Salisbury, Maryland Zoo. Graham's criticisms were different from Conway's in that his disillusionment seems to stem from his belief that the Society has not been sufficiently aggressive in its efforts to reform zoos. Like Conway, he has been very outspoken about animal welfare issues and the ethical obligations of the zoo profession and has presented several papers at AAZPA conferences (1973, 1978 & 1978a) on these subjects. Additionally, he has the distinction of being the only director of a
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zoo (the Salisbury, Maryland Zoo) to be upgraded by The HSUS from a class 3 institution to a class 1.

Since that time, when, he acknowledges, The HSUS and Sue were very helpful to him in improving the zoo's image in the community, he says he has tried on several occasions to get help from The HSUS regarding a number of other animal welfare problems, but his efforts have been largely to no avail. He perceives The HSUS as too large, "too spread out," and "totally emasculated." He believes the organization is trying to do too many things and as a result is not doing any of them particularly well.

Without providing specific details, Graham asserts that if The HSUS is going to conduct a zoo program, "it ought to do it right." He implies the Society should pursue a course of taking more legal action against substandard zoos, and states he feels The HSUS is "afraid of losing its holdings." He adds that The HSUS has missed an opportunity to "make a strong statement for its cause." This comment appears to be levelled at the organization in general rather than at the Zoo Program specifically.

Graham contends The HSUS and Sue are mistrusted by zoo people generally, for which he appears to blame the Society's image rather than any of Sue's actions in particular. He believes zoos do not consider The HSUS a genuine threat, but he adds that some of them probably perceive The HSUS as a "potential" threat. He thinks the AAZPA considers Sue to be its "token humane representative" and a "thorn" in its side.

While making these disparaging remarks about The HSUS, Graham also adds that he
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does not know of any other humane organizations which have been "visible" in the zoo world. Even though The HSUS has not been of help to him recently, he says, "there is nowhere else to go" for help with animal welfare problems.

He believes that AAZPA will work with The HSUS "when The HSUS is right," and that The HSUS and the Association should work together more closely.
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In order to compare the approach to zoos of other national animal welfare organizations with that of The HSUS, a letter of inquiry not indicating any affiliation with The HSUS, (See sample letter, Appendix D) was sent to the American Humane Association, the Animal Welfare Institute, the Animal Protection Institute, the Society for Animal Rights, Friends of Animals, the Fund for Animals, and United Action for Animals. Among these, only the Fund for Animals failed to respond. The varied responses indicate that these organizations may be divided generally into two groups: those which oppose the continuation of zoos under any circumstances and those which accept the continuation of zoos if certain conditions are met.

No organization gave any indication of having an organized program like HSUS's for dealing with zoos or of having a published policy regarding zoos. Neither did any organization indicate specific criteria, akin to The HSUS's rating system, for distinguishing among zoos.

Due to the varied responses of the organizations and limited access to their materials and publications, the following comments constitute only general impressions and do not purport to be thorough analyses of their programs and policies.

American Humane Association

In his response to the letter of inquiry, Mr. Dennis White, Director of Animal Protection for American Humane, stated that his organization "is not opposed to certain types of zoos and aquariums and feels they have a place in the world that is becoming increasingly ecology conscious and it supports the activities of
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properly managed zoos and aquariums." Mr. White went on to describe American Humane's general requirements for humane treatment for captive wild animals as "proper housing; space and shelter; adequate food and water to fulfill the animals' biological needs; prompt and good medical treatment and professional animal management as dictated by the species involved." While stating the organization's opposition to any zoo or aquarium which fails to meet those requirements, he expressed the sentiment that "modern, well run zoos and aquariums benefit animals by breeding and saving endangered animals, by educating the public about the value of wildlife preservation, and the recreational facilities for the public." He also indicated that although he has personally inspected a number of zoos, American Humane "does not have any particular department specializing in wildlife, zoos or aquariums . . ." and "relies heavily on the information and other consultant services of the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums."

Several years ago American Humane did have a Wildlife Consultant. In 1973 the Consultant was Richard Denney, who reported in a presentation to the American Association of Zoo Veterinarians at their annual conference that AHA had established (probably in the late 1960's or early 1970's) minimum cage requirements for captive wildlife--though he did not indicate how these were used or distributed. He also pointed out that AHA had assisted the Department of Agriculture in drawing up the minimum regulations for exhibitors under the Animal Welfare Act of 1970. According to Denney, "it was recognized that insufficient data exist to specify precise space parameters for [wild animals]," thus, "it [was] felt that the discretion and judgment of the USDA inspectors can best be guided by the condition of
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the subject animals in regard to postural attitudes and behavior" (See: The HSUS, USDA, and the AWA-1970).

Denney also indicated that AHA had conducted a questionnaire survey in 1972 in conjunction with the AAZPA, "to assist Representative Whitehurst in obtaining supportive and background information for the bill he introduced to form the National Zoological and Aquarium Corporation."

The Animal Protection Institute (API)

Ms. Cheryl Mouras, an investigator for the Animal Protection Institute, stated in her response to the letter of inquiry that, "although API has not made an official statement about views on zoos, [it does] feel that as a general rule animals should be left in their own natural habitat." However, she also noted that API endorses the efforts of zoos to propagate endangered species. She also stated that API "has worked closely with agencies associated with zoos when their support of legislation was similar [to API's]." She suggested that more information might be obtained from the AAZPA and from Jerry Owens of the Fund for Animals, and that Living Trophies by Peter Batten would be an "excellent, up-to-date . . . reference" for a report on zoos. Ms. Mouras also included several articles from API's Mainstream magazine including a review of Living Trophies, a description of an attempt to make the orangutan enclosure at the San Francisco Zoo more suited to the animals' behavioral needs, and a general description of some of the changes which have taken place in zoos over the past few years.

API appears to have neither a zoo program, nor a carefully thought out approach to the problems and shortcomings of zoos.
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Friends of Animals (FOA)

Friends of Animals replied to the letter of inquiry with an assortment of newspaper clippings (one of which concerns the cruelty to animals found in traveling petting zoos and quotes Sue Pressman extensively), published statements, and a short cover note from an Administrative Assistant stating, "Friends of Animals does not have police power, so we can not [sic] hold official investigations. When we have an unofficial investigation, and find violations of the Animal Welfare Act, we present our case to the media."

The assorted materials accompanying the note included a memo from FOA President Alice Herrington to FOA "letterwriters" dated 14 October 1977. It indicates that one of FOA's, "continuing drives," conducted primarily through letter-writing campaigns to newspapers and government officials at all levels, would center around the "phasing out" of all zoos. Phasing out would be accomplished by prohibiting both the further breeding of captive animals and the acquisition of any animals from the wild. Municipal funds would be expended only to provide good care for existing zoo animals. Ms. Herrington states quite flatly that:

The zoo is an antiquated process, no longer educational since it cannot compete with documentary films of animals in their native habitat. Animals incarcerated in prisons, whether safari park or concrete cage, become psychotic; those born in captivity are no longer wild animals, and across the nation the vandalism at zoos is rampant. . . . [zoos] must be likened to Medieval English entertainment--street caging of insane people to be laughed and poked at by the passersby.

Ms. Herrington states her contentions again in the lengthy memo, but provides very scanty documentation to back them up. She stresses the profit making aspects of
performing animal acts associated with safari parks and of the breeding of zoo animals. She cites performance-related reptile deaths alleged by employees of a safari park in Largo, Maryland, and in the same paragraph makes reference to the death of a young lion in a territorial dispute in the same park. It is far from clear exactly what points she is attempting to make, but there seems to be some implication that the reptile deaths as a result of overhandling are typical of animal acts associated with zoos, and the indication that "tourists watched on the roadside" while the competing lions fought to the death would seem to echo her contention that zoo visitors take perverse pleasure in watching animals suffer.

She condemns breeding programs in zoos with a reference to surplus lions ending up on the menus of gourmet restaurants and as targets in hunting preserves. She also contends that "breeding for unnecessary studies on animals is becoming more and more prevalent," citing alleged sales of marmosets from the Lincoln Park Zoo to "a Chicago hospital."

With respect to mortality in zoos she states: "The in-zoo mortality rate is high. One director reported 15-20% deaths." There is no attempt made to interpret the percentages other than a vague reference to the many "internal and external parasites, bacilli and viruses" zoo animals provide "for the scientists."

The concluding paragraph of the memo makes the very sweeping statement that "a very small percentage of animals shipped to zoos survive the rigors and horrors of transportation." She cites an unnamed "Chicago reporter" as asserting that "a number of species have been nudged toward their present rare or endangered status
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by collecting. " Although it is not so stated, the implication is that such collecting was done primarily for zoos.

The 1975 Annual Report for the Committee for Humane Legislation (the lobbying arm of Friends of Animals) indicates that representatives of the Committee testified against H.R. 70, the Federal Zoo Accreditation Board bill, on the grounds the bill would provide funding for research on zoo animals. CHL also maintained the bill would provide "no financial help whatsoever to the quality of care for the captive animal."

In his testimony for CHL on two bills which were similar to H.R. 70, Attorney Bernard Fensterwald offered conflicting statements regarding the continuation of zoos. On the one hand he claimed: "Zoos and Aquaria are outmoded, inhumane institutions which, year by year, serve a less important function in our society," and he declared that CHL opposed a "federal bail-out program" for them (U.S. Cong., 1974, p.36). But further in his testimony he stated that "we [CHL] are not in favor of abolishing zoos, and I very carefully steered clear of that because that is not our position" (p.41). Doubtless this equivocation led to the conclusion on the part of a number of zoo people that humane societies could not be trusted to state their true feelings about zoos: that zoos should be eliminated.

United Action for Animals (UAA)

Ms. Eleanor Seiling, President of United Action for Animals, indicated in her response to the letter of inquiry that UAA is presently so involved in lobbying for laboratory animals that it may never get to the "masses of new information" it has accumulated regarding zoos. She further stated that the considerable work
that UAA did at one time with respect to zoos was "to no avail" because it was "'no-goal' work, with no legislation or other corrective measures to point to."

Because of UAA's interest in the use of animals in research and testing, the information she refers to probably includes evidence of studies on zoo animals which Ms. Seiling would consider to be cruel--and no doubt useless--research.

In 1973 and 1974, UAA issued an "alert" warning that Representative Whitehurst's bill, H.R. 1266, to establish a National Zoological and Aquarium Corporation would "turn our zoos into centers for animal experimentation." UAA attacked both the American Humane Association for its open promotion of the bill, and The HSUS for what was referred to as its tacit promotion of the bill. The UAA alert charges: "The Humane Society of the United States in fact tacitly promoted the bill, calling for better 'conditions' in the zoos for purposes of 'education' which is precisely the aim of the bill, because today 'education' means the abuse and torment of animals."

In a 1975 UAA Report, "Time Runs Out For Zoo Animals," Ms. Seiling continues her attack on the federal zoo control bills--in this instance H.R. 70--and The HSUS. Also in this report she gives what amounts to UAA's policy on zoos. She argues against the captive breeding of endangered species on the basis that these animals would be used to restock the wild only to:

Ultimately provide a 'sustained yield' of the animals and their products for man's continued consumption. . . . [including] research, hunting, trophy collecting, trapping for their skins, falconry. . . . In brief, the zoo bills would recycle zoo animals and wildlife to suffer the same fate to which mankind has subjected them throughout recorded history.
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The logical conclusion of Ms. Seiling's argument, of course, is that only extinction provides wildlife protection from suffering. The report, however, does not take the reader beyond the first premise.

Ms. Seiling continues her condemnation of breeding by making reference to the overcrowded conditions caused by surplus animals. She refers to the "millions of animals" in urban zoos, a statement not supported by fact as there are apparently only about 600,000 mammals, birds, reptiles and fish in all the zoos in the world (U.S. Congress, 1974, p.44).

Seiling makes a distinction between experimentation on, and observation of, animals. She states flatly that "it is NOT POSSIBLE to experiment on animals without interfering with their health and welfare." She considers any statements by legislators to the effect that research in zoos could only be of the sort to benefit the animals as "doubletalk." Seiling cites experiments conducted on deer mice at the Oklahoma City Zoo and blood studies on monkeys at the San Diego Zoo as evidence that zoos are involved in needless, painful research on their animals. The Report does not give sufficient evidence to enable readers to determine whether these experiments were needlessly painful, or whether they might have resulted in some tangible benefit to animals in the zoo or in the wild.

Seiling distinguishes in the Report between The HSUS's approach to zoos and her own. She charges that HSUS and Sue Pressman put a "stamp of approval" on prey killing experiments with captive animals and then kept the information "secret" from the Society's members. According to The HSUS files, Sue Pressman and Regional Investigator Bernie Weller did investigate reports of prey killing experiments at
a Lion Country Safari in California. They were told, according to an official HSUS memorandum, that the experiments had already been discontinued because of the adverse reaction of the staff members.

If Ms. Seiling's reporting of The HSUS's Zoo Program is biased, her definition of research in the zoo is equally so. She states: "In nutritional research 'for the animals' own benefit', for example, the test animal must either die or be killed terminally from... overdosing of nutrients, or deprivation of nutrients." Her definition of education is equally tendentious: "The HSUS wants more breeding and more education, as if people get 'educated' by staring at captive animals as they do at a freak show."

In addition to her objections to the alleged research conducted on zoo animals and the lack of educational value of zoos, Seiling also makes reference to the mortality rate in zoos. She cites a list of causes of death cited in the 1972 annual report of the National Zoo. She concludes with a statement that "a zoo director recently revealed that the usual mortality rate of captive animals in zoos range between 15-20%" as though a percentage should be meaningful in and of itself. This assertion is followed by the appeal to "phase out zoos and give the animals a chance to live - in their own way, in their own homes, without further harassment and exploitation by mankind." She argues that zoos should be phased out "because of the high mortality rate of captive animals that neither The HSUS nor any other wildlife groups talk about."

The Society for Animal Rights (SAR)

The Society for Animal Rights was formerly known as the National Catholic Society
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for Animal Welfare, and its President Helen Jones was one of the original founders of The Humane Society of the United States in 1954. No information has surfaced to indicate exactly when SAR began to make comments upon zoos, but its current position is patently anti-zoo.

Ms. Jones herself replied to the letter of inquiry and stated SAR's conviction that it "is opposed to zoos as to all forms of exploitation of animals. We believe that existing zoos should be phased out and that no new zoos should be built."

She enclosed copies of SAR Reports which describe the organization's attempts to close the Central Park, Prospect Park, and Flushing Meadow Zoos in New York City and transfer the zoos' animals to the New York Zoological Society's Bronx Park Zoo. SAR suggested that the Bronx Zoo could afford to take the animals if it halted its 14 million dollar planned expansion including a new exhibition of Asian animals. The case was in the courts in New York from 1975 until 1978 when the Appeals Court, New York's highest, upheld a lower court decision that SAR did not have standing (the right to sue) in the case, although the judges apparently agreed that the charges of cruelty to animals were true (SAR Report, November-December, 1978).

Ms. Jones is adamant in her opposition to zoos, claiming they have only negative educational value. In response to the question, "what do children learn in zoos?", she replies:

They learn that adults sentence animals to life imprisonment behind bars although the animals have committed no crime. They learn that animals have been transported thousands of miles from their native habitat to cramped quarters where they are deprived of all of the natural stimulus of life, to be stared at and laughed at by humans. They learn that some animals rock back and forth and
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circle endlessly. No one tells the children that such stereotyped behavior is a sign of mental stress to the point where the animals are suffering from severe mental illness. They learn from signs on cages that animals capable of running great distances at high speed are confined to small concrete cubicles; that nocturnal animals are subjected to light; that animals are deprived of privacy; that boredom is so severe that some animals are given to pushing their own excrement around their cages; that climbing animals must sit on the floor. The list of maleducational effects of zoos is long.

The alternative to the "maleducational effects of zoos," she says, is films: "Children, and adults as well, can learn infinitely more about wild animals by watching films of animals in their native habitat, with an off-camera narrator but no on-camera humans, than they can by visiting zoos."

Though she does not cite in her SAR Reports any specific deficiencies in any zoos other than the three New York zoos included in the SAR lawsuit, Ms. Jones' catalog of the inadequacies of zoos includes all zoos--even the Bronx Zoo--by implication, and she does flatly assert that they should all be phased out.

The SAR Report for February 1980 indicates that the society has purchased all of the remaining copies of Living Trophies from the publisher and is making them available to its constituents at a special reduced price. SAR apparently does not question any of author Peter Batten's sweeping assertions (See: Criticisms and Praise of The HSUS Zoo Program, The Zoos' Consumption of Wildlife, The Disposition of Surplus Animals & Mortality Rates). SAR's subjective appraisal that "Living Trophies is unique among books on zoos because it is written with respect and concern for the captive animals and with a keen awareness for their needs" does not withstand close scrutiny, as there are a number of books about zoos which appear to express both concern for captive animals and awareness of their needs.
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Among them are: Man and Animal in the Zoo and Wild Animals in Captivity by Heini Hediger; Animal Gardens by Emily Hahn; The World's a Zoo by John Perry; and Lifeboats to Arrarat by Sheldon Campbell. All of these books reveal their authors' sincere affection and sympathy for wild animals as well as their understanding of both the strengths and shortcomings of zoos and their administrators.

The Fund For Animals

The Fund for Animals did not reply to the letter of inquiry, but information in The HSUS zoo files and a review of assorted literature from The Fund indicates the organization has been involved in zoo investigations from time to time. From a statement in one of its newsletters (undated, but probably from 1974, Vol. 6-No.2), it appears that The Fund makes the same distinction between good and bad zoos as The HSUS, but with less specific criteria:

Visit your local zoo. If the zoo is humane, congratulate the officials. If it's not, find out WHY. If money is the problem, form a group to help raise some. BUT, if money isn't really the problem, and they don't care about the animals, go to town. Get in touch with The Fund, ask for our Zoo "So You" pamphlet. Form a protest committee, get pictures, contact the local media, etc.

The same newsletter declares that "From New York to Los Angeles, The Fund for Animals is moving on a broad front on zoos, animal farms and pet shop exotics."

Another newsletter (not dated, Vol. 8-No.2, probably 1976) declares The Fund to be an "affiliate" of "United Animal Keepers," a "union" of zoo keepers, formed to "bring pressure on zoo administrations to correct instances of animal maltreatment." United Animal Keepers is also referred to as "a humane organization of animal keepers," and The Fund declares its feeling that "zoo problems originate largely
from poor administrations rather than keepers." This same article contains The Fund's "Zoo Bill of Rights" which declares the rights of zoo animals:

- to sufficient medical care to maintain health.
- to quarters that are healthful, clean, safe, and as close to natural habitats as is humanly possible.
- to a diet that is determined by qualified experts to be sufficient for healthy maintenance.
- to freedom from harassment, whether malicious or innocent, and from being fed inappropriate food by visitors.
- [and the right not] to be sold or donated to any individual without prior guarantee of the above rights.

The "Zoo Bill of Rights" also states that zoos shall:

- maintain personnel in sufficient numbers and training to provide constant protection for animal health and comfort.
- maintain sufficient equipment determined by qualified experts as necessary for the protection, health, and emergency care of each and every animal species; no animal shall be acquired by zoos unless and until such equipment and facilities are available.
- [and] zoos shall not destroy or exploit exhibited animals in their care as fodder for any other animal; no animal shall be destroyed without the consent of medical personnel.

The tenth and last article declares: "The above enumerated rights of all animals in zoos shall not be abridged by any consideration of administrative convenience, ease, or any other reason."

While the "Bill of Rights" does cover most aspects of animal welfare, it does not indicate whether The Fund has any criteria for zoos regarding education or conservation. Absent also in the various newsletter articles is any mention of the problems of municipal interference or antiquated structures in zoos. It is also unclear how one would determine whether money is actually, rather than only apparently, causing a zoo to be substandard.
In his book *Man Kind? Our Incredible War on Wildlife* (1974), Cleveland Amory, The Fund's President, dwells briefly on the negative aspects of zoos. He makes the rather garbled accusation (p.322): "Almost any animal in at least some zoos is subject to almost total persecution. And certain animals in even good zoos would qualify."

Earlier in the book he criticizes the New York Zoological Society for not openly opposing sports hunting "except of endangered species" (p.71). He mentions the zoo's famous collection of big-game trophies, the "National Collection of Heads and Horns," but gives the Society credit for closing the collection to the public. No mention of the Society's numerous conservation efforts is made.

Amory's only positive reference to zoos is his reference to the San Diego Zoo as "the greatest of American zoos" (p.326). The attribution is unaccompanied by any explanation.

In the *Politics of Extinction: The Shocking Story of the World's Endangered Wildlife* (1975), Lewis Regenstein, The Fund's Executive Vice President, speaks of the zoos' "decimation of wildlife" (pp.121-123). He gives no figures for numbers of animals imported specifically for zoos, but cites the total number of animals imported during a given period of time by zoos, the pet industry, and research interests (See: *Zoos: Pro and Con/The Zoos' Consumption of Wildlife*). He cites a statement made by former Assistant Secretary of the Interior Nathaniel P. Reed (though he fails to indicate that Reed's remarks were made at The HSUS Annual Conference in 1973) as saying that the Portland, San Francisco, Central Park, and National Zoos are "convincing evidence of inhumanity" (p.123). No specific examples of that inhumanity are cited.
Regenstein makes no mention of the conservation efforts of zoos, but he does indirectly compliment the New York Zoological Society in his reference to the international conference in Washington in 1973 which led to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES). He mentions that Wayne King of the NYZS was among the delegates at the conference, and states that the U.S. delegation "working day and night, fought hard for a strong, effective treaty, and in the end managed to obtain most of the provisions wanted. . . . [including] a permit system clearly documenting trade in any individual animal, or any part or product thereof, listed as endangered" (p.151).

Regenstein has been quoted in the Christian Science Monitor (Van Slambrouck, 1978) as saying that The Fund is "an organization bent on improving zoos rather than phasing them out." The HSUS files indicate that workers from The Fund have been involved with a number of zoos, such as the Lion Country Safari in West Palm Beach, Florida, and the Audubon Park Zoo in New Orleans, at the same time as The HSUS. In one newsletter article (Vol.6-No.2), The Fund takes credit for "revamping" the New Orleans' Zoo by threatening the "arrest of [the] whole zoo." Another newsletter (tenth anniversary issue, 1977) indicates that Fund representatives filed cruelty charges against the foreman of the Van Saun Park Zoo in Paramus, New Jersey.

The HSUS files also indicate that on at least one occasion a Fund representative asked for Sue Pressman's assistance with a zoo. Fund Representative Florence Schippert asked Sue to inspect the Lowery Park Zoo in Tampa, Florida in 1971. Although The Fund has not taken an overtly anti-zoo position, its stance has been interpreted as such by some members of the zoo world. In a booklet distributed by
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ZOOACT (See: Zoos Respond To Their Critics), George Steele makes a reference to Amory's book:

A favorite propaganda device [of humane organizations] is to carefully select isolated examples of bad zoological management and practices and then unfairly paint all zoos with one brush, falsely alleging, or implying, widespread mismanagement and inhumane treatment by all zoos. For example, the renowned columnist Bob Considine, in reviewing the recent book Man Kind written by Cleveland Amory, President and founder of The Fund for Animals, directs a scathing attack at all zoos in the U.S., saying "zoos by and large are operated today with all the insensitivity and neglect that prevailed in this country a century ago."

Apparently the relationship between zoos and The Fund has improved in the past few years. In his "Legislative Update" to the AAZPA in 1979, George Steele reported:

Speaking of telephone calls, perhaps nothing more dramatically demonstrates the point that we are trying to make [that ZOOACT has been effective in improving relations between humane organizations and the AAZPA] than an early morning phone call we received recently from Mr. Louis Regenstein of The Fund for Animals. Many of you will recall that Lou was one of the most severe critics of the zoological profession, our requests and applications for permits, and our efforts to simplify permitting procedures. Lou's last telephone call, however, was not to challenge or question or criticize, but was rather to inform us that the environmental community had suggested to the President that he send us one of the pens used to sign an amendment to the Fishery Conservation and Management Act, providing additional protection for whales. Lou indicated that the environmental community had informed the White House that without our assistance, this amendment would probably have never passed.

The Animal Welfare Institute (AWI)

Through its "lobbying arm," the Society for Animal Protective Legislation, the Animal Welfare Institute and its well-known spokesman, Mrs. Christine Stevens, have presented more testimony on zoo-related legislation than any other national animal welfare organization. Mrs. Stevens' participation in the hearings which
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led to the passage of the Animal Welfare Act of 1970 has already been discussed, as has, to some extent, her testimony on the bills to provide federal assistance to zoos and aquariums (See: The Federal Regulation of Zoos, and The HSUS Zoo Reform Program).

The Publications Secretary who responded to the letter of inquiry did not indicate that AWI had a written policy regarding zoos or had ever instituted any organized program of zoo reform. She indicated only that although the AWI "does not lobby," it does "consider the Animal Welfare Act to be valuable legislation and think[s] the regulations should be strengthened." The AWI publications she enclosed contained two very different sorts of references to zoos.

One AWI publication, Comfortable Quarters for Laboratory Animals, which deals primarily with the kind of confinement usually associated with research facilities, contains an article by Drs. Markowitz and Schmidt on "Behavioral Engineering As An Aid in the Maintenance of Healthy Zoo Animals" (See: Zoos: Pro and Con/Modifying Zoo Exhibits to Meet the Animals' Needs). This is a very positive article from the zoos' standpoint which describes the efforts made in three zoos to provide more stimulating environments for certain animals, and the added benefits they provide for the health care of the animal and the education of the public.

The article pertaining to zoos in the other publication, Humane Biology Projects, encourages students to conduct behavioral studies of zoo animals (as an alternative to performing painful experiments upon animals as part of their school science training), and also warns them to be alert to the "thoughtless exploitations" they might find in zoos. This very short article also contains a list of questions
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to be asked in "Evaluating Your Local Zoo." The questions are taken from Living Trophies by Peter Batten, and end with Batten's own caveat:

The first part of each question should be answered YES. If this is not so, ask to see the zoo director or his assistant—not the public relations person or 'educational curator'—and ask WHY; then brace yourself for evasive answers or rhetoric.

This tone reflects the same suspicion about zoos that was evident in Mrs. Stevens' testimony before the Senate subcommittee in 1974. In expressing her belief about the extent of neglect in zoos, she said it was "incredible, much more serious than... we know," and charged that zoo directors "cover up whenever anything is wrong." Although she did declare that "we endorse entirely the idea of the educational importance of zoos, but they are not as educational as they should be by a long, long shot." She cited the AAZPA's opposition to the USDI's model state bill in 1969, and charged AAZPA with playing "a leading role in keeping The Animal Welfare Act regulations as minimal as they are while humane societies are trying to raise them" (U.S. Congress, 1974, p.63). She stated that AAZPA's majority influence on the proposed federal zoo board would "lead to a proliferation of mediocrity at a time when the public expects genuine changes in the whole zoo concept" (p.64).

In spite of this essentially negative view of zoos and tendency to see instances of apparent neglect as the "tip of the iceberg" rather than as isolated and generally unintentional (which is the way The HSUS, more often than not, has seen them), Mrs. Stevens has been included in the "Zoological/Environmental" conferences initiated by ZOOACT.
In 1974, after a decade of drawing public attention to the plight of animals in roadside zoos, Defenders of Wildlife reduced its emphasis on the issue and phased out the position that Cecile O'Marr had held since 1969. The change in emphasis was due, according to John Grandy, Defenders' Executive Vice President, to an "increased level of activity" on other issues. Toby Cooper, Defenders' Programs Director, says the organization could not justify continuing to support one full-time staff person on that issue alone. Although Mrs. O'Marr contends that her program was always self-supporting.

In recent years roadside zoos have continued to be investigated and exposed by Defenders' regional representatives, although Defenders has never made it a point to "watchdog" USDA's enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act. The regional representatives have followed Defenders traditional approach of photographing roadside zoos, attempting to embarrass the owners, and making bad conditions known to citizens and legislators in areas where the zoos are found. Grandy believes the regional representatives have brought about a number of positive changes in some zoos with this approach and have even managed to close approximately twenty of them.

Before she left the organization, Cecile O'Marr had begun to express in her column in the magazine what amounted to opposition to all zoos, but Toby Cooper maintains that Defenders is not opposed to zoos in principle. John Grandy says Defenders does not have a written policy on zoos, but that its unwritten policy is very similar to that of The HSUS. Defenders is unalterably opposed to roadside zoos.
zoos, but feels the relative merits of other zoos must be considered on a "case by case basis." Grandy indicates he personally does not like to see wild animals in captivity, but says his organization supports the efforts of zoos to breed animals in captivity as a means of reducing the drain on wild populations.

Even though they were unable to cite specific figures, both Grandy and Cooper declare that the organization continues to receive a number of letters from people expressing their opposition to conditions in roadside zoos. Articles in the magazine always result in a volume of mail, they contend. Cooper adds that Defenders has never received any mail from its constituents indicating the organization's concern for roadside zoos is misplaced.

Both Cooper and Grandy believe a campaign against roadside zoos would galvanize considerable public sentiment against these zoos, and could "get Congress moving" to pass legislation to close them. They have no plans to undertake such a campaign, however, and Grandy believes it would cost as much as $400,000.00 and would take a three-year multi-media campaign to produce the desired result. He further believes there would be considerable opposition to a move to legislate roadside zoos out of existence from roadside zoo owners, AAZPA, and ZOOACT.

A recent article in Defenders Magazine concerning the Central Park Zoo quotes Sue Pressman and describes The HSUS system for rating zoos. Additionally, Sue has been consulted by Defenders' New England Regional Representative Teresa Nelson concerning proposed minimum standards for roadside zoos which Nelson is preparing for the legislature in Maine.
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There are frequent references in the AAZPA conference proceedings from the mid-1970's to the threat against the continued existence of zoos from the activities of anti-zoo "protectionists" which had already resulted in increased legislative restrictions upon the acquisition and disposition of animals. Some zoo people referred to zoos as an "endangered species" being legislated out of business by fanatical, uninformed "tree-huggers" who had good intentions but no understanding of biological realities (Todd, 1973).

In a presentation to one of the AAZPA's regional workshops in 1975, Frank Todd (1976, pp.2-3), Corporate Curator of Birds for Sea World, Inc. of San Diego, described the accumulation of protective federal legislation which the zoos were coming slowly to regard as inimical to their continued existence:

The incredible saga of zoo problems began in earnest in August of 1972 when the USDA imposed retroactive avian importation ban [due to Newcastle's disease] went into effect. This was closely followed in December by the Marine Mammal Protection Act. In 1973 the New Endangered Species Act became effective, as well as the beginnings of the International Treaty [CITES] concerning endangered species. During 1973 USDA came out with their overly restrictive avian import and quarantine requirements and importers began to drop like flies. 1974 was no better as the first proposal [to amend the Lacey Act] from USDI regarding the so-called "injurious species" was presented. In addition, the concept of a federal zoo bill was being received favorably in Washington. The situation between USDA and American zoos continued to deteriorate. 1975 has started out just as poorly for us. The second, and just as bad, proposal from [US] FWS on injurious species has been made public and the concept of a Federal Zoo Control Board is gaining wider acceptance.

Zoos were frustrated by the paperwork and the delays in getting permits to import animals or move them across state lines "in commerce." In his presentation, Todd (p.3) gave an illustration of the sorts of restrictions zoos could encounter:
Zoos Respond to their Critics

Examination of a seemingly simple importation will serve to illustrate some of the problems; importation of a pair of laysan teal from Canada. First it is required to apply for a USDA import permit. If that is approved, space must then be secured in a USDA approved quarantine facility which frequently takes many months. Then the bird has to survive quarantine, and while in quarantine must even not be 'exposed' to anything such as VVND [Newcastle's Disease]. If so, they are destroyed. Now, unfortunately for the teal, they are considered an endangered species; hence an endangered species permit is required from USDI. Waiting periods up to one year are not unusual, even if approved. In addition, a $50.00 application fee is required, even though the birds are only worth $20.00 a pair. In the meantime, the birds may have died of senility. Assuming that they have not and are at least legally imported, and breeding is ultimately achieved, still another endangered species permit to sell the offspring is necessary. Laysan Teal are prolific breeders, so the only solution is to separate them to prevent the breeding of endangered species. . . . So, in effect, the bill that was conceived to assist endangered species is, in reality, the most detrimental thing that has happened to them in some time. In essence, they are being legislated out of business.

In spite of this rather dramatic illustration, other zoo people, such as Warren Iliff (See Appendix C), contend that federal regulations pose few problems if one is "organized." Earl Baysinger of the USDI believes there have been just enough problems with the implementation of federal regulations to lend credibility to the "screamers." Baysinger says he urged the government on many occasions to create a clearinghouse for permits, but to no avail. In 1977 it was taking an average of 120 days for an applicant to get a permit from the Federal Wildlife Permit Office.

Those "screamers" decided that zoos and aquariums had to protect themselves by "fighting fire with fire," and a number of them contributed funds in 1974 to establish the Zoological Action Committee, ZOOACT, to represent their interests in Washington and keep them informed of objectionable legislation before it was passed. ZOOACT slowly began to draw more support from AAZPA members, but they were not unanimously
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in support of zoos and aquariums being represented in Washington by someone outside their profession.

Two of the individuals interviewed in the course of preparing this paper were particularly critical of the AAZPA's approach to legislative representation in Washington. Dr. Wayne King (See Appendix C) thinks it is "appalling" for zoos to be represented by a professional lobbyist. He believes the AAZPA should do its own lobbying. He further believes the AAZPA does not understand the way the "political establishment" operates in Washington, but it could learn and could represent itself more effectively and at less expense.

Steve Graham (See Appendix C) apparently shares Dr. King's opinion. He believes that ZOOACT's Executive Director George Steele suffers from the image of being "too slick," and that is not the image AAZPA should be conveying to Congress. He also feels it is of no benefit to AAZPA to have ZOOACT working "on the outside"; he would have George Steele continue to represent AAZPA, but from within the Association.

These criticisms evidently represent the minority view, but it is apparently a vocal minority as the reports of the AAZPA Presidents and the Executive Director repeatedly defend the need to maintain "legislative services" in Washington. In his defense of those services in his "Presidential Farewell Address," outgoing AAZPA President Edward Maruska reminded the membership at the Annual Conference in 1979 that "the protectionist, conservationist and other pressure groups maintain million-dollar lobbies in Washington." He also stressed the need for AAZPA to "be involved in all conservation issues" (Maruska, 1979, p.6).
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Since it established its independence from the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) in 1971, the AAZPA has undergone many changes in its effort to be recognized as an association of professionals seriously dedicated to the purposes of "conservation, education, scientific studies and recreation" in zoos and aquariums. Since 1971 it has dramatically increased in size. From 671 members in 1971, the AAZPA's membership roll has increased to 2,815 members in 1979, a growth rate of 13% over the 2,500 members reported in 1978 (Wagner, 1979, p.10). There are also more than 220 member institutions in AAZPA, which number should be compared to the more than 1,200 exhibitors of captive wildlife listed as registered or licensed by the USDA under the Animal Welfare Act. Clearly, not all so-called "zoos" are subject to the sanctions of the AAZPA, and do not derive the benefits of the Association's educational activities. AAZPA members do appear to take advantage of the Association's efforts to encourage the sharing of information; the Executive Director reports that "more than 50% of AAZPA members attend Association meetings [regional workshops and annual conferences] on an annual basis" (Wagner, 1979, p.10).

Recognizing the need for scientifically trained individuals to determine the future course of the zoo profession, AAZPA has created categories of membership to distinguish between levels of training and experience. In 1977 the AAZPA began publishing in its NEWSLETTER a list of candidates for the Professional Fellow and Fellow classes of membership (AAZPA NEWSLETTER, 1/1979:6). By this means the members are given the opportunity to question the suitability of proposed candidates. The requirements for both classes are quite specific: Professional Fellows are required to be graduates of an "accredited institution of higher learning,"
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employed for a minimum of three years in a zoo or aquarium; Fellows must have been employed continuously in a zoo or aquarium for two full years. The educational requirement may be waived if the candidate has been employed for eight full years in a zoo or aquarium, and during four years of that time has been "in a management capacity on the administrative, scientific, maintenance or supportive staff" of the institution (AAZPA 1978-79 Directory, p.18). Candidates in both categories must be sponsored by three current members (Professional Fellows or Fellows)--only one of which may be affiliated with the candidate's own institution—who will attest in writing to the candidate's "qualifications, attitude towards the Association and professional ethics." Fellows may apply for Professional Fellow status when they can meet the requirements. New members must be approved by a two-thirds majority of the Board of Directors after an initial review by the Membership Committee (Wagner, 1979, p.10).

All members are required to be reviewed every three years "to determine their qualifications for continuance in their membership classification" (AAZPA 1978-79 Directory, p.17). In 1978 a review of all the Institutional/Society (I/S) members was undertaken by Professional Fellows who volunteered for the task. As a result, three I/S members were required to undergo three separate visits because of questions raised about the operation of their institutions. Two institutions voluntarily cancelled their memberships and one other was reinstated after suspension (Wagner, 1979, p.10).

Additionally, the membership of an animal dealer was withdrawn in 1976 "for cause" (AAZPA NEWSLETTER, 5/1976:2), and despite repeated appeals, has not been reinstated (Wagner, Personal Communication). AAZPA members are discouraged from doing
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business with animal dealers who are not members. Members do inquire about the membership status of animal dealers because special mention has been made of these requests in the NEWSLETTER over the past few years. AAZPA members may have learned a valuable lesson about doing business with non-member dealers after several major zoos were charged in 1977 by the government with receiving illegally obtained reptiles from the Philadelphia Reptile Exchange (Holden, 1979 and Campbell, 1978, pp.32-36; See also: Zoos: Pro and Con/The Zoos' Consumption of Wildlife).

In a further effort to regulate its membership and demonstrate its willingness to respond to criticism from within its own ranks, the AAZPA set up an Ethics Committee in 1975 (the only committee other than the Executive Committee to be elected by the membership). By January 1979 the Committee Chairman reported that 15 formal complaints had been reviewed, though no indication was given of action taken by the Committee (AAZPA NEWSLETTER, 1/1979:1). Although AAZPA members are required by their Code of Ethics to report violations, the provision requiring them to state the nature of any violation in writing, which will be made known to the accused along with the name of the accuser, probably has an inhibiting effect on the reporting of ethics violations (Wagner, Personal Communication).

Another major effort at self-regulation in the zoo profession is the AAZPA's Accreditation Program. A Study Committee was appointed in 1971 to investigate accreditation just prior to AAZPA's separation from the NRPA. Among the existing programs examined, that of the American Association of Museums was considered to be most suitable because both AAZPA and AAM members "maintain valuable collections for which scientific staffs are held responsible," and "both [have] education of
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the visiting public and conservation as major themes in their programs" (Wagner, from course material prepared for AAZPA's Management School).

The Accreditation Program, AAZPA acknowledges, was, in part, a response to the growing expression of public concern for the welfare of captive wildlife. AAZPA considers such legislation as the Endangered Species Act, Marine Mammal Protection Act, Animal Welfare Act, and the various Zoo Accreditation Board bills to be expressions of this sentiment. According to a statement included in materials prepared for AAZPA's Management School:

It became evident that if the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums did not initiate an Accreditation Program of its own, the federal government would be forced to enact legislation requiring accreditation of zoo and aquarium institutions and that such institutions would have to meet federal standards rather than standards imposed by professionals in the zoo and aquarium industry.

Inspections leading to accreditation are conducted by 3 Professional Fellows, serving voluntarily, and their traveling and accommodation expenses are borne by the institution seeking accreditation. The average cost to an institution seeking accreditation is estimated at approximately $750.00.

The three member Visiting Committee normally includes a veterinarian, and the members are chosen by the Director of the applying institution from a list of five willing volunteers. The official application must be signed by the institution's chief administrator and the chairman of the governing board. As is the case with The HSUS's own Accreditation Program, the idea is to insure that the governing authority "has formally considered and approved the submission of the application" (from AAZPA's Management School course material).
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The sixteen-page application and its accompanying documentation is reviewed by a nine-member Accreditation Commission appointed by AAZPA President (each incumbent President appoints three members to the Commission to insure continuity). If the Commission considers the institution to meet the requirements based on information contained in the application, it is granted the status of "interim approval." At each of the two annual meetings required of the Commission, accreditation of applicants is awarded, denied, or tabled. Applications may be tabled for a period of one year only, after which time they must be reconsidered and either approved or rejected.

Accredited institutions are given special recognition in the AAZPA's official Directory in addition to being mentioned in the NEWSLETTER. While no special announcement is made of institutions which are denied accreditation, that information is considered to be "public" and will be made available to persons making "reasonable inquiries" (AAZPA Management School course material).

AAZPA has accredited slightly more than 30 of its more than 200 member institutions since the program was begun in 1974 (See: Appendix B). The first series of reaccreditation inspections, required every three years and performed at no cost to the institution, was undertaken in 1979. The pace of accreditation has begun to accelerate, and the Executive Director estimates there will be 50 institutions accredited by the time of AAZPA's Annual Meeting in 1980 (Wagner, Personal Communication).

AAZPA acknowledges that accreditation currently offers "little more than self-satisfaction" (AAZPA Management School Course Material), but accredited institutions
have recently been given a special vote on Association matters, and the use of the AAZPA's official logo is permitted on the institution's letterheads. Dr. Ted Reed, Director of the National Zoo (See: Appendix C), says the National Zoo has not benefitted appreciably from accreditation and believes that AAZPA has not made its program sufficiently known to foundations so that zoos might begin to benefit financially from accreditation (Personal Communication).

Since 1977 all new Institution/Society members of AAZPA are required to apply for and be granted accreditation within a 24 month period or they will not be permitted to remain members of the Association. There are apparently a number of members who feel that accreditation must be made mandatory for all Institution/Society members. Those arguing in favor of mandatory accreditation point out that since Mr. Whitehurst continues to introduce his National Zoological Foundation Bill in Congress session after session, the possibility of federally imposed accreditation cannot be ruled out.

Supporters of mandatory accreditation also make reference to the likelihood that the Institute of Museum Services (IMS), which has made grants to several zoos (including Los Angeles and Topeka), will begin to require that institutions applying for grants be accredited by their professional associations. As more and more zoos are showing an interest in pursuing grant monies to supplement static or diminishing municipal funds, this caveat may be an incentive for more of them to pursue accreditation. This argument may not be convincing, however, to the smaller institutions in the AAZPA. According to Robert Wagner (Personal Communication), more than half of the member institutions have annual budgets of less than $250,000.00 and half of that number have budgets of less than $125,000.00. If the smaller
institutions are unable to compete with the larger ones for grant money, it will be of little concern to them what requirements are imposed by the IMS.

The Definition of a Zoo

One of the most important aspects of the Accreditation Program may well be its definition for a zoo or aquarium. That definition is:

An organized and permanent institution, essentially educational and aesthetic in purpose with professional staff which owns and utilizes wild animals, provides them with proper care and exhibits them to the public on a regular schedule.

The key words in the definition are further defined as follows:

1. **Organized Institution**: a duly constituted body with expressed responsibilities.
2. **Permanent**: the institution is expected to continue into perpetuity.
3. **Professional Staff**: at least one paid employee who commands an appropriate body of special knowledge and the ability to reach zoological park and aquarium management decisions consonant with the experience of his peers and who has access to and knowledge of the literature of the field.
4. **Wild Animals**: non-domesticated animal life.
5. **Educational**: providing information to develop and cultivate the mind.
6. **Aesthetic**: pertaining to the beautiful.
7. **Scheduled Hours**: regular and predictable hours which constitute substantially more than a token opening, so that access is reasonably convenient to the public. (AAZPA's Management (Course Material).

It is clear that if all so-called zoos were required to meet the criteria of this definition, most of those which cause problems from the animal welfare standpoint (both municipal and "roadside") would be excluded from using the term "zoo" to describe their operations (See: Conclusions and Recommendations).

It is worth noting that most of the zoos and aquariums accredited by the AAZPA are
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classed as 1's or 2's by The HSUS; however, there are a small number of class 3 zoos which are also accredited (See: Appendix B).
The statements of those who oppose the continuation of zoos have elements in common (Vanderpoel, 1975; Noyer, 1972; Herrington, 1977; and Jones, 1977, 1980). Opponents of zoos deplore the animals' loss of freedom through "imprisonment"; they stress the humiliation of animals by the laughing, teasing zoo-going public; and they emphasize injuries or deaths resulting from vandalism, as well as the often self-destructive behavior of animals confined in sterile enclosures that do not meet their behavioral requirements. Although little precise data exist to substantiate their claims, zoo opponents speak of the alleged high rate of mortality they believe to be associated with the capturing and transporting processes, and they often accuse zoos of depleting populations of wild animals with their collecting.

Opponents of zoos either are unaware of, or do not accept, the contention of zoologists and ethologists that animals in the wild, far from being "free" to roam at will, are "constrained by the natural limits of their home range, ecological niche, territory and the further constraints provided by space, time, resources, competition, and natural enemies" (Maple, in press). And that, further, the concept of "zoo biology" developed by Hediger (1969, p.54) "provides the scientific basis for the maintenance of wild animals in the zoo under optimal and appropriate conditions."

They also appear to deny the argument put forth by proponents of zoos that human beings, particularly urban dwellers, have a need for contact with nature that only the zoo can provide. Author and San Diego Zoo Trustee Sheldon Campbell (1978, p.xiii) contends:

It might be suggested that zoos allow us to stay in touch with our
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most primitive roots in a primeval world where human survival depended on knowing the shapes and habits of wild animals. So important were wild creatures to our distant ancestors that they were the most frequent subjects of paintings on cave walls, formed the basis for virtually all early religions, and were in numerous instances worshipped as gods.

Of the needs of modern man, Campbell says:

The exponential growth of human population and the ever-increasing sprawl of cities does more than rob land from wildlife: it pushes the animals farther away from city dwellers. People live in brick, concrete, and glass environments where they lose all touch with wilderness; children grow up who have never tried to catch a frog, never seen a hawk soar or a deer step daintily across a forest clearing--let along watched a herd of elephants amble across the savannah or a pride of lions stalk prey.

Hediger (1969, p.79) goes even further in describing the zoo as a place to cure the "psychical deficiency" of the urban dweller. He claims "the zoological garden is assuming the significance of a place where youth, particularly the young people in the big city, can be encouraged to contemplate the wonders of nature and to respect the living animal and thus be guided toward a respect for life in general." Opponents argue categorically that captivity only engenders contempt for wild creatures.

Hediger and other proponents of zoos would doubtless counter with the argument that the attitude of the zoo visitor may well depend upon how the animals are displayed, rather than upon the simple fact they are held captive. Proponents contend that "it is the animal itself that speaks best for itself" (Campbell, 1978, p.192), and that the elimination of zoos "would construct a 'solid wall' between people and the wild" causing them to forget that the animals are "out there" at all (Van Slambrouck, 1978).
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Critics, however, seem to persist in their view that zoos mean only deprivation for animals. As one critic states (Koyen, 1972):

[Zoos] confine the inmates in spaces which are miniscule in contrast to the expanses of their native habitats. Not only are the areas constricted; the climate, the vegetation, and the very soil are usually hopelessly alien.

Hediger, however, has drawn extensively upon the findings of zoologists who have observed animals in the wild to put forth a convincing argument that animals view both freedom and captivity very differently from the way they are perceived by human beings. He is critical of zoos for depriving animals of what they need, but it is not the deprivation of freedom that concerns him.

**Freedom and Captivity**

Hediger's work has had such an influence on zoos that it is deserving of careful consideration by anyone who admits the possibility wild animals may be kept humanely in captivity. The HSUS has never stated explicitly that animals can be kept humanely in captivity, but that presumption is implicit in the Society's official policy statement concerning zoos. As The HSUS appears to be the only national humane organization with a published policy on zoos, it may be obliged to defer to Hediger in defense of that policy.

Hediger (1964,p.4) bases his pronouncement that "the free animal does not live in freedom, neither in space nor as regards its behavior towards other animals," upon studies of animals in the wild. According to Hediger, not even migratory species roam at will over a given area. They, like all other species, are restricted in space and time by forces beyone their control:
A set timetable drives them from one end of their territory to the other, in strict obedience to laws. The seasonal movements of migrant birds should not be thought of as pleasure trips; these birds are in fact compelled to go on their exhausting migrations by a fixed rhythmic cycle and many fall a victim to the dangers and hardships. ... Every year the migrations of birds involve the extermination of countless numbers of individuals. ... Swifts sometimes abandon their last brood unceremoniously under the urge to migrate (p.5).

Even the non-migratory species' movements may be limited by factors which are not readily apparent to the casual observer. Hediger states:

Many ideas about the limits of range are wrong; these limits are not always necessarily natural obstacles like mountains, valleys, rivers, lakes, seas, etc. Temperature, humidity and vegetation, as well as air pressure, can act as surprisingly effective boundaries and so can psychological factors (pp.5-6).

Both migratory and non-migratory species are obliged to render an area "distinctive. ... in a particular way" (p.27), and defend it against intruders. The location of this particular "home" is determined by its proximity to food, water, and shelter, and by its defensibility against competing members of the animal's own species or enemies of other species.

In this "home" each animal has certain "work" to perform:

Each animal lives in its own specific world. The environment (milieu) offers as it were a reservoir of stimuli from which the subject constructs its own world. The building material consists of a variety of things of vital importance or biological interest to the animal (p.27).

Zoos have erred, according to Hediger, in failing to provide their captive animals with these materials to provide "qualitative details" in their synthetic environments. Armed with knowledge of the animal's natural needs and behavior, based
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upon observations of the free-living species, one is then able, says Hediger, to put oneself in the animal's place and "foresee its needs" in captivity. He concludes:

If all the needs of an animal are adequately met, the zoo offers its inhabitant a man-made, miniature territory with all the properties of a natural one. The animal will then consider the territory its own: it marks and defends the area and does not feel imprisoned.

The failure to foresee the animal's needs can result in the aberrant behavior which arouses the indignation of opponents of zoos who condemn what appears to be "constant suffering through lack of freedom in an artificial prison" (U.S. Congress, 1974, p.36). Hediger (1977, p.665) applauds the fact that "the naive assumption that animals in the wild have unlimited space," although incorrect, "has at least led to intense and successful protests against the old-fashioned menagerie method of keeping individuals in dungeonlike cages." But he continues to caution that the emphasis must be upon the quality of the animal's environment more than the cage size.

Modifying Zoo Exhibits to Meet Animals' Needs

Statements made by Hediger (1964, 1968, 1969) and others (Fox & Walls, 1972; Meyer-Holzapfl, 1968) indicate that certain species of animals--those referred to by Desmond Morris (1968) as "opportunists"--suffer from inactivity if their surroundings in captivity provide no opportunity for them to exercise behavior patterns which have evolved over long periods of time in the wild. Hediger says (1964, p.158):
When we consider that the wild animal in nature is constantly preoccupied with the impulses to avoid enemies and seek food, and that both these highly important elements suddenly disappear in captivity, it is obvious that this change must have far reaching consequences. The captive animal's most important occupations are taken from him. Enormous amounts of energy are thus released and must somehow be restrained. Clearly one of the most urgent problems in the biology of zoological gardens arises from the lack of occupation of the captive animal.

In the decade since the publication of Hediger's last major book on zoos in 1969, many American zoos have begun to make changes in their methods of exhibiting animals in order to provide outlets for their "enormous amounts of energy." Evidence of these efforts can be found in brief references in AAZPA newsletters and in more detailed descriptions in AAZPA regional and annual conference proceedings (Myers, 1975).

Some efforts have consisted primarily in modifying exhibits with the addition of "furniture" to improve the "quality" of the captive animal's environment (Eaton & Hancocks, 1975). The simple addition of materials to provide animals with opportunities for climbing, swinging, and digging probably suffice for some individuals of some species. Many zoos are now trying to keep the more gregarious species in groups, both to facilitate breeding and to provide the animals with opportunities for play, social grooming, and other forms of interaction.

Still other efforts to alleviate boredom have included the use of simple training techniques (Pryor, 1972). Hediger endorses these enthusiastically, but is more skeptical of circus-type performances which some zoos such as St. Louis have employed (1968, pp.136-137). Many zoo people appear to feel that trained-animal acts are inappropriate for zoos because they deprive wild animals of their natural
"dignity," but they would also probably acknowledge that the activity provided the animal is better than no activity at all.

Another approach to providing captive animals with activity, "behavioral engineering," refers to the use of mechanical devices ostensibly to elicit an animal's natural behavior. One of the most enthusiastic proponents of behavioral engineering, Dr. Harold Markowitz (1972, 1975 and 1979), created a number of methods of feeding animals such as monkeys and gibbons at the Portland, Oregon Zoo using Pavlovian-like mechanisms with which the animals would collect pieces of food or other items by pushing buttons in response to the conditioned stimuli of flashing lights.

Not all zoo people favor these techniques, however, and the Portland Zoo has discontinued them at the insistence of its current Director, Warren Iliff. According to Iliff, this kind of behavioral modification might ultimately do more harm than good for wild animals "by creating stereotyped responses, giving the animals a false impression of the foraging process, and possibly inducing the wrong kind of exercise." He bases his belief upon this fact: "We don't really know enough about the natural behavior of most zoo animals, so in using behavior modification we may be creating abnormal behavior instead of inducing natural" (Campbell, 1978, p.213).

Conservation Through Captive Breeding

Conservation is deemed to be, along with education, research, and recreation, a major purpose of zoos and aquariums. The term refers, almost exclusively, to the
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propagation of wild animals in captivity. No other zoos appear to be in the enviable position of the New York Zoological Society to contribute to the purchase of tracts of land in foreign countries where animals may be preserved in their native habitats. Conservation is also a stated purpose of the AAZPA, and to encourage the conservation efforts of its members, the AAZPA awards special citations for first and second generation births of endangered animals as well as for sustained breeding successes. Robert Wagner (1979, p.7) reports that "the number of births and successful raising of species seems to be increasing every year" according to the number of nominations received by the AAZPA Honors and Awards Committee.

It is interesting to note that successful births and hatchings recently have appeared to occur almost simultaneously in different institutions, or at least to follow in close sequence. Although no explanation has been put forth for this phenomenon other than "growing dedication and expertise" (Wagner, 1979, p.7), it may be a good indicator of the improved communications between institutions for which AAZPA deserves a large measure of credit.

In an article in International Wildlife in 1976, John Perry reported that, according to figures provided by the International Zoo Yearbook (IZY), zoos, at that time, had populations of only 13 species of animals "that seem secure without further additions from the wild." That is, the captive populations numbered more than 100 animals each and more than 50 percent were born in captivity. The list includes the Przewalski's horse (Equus przewalski) and the Père David deer (Elaphurus davidianus) which exist only in zoos, their wild populations having been extinct for some time.
Perry and two colleagues, in a study in 1972, found that of 162 threatened species kept in zoos during the preceding decade, only 8 became well-established. Hence the IZY's list indicates an increase, however slight. To determine why the zoos' record was no better, Perry and another colleague undertook a closer study of 146 zoos. They found that half of them, on the average, had one or more species of threatened mammals, but their combined holdings averaged only 22 individuals per species with some males and females being kept without mates. Perry concluded that the 146 zoos had a capacity of 32,000 mammals, and if they were to maintain even 100 individuals of each species, they would be able to accomodate only 320 species instead of the 885 they were exhibiting—or else they must increase their space dramatically. Perry concluded that "though zoos will undoubtedly preserve more than the thirteen species which now seem secure, it is physically impossible that they could become the ultimate refuge for a large share of the earth's threatened species."

At the opposite end of the "wildlife survival spectrum" from zoos, says Perry, are national parks. But national parks, though they've grown in numbers in recent years, include a mere one percent of the earth's land surface and "are not repre­sentative samples of all natural areas." Perry proposes that there are four options for preserving vanishing wildlife which represent a spectrum from most to least desirable. He says: "The ideal strategy for saving wildlife is to preserve enormous area of natural wilderness. The last resort for saving endangered species is artificial breeding in zoos." Between the two extremes are "mini-reserves, small protected pieces of larger ecosystems," and "translocations" which include the transferral of animals to non-native habitat. This last alternative includes
the exotic game ranches which are looked upon with such contempt by animal welfare organizations (See: Zoos: Pro and Con/The Disposition of Surplus Animals).

Sheldon Campbell (1978, p.27) appears somewhat disparagingly to attribute the zoos' conservation efforts more to necessity than anything else. He states: "What zoo managers do have a firm grasp of is the terrifying fact that wild animals, without which they cannot continue to operate zoos, are becoming increasingly hard to acquire." Campbell, like Perry, is a staunch advocate of captive propagation, but he is more openly critical than Perry of their failure in this regard: "For thousands of years then, the movement of animals has been one way--from wilderness to captivity--and zoos have done little to repay their part of that debt" (p.55). He adds: "Before the public can care, zoos will have to care. No activity by zoos has received more lip service and been less seriously undertaken than captive breeding. All zoos subscribe to the idea, but few are really doing much about it" (p.206). Campbell's conclusion is reinforced by the fact that a small number of AAZPA members appear to walk away with the awards year after year.

Campbell recognizes the constraints upon most zoos which inhibit their contribution to captive breeding programs. As Perry stated, many of them lack the space, but an even greater number, being constrained by their reliance upon municipal largesse, lack the necessary funds. Campbell laments the necessity of zoo budgets being dependent upon "uncomprehending bureaucrats. . . . who don't know the difference between an aardvark and a jaguarundi and may sharply question any funds allocated for captive breeding" (p.207).

The list of Endangered Species is growing longer rather than shorter, with more
than 430 species of birds, mammals, reptiles and fish currently included (AAZPA NEWSLETTER, 11/1979:11). The destruction of habitat is considered to be the principal cause of endangerment for many species, and it appears increasingly likely that zoos may well be the last repository for a number of them. How many they will be able to save appears to be the most pressing question.

Dr. Thomas Lovejoy, Director of the World Wildlife Fund USA, made a grim prediction to the zoo directors and conservationists gathered at the World Conference III on Breeding Endangered Species in Captivity in November 1979. He stated:

It is now necessary to decide which species zoos should undertake to breed and save and which will have to be allowed to totter or fly off into the sunset of extinction. We cannot save all the species, not even all the vertebrates. This essentially means that a place in tomorrow's biota—or a place on the ark which zoos can provide—will be By Invitation Only (Jouet, 1979).

William Conway's remarks to the delegates at the same Conference describe the conservation task of zoos from the economic perspective and give some insight into his frustration with the short-sightedness of humane organizations which, he contends, are "more concerned with whether an individual animal dies well than with whether a species lives at all" (See: Criticisms and Praise of The HSUS Zoo Program). Conway (1980, p.32) and some of his colleagues have estimated that it would cost 25 billion dollars for zoos to maintain captive populations of 500 individuals of only 2,000 species for the next twenty years, or "just about what it cost to put a man on the moon."

In describing the "environmental doom" facing the planet, Mr. Conway cites the predictions made in a government study initiated a few years ago by President Carter. The report, entitled Global 2000, predicts that "approximately six hundred
thousand additional species of plants and animals will have become extinct" by the year 2,000 (p.28).

To further dramatize the enormous costs involved, Conway cites an estimate for just one sub-species of one well-known mammal:

Consider the 750 Siberian tigers that exist in zoos today. Dr. George Rabb, Director of the Chicago Zoological Park, and I have calculated that it costs $1,200,000 each year just to feed them. Adding veterinary and curatorial care, heat, light, water, and building maintenance at a very conservative $4.50 per day per animal, the world zoo bill for annual Siberian tiger care is about $2,432,000. Disregarding capital improvements, sustaining a stable population of these felids until the year 2000 will cost at least $49 million. By contrast, rare Rembrandts in a museum will require only an occasional dusting (p.32).

With respect to the selection of species to be preserved, Conway believes "that wild-animal breeders should concentrate upon unique creatures for which other kinds of conservation techniques hold no real promise" (p.29). As for ownership, he states that "breeding consortia seem to fulfill the need to build a bridge from the proven workability of private ownership to institutional possession in the public interest. Their development is a major and specific direction for the future" (p.30).

One example of a successful joint venture in captive breeding that Mr. Conway might refer to is the World Herd of Arabian oryx (Oryx leucorix). A small number of these critically endangered ungulates, believed by some to have given rise to the legend of the unicorn, were captured in 1962 for the specific purpose of attempting to breed them in captivity (Campbell, 1978). By 1978, the World Herd had bred so successfully in zoos (including the Phoenix, Arizona Zoo and the
San Diego Wild Animal Park) that it numbered nearly 100 animals and the Trustees of the Herd decided to attempt a reintroduction of a small nuclear herd into the animals' native Jordanian desert. Whether they survive may well depend upon the behavior of native tribesmen whose hunting of the oryx contributed to its endangerment in the first place.

It is one thing to reintroduce herbivorous animals such as the oryx and quite another to attempt the reintroduction of large carnivorous species. Regarding the territorial requirements of the captive Siberian tigers, William Conway has estimated that "the 750 Siberian tigers in zoos would require an area in nature about four times the size of Yellowstone National Park" (1980, p.30). Despite the high costs of captive breeding and slim possibilities of reintroducing captive bred species into the wild, Conway considers the preservation of species by zoos to be a valid proposition. It is, he says, "the preservation of options." And further, he asks the opponents of captive propagation:

Would a moa or a mastodon alive today be any less interesting than their continuously sought after and carefully preserved fossils? Are we so prescient, or merely so cynical, that we believe that there can be living creatures which offer nothing for us to wonder at, to learn from, or even to profit from because they are sustained only in captivity? (1980, pp.28-29).

Opponents of zoos, such as Alice Herrington, disparage the propagation of wild animals in captivity on the grounds that the offspring are no longer "wild." There is some cause for concern that generations of animals bred in captivity evolve differently from their wild counterparts and may lose some of the traits, such as wariness of predators, necessary for their survival in the wild. But because the practice of reintroduction is in its infancy, there appears to be no real basis
yet for such a flat statement as Ms. Herrington makes.

Hediger (1964, 1968, 1969) has written at length about differences between wild and domesticated species, and has warned that "in the zoo . . . we must take care to counteract all [the] domestication phenomena; the wild animals loaned to us from nature must be kept in the most pure and original condition" (1969, p.63). He also explains that the process of domestication "takes generations" (1968, p.108) and must include "on the part of man and animal, a readiness to domesticate and be domesticated" (p.105).

It must also be recognized that even after thousands of years of domestication, the ability to live in the wild may not necessarily be lost to all of the members of a given species. John Perry (1969, p.171) points out the numerous instances in which long-domesticated species such as cats, dogs, pigs, goats, and horses have established wild populations successfully.

William Conway (1974, p.143) adds yet another dimension to the issue:

Many biologists have expressed concern about the possibility that zoo animals will rapidly be modified by artificial selection and reduced genetic variability. While the danger is real, there are mitigating factors as well as hazards. The effective rate of turnover of generations, hence the opportunity for selective processes to exert pressure upon the genotype is likely to be far more rapid in short-lived natural populations than in long-lived zoo herds. Moreover, it should not be thought that wild populations are not being subjected to new pressures foreign to the evolutionary experience, like zoo animals. In many cases wild animals now face forces every bit as "unnatural" as those of any zoo. Thus creatures of open lands have been forced into forests and those of valleys on to the mountains.

Certain behavior in wild animals of certain species appears to be learned from their
con specifics, however, and may be lost to the species forever if it cannot be "taught" in the zoo. Sheldon Campbell (1978, pp. 142-146) describes an interesting and apparently successful—although costly—experiment at the San Diego Zoo in which a female gorilla was "taught" to care for her newborn infant by a male graduate student in animal behavior.

Encouraging captive parents to rear their own young is a major problem zoos face where several species are concerned. Doubtless there are many instances in which zoos have removed infants prematurely to be hand-reared by humans, thus thwarting the demonstration of the animals' natural parental behavior; but there are enough indications of attempts by zoos to encourage parents to rear their own young to cast serious doubt upon Peter Batten's (1976, pp.73-81) sweeping statements implying that nearly all zoos are more concerned with the public relations value of baby animals hand-reared in the zoo's nursery than they are with encouraging animals' natural parental behavior.

Research in Zoos

Opponents of zoos charge that zoos have used animals in painful experiments, implying generally that such experiments were conducted needlessly, and that surplus zoo animals often end up in laboratories in research projects. Zoo advocates, by contrast, lament that far too little research is done in zoos and aquariums. The controversy hinges, to some extent, upon the definition of the term "research." To the critics, research in zoos means pointless vivisection; to proponents it means collecting data through observation and such routine tasks as measuring height and weight and taking blood samples. It also involves the pathological
examinations of animals that die to determine the cause of death and any other
information that might be gleaned regarding wild species about which little
information is available.

Hediger (1969, p.47) states: "However galling it may be for a zoologist, it has
to be admitted that scientific research is usually placed last in zoological gardens
if indeed it has any place at all." Nearly a decade later, Campbell (1978, p.162)
indicates that Hediger's pronouncement is apparently stil true:

Contrary to the suspicions of some conservationists and anti-vivi­
sectionists, who entertain dark thoughts about what happens to the
animals in zoo research programs, those few zoos that fund research--
notably London, Antwerp, East Berlin, New York, Washington,
Philadelphia, Brookfield, Oklahoma City, Portland, and San Diego--
are seeking to improve the health, welfare, and reproduction
of captive animals.

Regarding the nature of some of those programs, he says (pp.162-163):

In the United States the three zoos with the largest research budgets,
New York, Washington, and San Diego, have approached research
along differing though complimentary lines that reflect the convic­
tions of directors and principal investigators. New York backs
an astounding number of field studies, mostly in the tropics of
Africa, Asia, and the Americas. It can be said quite truthfully
that the sun never sets on New York research. . . . From George
Schaller's work on mountain gorillas, lions, and tigers have
come both scientific and popular books that markedly expanded human
knowledge of everything from food preferences to sexual antics
of animals. . . . Studies of behavior also characterize the
research programs of the Washington [D.C.] Zoo and its 4,000 acre
breeding reserve at Front Royal, Virginia.

Yet the negative connotations of the term "research" have made a number of zoo
people wary of arousing public indignation over the issue. Campbell says (p.162):

So sensitive are some of the major United States zoos to possible
complaints about the use of animals in research that two of them, New York and San Diego, have written policy directives that forbid curators from selling any animals to centers where they might be used for biomedical research.

The sensitivity of the New York Zoo is understandable as it was charged several years ago with conducting a pointless experiment upon a number of cranes in its bird collection. United Action for Animals, having read an account in a medical journal of the zoo's destruction of a number of Demoiselle cranes, charged that the zoo had destroyed the birds just to see what could be discovered by dissecting them. The fact was the zoo had destroyed the cranes after discovering during routine blood tests they were infected with a form of avian tuberculosis. The medical journal had simply failed to make it clear that the contagious disease had been discovered before the birds were killed.

In its Guidelines for the Disposition of Surplus Animals the AAZPA makes a statement regarding sales or donations of zoo animals for research purposes (AAZPA NEWSLETTER, 11/1978:17):

Living animals may be disposed of to a research institution licensed under the USDA Laboratory Animal Welfare regulations but not for inhumane biomedical research. However, animals in the collection should neither be used nor loaned except for the direct benefit of wild and zoo animals themselves. Nevertheless, zoo biologists, animal lovers and humane officials must recognize the necessity of studying wild animal diseases, and providing for their prevention, for the welfare of animals in zoos and in nature. Zoo surplus is better used for studies of direct benefit to the species themselves than are healthy wild animals freshly captured from the wild. Examples of studies which, upon individual examination, may prove acceptable are nutritional studies, behavioral observations, genetic investigations, vaccine research, blood analysis and so forth.

From information contained in The HSUS zoo files, there are indications that a
number of zoo people would react vociferously to evidence of inhumane research in zoos. Seattle Zoo Director David Hancocks sent a copy to The HSUS of his letter of protest to the Henry Vilas Zoo in Madison, Wisconsin, regarding a research project on primates which involved the deprivation of water for weekly periods of twenty-two hours. Sue Pressman believes that, while Hancocks may be in a minority of zoo people who would express their condemnation of projects in writing, he is certainly not unique. In 1972, Dr. Phillip Ogilvie, Director of the Portland Zoo (See: Appendix C), wrote to The HSUS about the charges levelled by Eleanor Seiling of United Action for Animals (See: Zoos and Other National Animal Welfare Organizations):

I would strongly second Representative Whitehurst's request that if he [Ms. Seiling], in fact, has evidence of vivisection being practiced on zoo animals, I would be delighted to receive such evidence. I would also pledge that, in fact, any inhumane treatment going on in American zoos today and brought to my attention will be very strongly brought to the attention of the Board of Directors of the AAZPA.

After a symposium on "Research in Zoos and Aquariums" was held at the 1973 AAZPA Annual Conference, the controversy became more intense. UAA and FOA charged that the symposium, cosponsored by The Institute for Laboratory Animal Resources (which also published the proceedings), constituted evidence that zoos were conducting inhumane research on their animals and scientists were eager to experiment on them to an even greater extent.

Attorney Bernard Fensterwald stated to a Senate subcommittee on behalf of the Committee for Humane Legislation (U.S. Congress, 1974, p.38):

We know that there is tremendous pressure to convert the existing
zoo, which is recognizably an obsolete institution, into a research and breeding center... not satisfied with inflicting disease and suffering on millions of domestic animals in pharmaceutical and medical laboratories, the pressure is on to obtain exotic species for various basic research experiments. By basic research, we mean simply the satisfying of curiosity similar to that of the small boy who takes the watch apart. The research has no goal in mind.

As evidence of this pressure, Fensterwald cited the AAZPA symposium on research and the fact it was supported partly by the Institute for Laboratory Animal Resources of the National Research Council.

In his response to HSUS's letter of inquiry regarding the symposium, Brookfield Zoo's Associate Director, Dr. George Rabb, stated that the term "research" indicated simply "a disciplined approach to acquisition of knowledge," and confirmed that this approach seemed currently to involve only "the major zoos."

He described the symposia:

The symposia on behavioral studies and reproductive biology were devoted to methods of gaining and applying knowledge that would lead to better living conditions for zoo animals and to better prospects for long-term breeding programs. Techniques discussed included involvement of students and keepers in collecting observational data on behavior, modification of exhibits to meet behavioral needs of the animals, analysis of stud book records in relation to genetic deficiencies, and prospects for sperm banks. The last symposium was mainly a reminder of the necessary judgment on the quality of a zoo's performance in maintaining animals that is available through pathological and other medical studies. Since few zoos can afford a full-time pathologist, cooperative programs on local and national levels were emphasized.

Rabb concluded that "unless zoos become more deeply involved in scientific studies and programs that lead to better management of their collections, zoos will function inadequately as survival centers for many species that are endangered or already virtually extinct in the wild."
Rabb further suggested that the lack of published policies regarding the use of zoo animals for research purposes was indicative of the lack of research programs in zoos. He also indicated his belief that "zoos are not in the business of supplying or maintaining stocks of animals for use by others and no change in this outlook is in prospect or being contemplated." He deemed the sale, trade or donation of zoo animals to laboratories as "infrequent" and usually done in "special circumstances (for instance, shipment of a blind or aged animal to a center studying aging in similar animals)."

No explanations, however, are likely to quiet the suspicions of the opponents of research in zoos, as they tend also to be opponents of the concept of zoos. So being, they are probably not going to consider as acceptable any study of animals which might result in their being made more comfortable in captivity. Eleanor Seiling has even voiced her opposition to such a fundamental practice as taking blood samples from captive animals. But those who have charged zoos with conducting inhumane research have had an effect upon the zoo profession. Recently, the AAZPA dropped the word "research" from its logo and urged its members to do the same (Campbell, 1978, p.162).

In 1978, some years after the controversy surrounding the AAZPA's symposium on research and the Senate hearings on the zoo accreditation bill, the Sedgewick County Zoo in Wichita, Kansas, attempted to compile a comprehensive list of the research projects currently underway in zoos and aquariums. In response to its request for information, the Sedgewick Zoo received only seven responses, with the majority indicating that their programs involved "behavioral observations" of a particular species (AAZPA NEWSLETTER, 10/1978:11). The Sedgewick Zoo suggested that
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the very limited response surely could not be indicative of the extent of research programs in zoos, but gave no explanation of why the response was so slight. One may surmise either there are very few research programs underway in zoos or the zoos are reluctant to discuss them for fear of being attacked as vivisectors.

The Disposition of Surplus Animals

Ironically, in their attempts to breed wild animals in captivity, zoos have found themselves faced with the problem of disposing of either the parents or their offspring. By 1978, the problem was considered so serious that the AAZPA set up a special Surplus Committee to report to the Board of Directors on the various ramifications of the issue. The Committee drew up "Guidelines For The Disposition of Surplus Animals" (AAZPA NEWSLETTER, 11/1978:14-18) which cover all aspects of the problem likely to be of concern to animal welfare advocates.

The preamble to the Guidelines states that "the surplus problem has arisen because zoos are getting better," and deems it to be "unavoidable in sound propagation programs." The preamble further explains how the surplus phenomenon is linked to the zoos' obligation to maintain the genetic viability of captive species:

All healthy wild animal populations produce more young than are needed or could be accommodated within normal adult breeding populations. All predators depend upon 'surpluses'. . . . zoo animals tend to live far longer than their wild brethren. The infirmities of age play a larger part in zoo collection mortality than in wild populations and now present zoos with the problem of the superannuated animal. The maintenance of large numbers of superannuated animals increases crowding, depresses breeding, improves the chances for disease and generally lowers the viability of zoo populations. Mortality of wild animals and zoo animals is higher in the young, but zoo young, like zoo aged, are sheltered from nature's rigorous pressures. And so, zoos are faced with the
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problem of what to do with less fit specimens, including those showing mutations and other abnormalities.

The preamble goes on to explain the special problem caused by polygynous species of animals, such as antelope, in which males and females are born in equal numbers (a 50/50 male/female sex ratio), but live in herds with a ratio of one male to several females. The excess males cannot be kept harmoniously with the rest of the herd, and in nature either establish their own herds or fall prey to carnivorous animals.

A logical alternative which might be suggested is to regulate the births of zoo animals. Peter Batten described his use of birth control pills on lions at the San José Zoo. He declares that no other zoo director indicated any interest in his "unique" project, implying that they were unconcerned about the problem of surplus animals. Typically, Batten neglects to mention the efforts to regulate zoo animal births made in other institutions such as the National Zoo, San Diego Zoo, Milwaukee Zoo, and Chicago's Brookfield Zoo (Rothmyer, 1974; King, 1976; and Miller, 1977). Besides attempts to regulate births by chemical means, zoos have separated males and females, and have even resorted to surgical procedures such as vasectomies. Batten also neglects to mention that the various methods have not been without side effects. The AAZPA Guidelines allude to these side effects, stating that "it may be that parental behavior and even fertility are adversely affected by reproductive restraints in some species," though "irreversible sterility seems justifiable for abundant species."

As first priorities, the Guidelines list the sale or trade of surplus animals to other zoos or the restocking of the wild. It is where these objectives cannot be
met that "the surplus problem becomes more confused." The Guidelines declare that the disposition of zoo animals must be "in the best interest of the specimens themselves, the species, the zoo or aquarium and the public it serves." Although the preamble mentions the obligation of zoos to "give higher priority to the welfare of species than to individuals of that species." This obligation takes on a particular meaning with respect to the disposition of zoo animals to game or "shooting" ranches; a practice which is widely condemned by humane organizations.

The Guidelines state: "The Association strongly opposes disposal of exotic wildlife to organizations or individuals solely for the purposes of shooting." However, a passage preceding the preamble contains a statement which indicates that this opposition may, in the future, be less absolute:

The AAZPA Board has noted that the appellation 'shooting ranch' is ill-defined. Some organizations and individuals which permit shooting of exotic animals on their properties have some of the most important remaining populations of these species. They propagate them successfully and with dedication. Moreover, there are differences between organizations which use zoo-bred animals as breeding stock for their ranch operations and those which shoot zoo-bred animals. And there are important differences between the two groups of animals. Ranch-bred exotics may be as wary as native game.

These preliminary findings led the AAZPA Board to charge the Surplus Committee to conduct a special study of exotic game ranches (EGR's) in 1979. Because of its experience with such ranches, particularly through the Gulf States Regional Office, The HSUS was able to assist the AAZPA with the study.

In the "Recommendations for the Disposal of Surplus Ungulates with Regard to Exotic Game Ranches" the Surplus Committee held to its earlier recommendation that "no
animals be disposed of to individuals, ranches or other organizations to be hunted."

But the Committee was intrigued by the size of the exotic game ranches and their success in maintaining genetically viable herds of exotic ungulates. One EGR in Texas was declared to be larger in land area than all of the world's zoos combined. The Committee further recommended that "AAZPA institutions explore the possibility of developing cooperative long-term breeding programs with exotic game ranches for species declining in nature." The AAZPA's Conservation and Management Committee was asked to study the feasibility of such programs and to propose "an action program on behalf of appropriate species."

Cooperation with exotic game ranches to save endangered species presents the zoos with a dilemma. AAZPA members are not likely to be unanimous in their support of such programs: some, because of their personal opposition to them on ethical grounds, and others, because of their fear that the zoo-going public and the humane organizations will noisily protest any form of cooperation between zoos and sports hunting interests. The findings of sociologist Stephen Kellert that a large percentage of zoo visitors appear to oppose sports hunting will doubtless be taken into consideration in any program proposed by the AAZPA (See: Zoos: Pro and Con/Zoo Visitors).

Cooperative programs between zoos and game ranches may also create a dilemma for animal welfare organizations if it is determined such programs constitute the only effective means of insuring the survival of certain species of endangered animals. 

Mortality Rates

Opponents of zoos tend to refer to the numbers of animals which die annually in
zoos and aquariums as though percentages had meaning in and of themselves. Peter Batten (1976, pp.129-130) makes a typically sweeping statement that:

No attempt is made to enumerate the routine loss of animals in zoos, by what, if zoo directors were licensed professionals, could only be described as malpractice. The number of wild animals killed during capture, or that die in zoos through human error and incompetence only to be replaced by animal dealers whose agents contribute to further losses, runs into many thousands yearly.

Without supporting documentation, Batten's statement must be classified as pure conjecture. The HSUS files indicate that a number of zoos do report their annual mortality rate and indicate the causes of death if they are known. But even these listings do not indicate whether the deaths are attributable to poor husbandry or to factors beyond the understanding or control of the staff. No one can presume to say all that can be known about wild animals is known. They keep their "secrets" well, and often carry them to their graves.

When Batten states that "zoo directors currently do not account to any government agency for animal deaths," he undoubtedly is thinking of the federal government. There is no reason to believe that city, county, and state governments, having funded the purchase of animals in a zoo, do not then expect some accounting for requests for funds to replace animals that die and some explanation of why they died. If may be that a good many animals die in zoos because of poor husbandry, but to make such a determination, one must consider each case individually--which neither Batten nor other opponents of zoos such as UAA, FOA, and SAR appear to have done. These critics seem to ignore the fact that animals in the wild have mortality rates too, and these vary within the classes of animals (i.e., longevity
and infant mortality vary for mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, and fish) and from species to species. In comparing wild and captive animal mortality, William Conway (1974, p.142) states:

Populations of captive animals differ from those in nature both theoretically and actually. On the average, established adult zoo animals live far longer than their wild brethren. For example, animal adult mortality in various gallinaceous birds and ducks ranges from 40% to 60%; in various shorebirds and gulls, 30% to 40%; and about 10% in one studied species of penguin. . . . These rates are unaffected by age, in nature, up to a time when extremely few are left alive. By contrast, at the New York Zoological Park, annual adult mortality in gallinaceous birds and ducks is less than 7%[;] in various shore birds and gulls, about 7.6%[;] and about 5% in penguins.

These figures, of course, do not give any indication of the mortality rates for these birds in institutions where animal husbandry and handling may be inferior to that of the New York Zoological Park.

One thing Batten does appear to be right about is that zoos have different systems for counting their animals; some, for example, do not count newborns until they have lived for a specified period of time. Thus their deaths may not be included in the tabulating of mortalities.

In discussing mortality, it is also necessary to consider that inbreeding may result in a high percentage of deaths of newborn or young animals. Only in recent years have zoos attempted to determine the extent to which animals in their collections may be suffering from the effects of inbreeding. Now aware of the problem, some zoos are taking steps to limit the effects of inbreeding upon captive populations through better record keeping and improved communications between institutions cooperating in breeding programs (Ralls, Brugger, & Ballou, 1979; Webster, 1979;
and Conway, 1979). It is also important to bear in mind that zoos may be obliged to continue taking animals from the wild to maintain genetically viable captive populations. Infusions of "new blood" may be the only way to insure the perpetuation of some species.

In attributing mortalities in zoos to neglect or indifference zoo critics appear to ignore that wild animals often "tend to conceal the subtle, early signs of illness." In his explanation of this phenomenon, Dr. Hal Markowitz (1979) says:

Some reasons for this deliberate concealment of signs appear to lie in the toughness and stoicism of wild animals and natural inclinations to avoid appearing abnormal, thus attracting predators. For example, a wolf pack will not attack a normal moose but may make a concerted effort to attack and run down a moose with a slight limp. In the wild, where survival of the fittest is a general rule, the longer an animal can conceal signs of illness or injury, the longer it may stay alive.

Dr. Markowitz also points out that reactions vary according to the individual animal, and individuals which react fearfully or aggressively toward veterinary examinations, for example, may conceal the clinical signs of their illnesses with such behavior.

The HSUS appears to have responded far more responsibly than most other humane organizations in considering the question of mortality in zoos. Sue Pressman has generally regarded a high rate of mortality in a zoo as symptomatic of a larger problem, and has resisted dwelling upon the issue of percentages of deaths. She has recognized that one single death may be due to poor husbandry practices where fifteen others may not. Such judgments can generally only be made as part of an overall evaluation of an institution.
The Zoos' Consumption of Wildlife

One of the most controversial aspects of zoos concerns their removal of animals from the wild to replace animals that die or to increase the size of their collections. Horror stories abound regarding the suffering of animals during capture and transport, with the most widely condemned practice involving the killing of adult animals to facilitate the capture of infants (Schaller, 1963; Harrison, 1972, p.507; Campbell, 1978, p.38). Zoos have been charged--along with the pet and products industries and research interests--with seriously contributing to the decimation of wild populations. William Conway declares adamantly, however, that "zoos have never been a significant factor in the endangerment of any species at any time" (U.S. Congress, 1974, p.44). Zoo professionals resent being classified with these other consumers of wildlife and maintain that the number of animals they take from the wild are minuscule compared with the vast numbers taken for pets, products, and research purposes.

Zoo critics tend to make sweeping charges regarding consumption of wildlife by zoos, but offer little in the way of supportive documentation to back them up. Typical of these is the statement by Bernard Fensterwald in his testimony on behalf of the Committee for Humane Legislation (U.S. Congress, 1974, p.36):

Attempts are made to hide the extent of the destruction of wildlife caused by the supplying of animals to American zoos. For example, to obtain a baby walrus, whale, or monkey, whole families of these species must usually be killed, since they are very protective of their young. Additionally, a very small percentage of these creatures survive the rigors and horrors of the transportation to America. Thus, the whole concept of the zoo is based upon ecological disruption in the countries from which animals are obtained, and is marked by suffering and waste of life in transport.
Peter Batten goes even further, offering an estimated percentage of losses in his introduction to Living Trophies (1976, pp.1-2): "While it is impossible to obtain reliable statistics on mortality from time of capture, it is doubtful whether 50 percent of all animals trapped or captured in the wild live to see the zoo visitor." Batten does not explain how, in the absence of "reliable" statistics, he came to the conclusion that 50 percent do not survive. The absence of documentation, however, has not deterred zoo critics such as the Society for Animal Rights from using his "guesstimate" to support its contention that zoos should be phased out.

According to Earl Baysinger, Special Assistant to the Deputy Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (See: Appendix C), it is simply not possible to determine how many animals are lost in the process of collecting for zoos. Nor do the data exist to determine to what extent zoos are a drain on wild populations, though Baysinger contends that the animal captured for the zoo, if it does not reproduce, is just as dead as the animal taken by the trophy hunter as far as the wild population is concerned.

The Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) should generate statistical data, but that data will not include information about species not listed as endangered or threatened. Baysinger contends that the existing appendices are more reflective of the level of interest in the species than of strict biological reality; hence, some species which may actually be in trouble in the wild will not be monitored or listed. He further contends that although precise data do not exist, informed opinions do, and he feels that zoos are a significant drain on certain wild populations that cannot stand the strain. He
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charges that zoos focus on rarities and they have not done enough to establish self-sustaining captive populations.

The absence of data is further underscored by the creation of an independent (not industry related) monitoring group to provide documentation where none presently exists. This group, called TRAFFIC (Trade Records Analysis of Flora and Fauna in Commerce), was established in Great Britain in 1975 by the Survival Service Commission of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) to monitor the international trade in wild animals and plants. In 1979, a TRAFFIC office was opened in Washington, D.C., to collect information on the trade in animals and plants into and out of the United States. Called TRAFFIC (U.S.A.), it is housed in the office of the World Wildlife Fund.

TRAFFIC (U.S.A.) is charged specifically with:

Gathering trade information from [U.S.] ports of entry as well as from the five federal agencies responsible for the enforcement of wildlife regulations (Fish and Wildlife Service; Customs; Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; Health, Education and Welfare; and Commerce). . . . [and] then [analyzing] the data, [preparing] reports to supply information on heavily exploited species, and [disseminating] these reports to the said government agencies and national and international nongovernmental conservation organizations (TRAFFIC Newsletter, Fall 1979).

Until this information can be gathered, one can only rely upon the few available estimates and extrapolations which compare the consumption of wildlife by zoos with that of research interests and the pet and products trade. In the book Wildlife and America, published in 1978 by the Council on Environmental Quality, there is a chapter on "The Wildlife Trade" by Dr. F. Wayne King, former Director of Conservation for the New York Zoological Society (See: Appendix C). In this chapter King
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describes the laws governing the taking of wild animals; compares the estimated and known numbers of animals taken annually for zoos, research, the pet industry and the animal products trade; and makes recommendations for further government action to protect wildlife in commerce. With respect to the trade in live animals, King states:

The vast majority of live animals traded internationally are destined to be sold as pets to private citizens. Import records of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for 1970 and 1971 indicate that about 95 percent of the birds brought in are for sale in the pet trade, including pheasant and waterfowl breeders; maybe 4 percent go to biomedical research; and less than 1 percent are destined for zoos and aquariums. The remaining fraction is imported by wildlife officials or other special interests. Approximately 44 percent of all wild mammals are imported for the pet trade, 54 percent for biomedical research, and less than 2 percent for zoos and aquariums, with the remainder for governmental wildlife or agricultural interests (pp.263-264).

From extrapolations based on U.S. Fish and Wildlife records (in preparation), the 1975 records of the National Academy of Sciences, and the 1976 records of the AAZPA's International Species Inventory System, King concludes that the pattern has remained essentially the same, with some decrease in bird imports due to the 1972 ban to prevent the spread of Newcastle's disease, and a "large relative decline" in mammals due to the 1975 ban on imports of primates for the pet trade (p.264). King also mentions the consumption of wild animals for the systematics collections in museums. He states that museums in North America add 86,000 mammals, 100,000 birds, 75,000 reptiles and amphibians, and 500,000 fish annually to their collections (p.267).

To further distinguish between the consumption of wildlife by zoos and research facilities, King offers the following statistics concerning their respective efforts
The U.S. biomedical trade consumed an estimated 130,000 wild-caught imported primates during 1972-73, while research facilities produced 4,682 primates by captive breeding (National Academy of Sciences, 1975). In 1975, the 108 zoos and aquariums participating in the International Species Inventory System (1976) purchased 899 mammals, including 256 primates of all species, the majority imported or wild-caught, and at the same time bred 2,856 mammals, including 445 primates, in captivity. Neither biomedical research facilities nor zoos and aquariums breed all the species they get from the wild, but in overall numbers, zoos and aquariums are net producers of wild mammals while biomedical researchers are net consumers. Data are not yet complete for birds, but records from a few zoos and aquariums suggest that these institutions are net producers of wild birds as well (p.264).

But as King himself states elsewhere (1978a) in citing these same figures, "the numbers of animals in zoos do not speak to the quality of husbandry those creatures receive. Clearly all zoos do not provide the facilities and care that various species need to live normal, healthy lives."

Earl Baysinger, whose special interest is ornithology, contends that zoos are using large numbers of certain species of small birds and that even the best institutions have higher mortality rates than they should. It will be of interest to see if the statistics, when they are available for birds, provide any evidence to support his contention. Nicole Duplaix, Director of TRAFFIC (U.S.A.) and former Editor of the International Zoo Yearbook (See: Appendix C), contends that the best zoos--and, she cautions, the best are not always the largest--consume the least wildlife and always have.

Although Dr. King's figures are helpful, they do not indicate the number of animals lost during capture and transport, nor do they indicate whether the wild populations
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of the species taken can withstand even the limited pressure put upon them by collectors for zoos and aquariums. Neither do these figures answer the larger philosophical question of whether it is justifiable to capture the few remaining members of any species whose habitat faces imminent destruction for transport to a captive environment in the hope that the species can be kept alive even if it can never be returned to the wild. The figures are also useless in determining whether the sympathy allegedly elicited from the public through exposure to captive wild animals is sufficient to prevent the further extinction of species and destruction of habitat.

Does the fact that certain species owe, in part, their existence on earth today to zoos (e.g., the American bison, Père David deer, Przewalski horse, etc.) constitute justification for removing more animals from critically endangered wild populations? Zoo advocates contend that it does, and the Endangered Species Act and International Convention (CITES) recognize captive breeding as a means of enhancing the potential of endangered and threatened species to survive. If one accepts this contention, the next step is, logically, to insure that those institutions entrusted with the breeding of endangered animals have the knowledgeable professional staff, funds, and physical facilities necessary to accomplish their goal.

Clearly, any meaningful discussion of the consumption of wildlife by zoos must begin with a distinction between animals taken by zoos and those taken by other consumers of wildlife such as the pet and products industries and research interests. It is also clear one cannot extrapolate figures for mortality for all species
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from known figures for one species. It makes no sense to speak of capture
techniques for hooved animals, birds, reptiles, and primates, for example, as if
speaking of one single technique.

Misunderstandings surrounding the zoos' consumption of wildlife also apparently
exist within the federal government. In 1976 the Department of the Interior's
Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) proposed the addition of 27 species of primates
to the appendices of endangered and threatened animals. While listing habitat
destruction and hunting as the major causes of the decline in population for
these species of primates, the USFWS cited zoos as contributing to the decline
of some primate populations. While supporting the "general intent" of the
proposed rulemaking, the AAZPA offered some specific objections to the charges.
Regarding the Diana guenon (Cercopithecus diana) that USFWS had alleged to be
"more likely to be sought for zoological display" because of its "striking colora-
tion," AAZPA replied that the comment "is presumptuous, false, subjective, and
unsupported by any evidence." AAZPA cited the USFWS's own statistics included in
the proposed rulemaking which indicated that "between 1968 and 1970, only 46
animals were imported into the United States," or an average of 15 per year. AAZPA
further stated, "if all of these went to zoos, a distribution factor of one Diana
guenon among 10 zoos per year would be involved. More over [sic], during that
same period of time, our records state that 28 Diana guenon were born in United
States zoos and an additional 25 were born in other zoos throughout the world."

With respect to the charge by the USFWS that the red-eared guenon (Cercopithecus
erythrotis) "is occasionally caught for export to United States zoos," AAZPA
countered that the records of the International Zoo Yearbook and the International
Species Inventory System "indicate that no members of this species are maintained in any United States zoo." In response to the charge that "mandrills (Mandrillus Sphinx) are in demand for zoo exhibits because of their spectacular appearance," AAZPA stated that it was "subjective" and "not supported by evidence," and pointed out there were only 116 Mandrill in 107 U.S. zoos, and "there were 75 Mandrill born in our zoos during 1968 to 1972." They also charged that USFWS fails to indicate whether the 61 Mandrill imported during that same period had been destined exclusively for zoos. Of the total of 27 species of primates proposed for listing, AAZPA claimed that 13 were "not held in any United States zoo."

AAZPA concluded its evaluation of USFWS's proposal with an urgent request that the Department of the Interior "become aware of the potentials for captive propagation in our zoological institutions and to promulgate regulations that will facilitate captive breeding, rather than hinder it" (AAZPA NEWSLETTER, 7/1976, pp.3-5).

The extent to which zoos and aquariums are involved in the illegal trade in wildlife is no more clear than the extent to which they are responsible for the depletion of wild populations. The same tip-of-the-iceberg conjecture is generally employed by critics of zoos in both cases. It is clear, however, that the entire zoo profession sustained a "black eye" when U.S. Government officials linked several major zoos, including National, Philadelphia, and St. Louis, to an illegal reptile deal in 1977 (Campbell, 1978, pp.32-37; Holden, 1979). The government prosecutor apparently concluded that most of the zoo people in question "had been innocent of any intentional wrongdoing," rather, "they had simply not been careful enough in requiring proof that the reptiles had been legally brought into the United States" (Campbell, 1978, p.35). Zoo directors, upon whom the responsibility
ultimately fell to answer for their institutions, were at a disadvantage in claiming they were obliged to rely upon the word of the "fairly reputable" animal dealer that the animals were not obtained in violation of any U.S. or foreign laws. The reptile dealer in question, Henry Molt, Jr., of the Philadelphia Reptile Exchange was not a member of the AAZPA, and his reputation had evidently been less than reputable before the government indicted him in this case. The guilt of a few zoo curators caused doubts about all others. A writer for Science magazine (Holden, 1979) probably expressed a widely held opinion when she said of the Molt case:

If a scandal of these proportions can be uncovered in Philadelphia, which is not even one of the eight ports designated for import of wildlife and their products, it may well be asked what kinds of shenanigans wait to be exposed at the big ports such as New York, Miam, Los Angeles, and San Francisco.

The writer also credits the scandal involving Molt and the zoos with spurring a new federal initiative to crack down on the illegal trade in wildlife in the U.S., estimated to be between 50 and 100 million dollars annually. The first initiative of the crackdown included the creation of a Wildlife Law Section under the Department of Justice.

Earl Baysinger contends that all animal dealers and most purchasers of animals have been involved in transactions of questionable legality at one time or another, but not necessarily with any foreknowledge of wrongdoing. The Lacey Act prohibits the traffic in animals taken in violation of federal, state, or foreign laws or regulations. This constitutes a considerable body of law and the AAZPA and the Department of the Interior disagree over who should be responsible for compiling
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it. In his presentation on the "Responsibilities and Liabilities of Zoo Administrators Under Wildlife and Customs Laws," made at the AAZPA's Annual Conference in 1979, Ken Berlin, Wildlife Law Coordinator for the Department of Justice, stated that "the Association (AAZPA) should gain expertise on foreign laws" (1979, p.36), a matter which sounds simpler than it is since it involves approximately 150 countries. AAZPA feels that the federal government should take the responsibility for compiling and publishing the laws and regulations of foreign nations. AAZPA members feel they have done their part, having spent more than $40,000 to publish the AAZPA Manual of Federal Wildlife Regulations (Wagner, Personal Communication).

Even when animals are legally taken, zoos can find themselves the object of public scorn. This was the case in 1976 when an expedition from Sea World attempted to capture several killer whales in Puget Sound. Although the members of the expedition had the permits required by the state of Washington and the Marine Mammal Commission, they were accused of using inhumane capture techniques, and extensive coverage of the event by the news media led to a nationwide protest. Humane organizations, including The HSUS, opposed the capture, and Washington's Senator Magnuson introduced a bill to prohibit any future capture of killer whales for exhibition purposes.

Zoo and aquarium advocates, for their part, were indignant, claiming the round-up was not inhumane, and it was the exhibition of captive whales which had inspired the desire for their preservation in the first place. They were angered by the proposed prohibition against capturing killer whales because, in addition to affecting their exhibits, it established "a political rather than a scientific
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basis for protecting wildlife," causing "popular animals [to] get attention while [neglecting] lesser-known or unpopular animals" (Campbell, 1978, p.190).

When charged with the careless depletion of wild animal populations, zoo people cite in their own defense the AAZPA's close ties over the years with the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), the Association's support of legislation to protect endangered species, and its self-imposed boycott of certain endangered animals prior to the enactment of protective federal legislation. At hearings on the endangered species bill held before the House Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation in 1969, John Perry, at that time Assistant Director of the National Zoo, gave the following account of the AAZPA's efforts to curtail the trade in orang-utans (*Pongo pygmaeus*):

In one conspicuous case our own American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums did not wait for other nations to act, or indeed for the Congress of the United States. This was the case of the orangutan, one of the very few species threatened directly by collecting for zoos. We were the principal customers. At that time, prior to 1962, almost every orangutan moving in the world trade had been taken illegally. We recognized this, and we as an association imposed self-discipline upon ourselves, by resolution of our membership, that we would not henceforth buy or accept as a gift or otherwise traffic in any orangutan which did not have legal evidence that it originated properly in the country of origin. . . . Of course, some of our members were unhappy. If we do not take these orangutans the zoos of other countries may. In some cases this has happened. But our action was very quickly followed by parallel action of the Zoological Association of Japan. The British followed suit. . . . The International Union of Directors of Zoological Gardens adopted and enforces a parallel resolution. In Germany and other countries other zoos have followed suit. The fact is that the primary market is gone. . . . So today we know of a number of orangutans which were smuggled out which could not find buyers. We did not wait. We did what we knew was right. We believe the Congress of the United States will wish to do the same thing (U.S. Congress, 1969, p.172).
Opponents of zoos generally portray zoo staff members--and directors of zoos in particular--as crass exploiters of animals who give little thought to questions of animal welfare. Doubtless there are those who do fit that description, but The HSUS files indicate that within the zoo profession there are also those who are as interested in a variety of animal welfare issues as any "card-carrying" humane society member. Within the zoo world there are both proponents and opponents of hunting, trapping, and other similar uses of animals.

Some zoo people have expressed concern that zoos might be harmed by legislation to outlaw leghold traps, while others, such as Philip Ogilvie and Stefan Graham have actually testified in favor of bills to ban traps. In a letter to the Washingtonian in 1979, Dr. Ted Reed, Director of the National Zoo, protested the magazine's use of the zoo as a background for photographs in an article promoting fur coats. He stated:

I hope you are aware of the considerable public concern about the suffering wild trapped animals endure as a result of the fur trade. . . . In today's world there is no justification for this suffering. . . . Your statement about the absence of alternative incomes for trappers is untrue except for the possible exception of those living on extremely isolated islands. The notion that furbearing animals are endangering man is nonsense. . . . The National Zoo is committed to furthering the appreciation and understanding of wild animals. Your inappropriate use of the park defies our purpose (HSUS: National Zoo File).

The HSUS files also indicate that people associated with zoos--educators, keepers, docents, directors, curators, veterinarians--have expressed concern about such issues as wild animals kept inappropriately as pets, predator control programs,
and rattlesnake round-ups. In 1972 the New York Zoological Society joined in
a coalition with The HSUS, Defenders of Wildlife, and other groups to halt the
interstate shipment of pesticides for predator control programs. In other
instances: the Director of the Oklahoma Zoo (one of two zoos listed in the files
as having operated an animal shelter on its premises) asked for Bernie Weller's
assistance in 1974 in investigating cockfighting; the Director of the North
Carolina Zoo asked for help from The HSUS in establishing a local humane society
in his largely rural county; several zoos appear to distribute literature on pet
care; and the Zoo Society in Pittsburgh, before it left the zoo, maintained a
"Pet Information Center" in its children's zoo, with information on the importance
and spaying and neutering dogs and cats.

A number of zoo people have requested information and materials from The HSUS to
incorporate into their education programs. John Dommers, Director of the National
Association for the Advancement of Humane Education, says that approximately 10
percent of NAAHE workshop participants "have connections with zoos," and 50 to 60
NAAHE members are affiliated with zoos.

Education In The Zoo

The HSUS Zoo Reports issued in 1972 and 1975 condemned zoos which were not ful-
filling their educational obligations to society. These reports dealt primarily
with exhibits which prohibited animals from demonstrating their normal behavior
patterns. Other aspects of the educational potential of zoos were not discussed,
but the 1972 Report implied there was more to a zoo's education program than the
simulation of natural habitat. The HSUS has never attempted to define zoo education
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but merely to draw attention to it as one of the few aspects of zoos which justifies the keeping of wild animals in captivity, and to point out the specific absence of educational programs in certain zoos.

If education is to be cited as a justification for the continuance of zoos, a better understanding is needed of the forms it can take and the degree to which American zoos are fulfilling their potential as educational institutions. In 1977, Karen Hensel, Curator of Education for the New York Aquarium and, at that time, Chairman of the AAZPA's Public Education Committee, conducted a survey of the member institutions of the AAZPA to determine the growth rate of education programs in zoos, as well as their scope and presumed effectiveness.

In a report on the results of the survey, Hensel defines the concept and describes the practice of zoo education:

All forms of interpretation exhibits and other services provided by the zoo or aquarium are part of the educational service provided by our facilities. We provide a unique learning/teaching opportunity for the student and casual visitor alike. Our mission is to foster a concern for and understanding of animal biology and behavior and wildlife conservation via a variety of mediums in hope that it will enable a concerned citizenry to make informed decisions about a variety of animal related concerns in the future.

She also discusses the variables which must be taken into account in comparing education programs:

Determinants of educational programming in individual zoos and aquariums vary based on size of budgets, staff, additional duties of educators, institutional philosophy, educational philosophy of school systems in local area, size of audience served, type of audience served, and focus of the institution.
Out of 225 member institutions of the AAZPA to receive Hensel's survey, 125 responded. Those responses revealed some interesting information about the evolution of zoo education:

Only 4% of zoos and aquariums responding had education departments prior to 1950, while in 1977, 77% reported having such departments. The greatest rate of growth of education departments has occurred within the past seven years, with 30% of education departments having been created since 1973... In 1973, 55% reported [having] paid staff; in 1977, 91% reported paid staff. Yet only 1.5% of respondents reported paid staff of 11 or more in 1973, while in 1977, 28% did.

The course of this programming, Hensel reports, "has followed a predictable course with docent programs, guided tours, and lecture programs being the mainstay of education departments." Regarding the philosophy of the institutions responding, she reports that 46% felt education was the most important function of the zoo or aquarium, while 29% felt recreation was the primary function, and 9% listed conservation as primary.

In spite of the reference to the "predictable course" of educational programming, additional statistics gleaned from the survey revealed that:

94% of all institutions responding provide tours as part of their educational programs. 90%... provide lectures. 81% provide programs in schools. 70% provide exhibition/graphics. 70% provide audio/visual presentations. 62% provide pamphlets. 50% provide a children's zoo. 50%... provide teachers' workshops. 47% provide other activities such as: accredited college courses, wildlife safaris, orientation centers and galleries, joint programs with other institutions, camps, in-depth lecture series, family workshops, mandatory teachers' workshops.

Other parts of the survey concern the use of volunteers, budgets and sources of
funding, priorities of institutions as funds become available, the exchange of information between institutions, and the evolving methods of evaluating the effectiveness of present and future education programs.

The survey results, while providing a valuable overview of the recent history and scope of zoo education, do not enable one to conclude flatly that zoo education programs are as effective as filmed documentaries in fostering interest in, and concern for, wildlife. To make a fair determination of its effectiveness, one must examine each education program in the context of the needs and response of the surrounding community.

In the same AAZPA Conference Proceedings (1978) in which the results of Hensel's survey are reported, several other papers by zoo educators are included, all bearing the title of "New Directions in Education." These papers describe different aspects of zoo education programs in detail and the responses of various segments of the public to them. Barbara Burgen, Curator of Education from the Sedgwick County Zoo in Wichita, Kansas, describes a joint curriculum development project of the zoo's education department and the science curriculum division of the local school district. She states that the "zoo was in the position of being the only science resource in a school district of 50,000 students."

Participating teachers were offered graduate college credit by Wichita State University to encourage them to disseminate the materials developed. These materials included information on endangered species, food chain relationships, protective coloration, and prairie grasses and trees found on the zoo site. Of particular
interest is the reference to the encouragement of activism in students by involving them in "letter writing campaigns, planting trees," and so forth. The final phase of the project was financed by HEW, and the response would seem to indicate the entire project was very successful. Burgen concludes:

Teachers were committed during the project to the use of the materials in their classrooms as one of the mandatory portions of a signed contract to become an environmentally aware facilitator. With the average class size of 25 represented by the teachers, our project teachers represented over 2,000 participants who used the five modular units last year. We did not have 2,000 participants. After we had 17 [school] buildings involved, we had 5,000 participants. . . . Many other school districts. . . . want to be involved. We have a possibility now of offering the using of the zoo as a resource workshop to teachers from other districts because it will be taught at Wichita State University as a three-hour, graduate-level course.

Another reference to zoo education programs in the Conference Proceedings indicates that an in-service training program for elementary and secondary school teachers at the Denver, Colorado Zoo is funded, in part, by the National Science Foundation, which has apparently indicated a willingness to fund similar programs at other zoos. It is reported among participants:

The most popular programs are those consisting of zoo tours. People like to mingle and talk with the keepers who take care of the animal collection. . . . I think a real transformation in their attitude and their opinion of animal keepers takes place. . . . Teachers discover that our keepers are highly educated, highly skilled, highly knowledgeable, very enthusiastic. . . .

This statement bears out others made by zoo people who claim that better educated and more environmentally aware zoo staff members are contributing to the better image zoos have been enjoying in recent years.

Another innovative education program described in the Proceedings by the Curator
of Education at the Cincinnati Zoo also involves keepers. Under this program, keepers are paid $25 for each lecture they give in the community. In 1978, at the time of the publication of the report, over 200 such lectures were being given annually. In addition, professors of Biology, Anthropology, and Psychology were including brief presentations by the zoo's keepers in their courses, and some keepers were being paid as much as $50 for their presentations to university sponsored evening programs designed for the community at large.

The success of these programs prompted the zoo's education department to pursue other ways in which keepers could be encouraged to present their special knowledge to visitors on the zoo grounds:

One of our keepers was interested in birds of prey, so he developed a small bird-of-prey show. Someone else was interested in the interpretive technique, so we began a program 'Do You See What I See.' The keepers were very willing to do it on break time, lunch-time and off days just as a supplement to their regular routine. After a while when we had 500-1,000 people sitting in and listening to their show, this made them feel extra special and contributing to the zoo in more ways than just the normal work expectations.

Keepers in the Cincinnati Zoo, according to the report, also participate in the teaching of the 50 students who attend the zoo's "full-time high school" for their junior and senior year.

Such programs appear to demonstrate that zoos and aquariums can indeed function as educational institutions in the community, receiving the cooperation and blessing of the community's other educational institutions at all grade levels. They would also appear to confirm the contention of zoo people that filmed documentaries do not adequately substitute for the presence of living animals for some segment--
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perhaps sizeable--of the general public.

The fact that more zoos do not report having successful educational programs indicates that, to paraphrase the 1972 HSUS Special Report on Zoos, "humanitarians" still "have work to do." This work, however, must be preceded by an understanding of the differences between zoos with reinforcement for the positive achievements of good zoos which share the Humane Society's commitment to the fostering of a respect for all forms of living things (See: Conclusions and Recommendations).

Zoo Visitors

While the opponents of zoos have claimed that anti-zoo sentiment in America is on the increase, statistics regarding the number of visitors would seem to indicate otherwise. People appear to be attending zoos in ever increasing numbers. William Conway has stated on several occasions that zoos generally draw more visitors annually than all professional sports events combined, and Yankee Stadium's attendance in its best years has never equalled that of the Bronx Zoo in its worst (Livingston, 1974, p.266; U.S. Congress, 1974, p.42).

The Wall Street Journal (Lublin, 1973) reported zoo attendance to be in excess of 85 million visitors in 1973, up from 60 million a decade earlier. The President of the AAZPA reported that the estimates of visitors in 1978 from the Association's 220 member institutions indicated the number of zoo and aquarium goers to be in excess of 100 million (AAZPA NEWSLETTER, 3/1979:1). This appears to be a reversal of a trend away from zoo attendance that was noted in the 1950's (U.S. Congress, 1974, p.50). These figures would seem to support the contention of zoo advocates that urban-dwelling human beings need the contact with nature zoos can provide.
Because numbers alone reveal nothing about the motives or interests of zoo visitors, several studies have been undertaken over the past few years to provide demographic profiles of zoo visitors and to determine what visitors expect from zoos as well as what they appear to get out of their visits.

A study by Curator Clyde Hill (1969) of 1,000 groups of visitors to the San Diego Zoo indicated that the "majority of zoo visitor groups consisted of young nuclear families in which the head of the household had 13 or more years of formal school and... earned less than $9,000 a year" (pp.159-160). Only 5% of the heads of households had less than an eighth grade education (p.160). Additionally, more than 81% of the groups consisted of husband and wife or husband, wife, and children. Almost 60% of those interviewed were between the ages of 18 and 39 years of age; 30% were between the ages of 40 and 59 years of age (p.160). Hill also found that, at that time, "large zoos such as Bronx, Philadelphia and Chicago, were visited no more often than small zoos in the same geographical area," and 42% of the respondents to the questionnaire indicated they had visited another zoo within the previous two years (p.161).

Dr. Neil Cheek, Jr. (1973, p.10), a sociologist on the faculty of the University of Denver, conducted a study of zoo visitors for the Department of the Interior and the New York Zoological Society. Unlike Hill, Cheek attempted to determine the significance of zoos to people in general. To do so he devised a means of comparing acknowledged zoo-goers with non-zoo-goers and then compared both with a representative sample of the general public.

One of the most significant of Cheek's findings was that the wide-spread belief
that zoos are the "province of children" is a myth. He reported that "gate
tallies at zoos around the country reveal that by far the largest proportion of
visitors are adults." He also found that although the adults visiting zoos are
more likely to be parents than non-zoo-goers, visits to zoos were initiated by
children less than 30% of the time (p.11).

Cheek's profile of zoo-goers showed them to be better educated and more affluent
than non-zoo-goers. In addition, Cheek found them more likely to be white and,
as Hill's study had indicated, under 50 years of age. When asked for their
comments about their experiences in zoos, "two-thirds of the zoo-goers in the
survey said they felt they learned more about nature. Almost half said they felt
closer to nature at the zoo, and another 40 percent went even further: they said
the zoo helped them feel how beautiful life is" (p.12). Cheek also found that
zoo-goers enjoyed the park-like setting of a zoo, and because they seldom went
alone, visitors found the social aspects of zoos important. Ninety-two percent
of the survey respondents said they were glad they went to the zoo (p.14).

Dr. Philip Kuehl of the Westat Corporation (1976) studied 903 adults and children
visiting the National Zoo in 1974 and 1975. He reported findings similar to those
of Cheek and Hill. Visitors to the National Zoological Park (NZP) were predominantly
white, and compared with the general public (based upon information supplied by
the Bureau of Census), were better educated and more affluent. For example, 13.3%
of the U.S. population over 25 years of age had completed four or more years of
college at the time of the study, while 40.9% of the zoo visitors held at least
a bachelor's degree, with 13.3% of that group holding an advanced or professional
degree (pp.17-18).
Zoos: Pro and Con

Kuehl found that more than 80% of the visitors came as single or multi-family units, and more than 80% had visited other zoos as well as the Smithsonian's Natural History Museum (pp.19-20).

Kuehl's findings about zoo visitors' attitudes are worthy of being reported in some detail:

When visitors were asked if their expectations about the NZP were fulfilled during their visit, 91.5 percent either agreed or definitely agreed. . . . Nearly one half. . . . of the respondents felt that most people came to the zoo primarily for recreational purposes, while only 14.9 percent. . . . thought people came to the zoo primarily for educational purposes. In addition, 35.9 percent. . . . felt people visit the NZP for both educational and recreational purposes. . . . Almost all (97.4 percent) of the respondents. . . . feel that people visit the zoo to see animals on a close-up basis. However, a similar proportion of all visitors (93.5 percent) feel that animals should not be placed in smaller enclosures that best enable visitors to easily see the animals on a close-up basis. . . . Nearly all respondents (95.0 percent) feel most animals should be placed in natural-like habitats or environments at zoos. . . . More than half. . . . of the respondents. . . . feel people visit the National Zoo to learn about how animals live and relate to other animals. . . . 81.8 percent. . . . believe [the zoo] should emphasize [this] in its exhibits. . . . 83.1 percent [of respondents] believe that zoos should begin to emphasize environmental issues that affect animal life (pp.21-24).

In 1979 another study of visitors to the National Zoo was conducted by the Department of Psychological Studies of the Office of Museum programs of the Smithsonian Institution to arrive at an even better understanding of "visitor perceptions of zoo experience" (Wolf and Tymitz, 1979). Informal interviews were conducted with 300 randomly chosen people over a period of several months. This unique study by a method termed "naturalistic evaluation" did not tabulate percentages of the types of responses made to questions. The researchers defended their use of adjectives
such at "most, many, some, few," and "none," instead of giving the usual percentages on the basis of their view that "when numerical ratings are assigned to judgmental data there is a great tendency on the part of the reader to engage in hyperbole or misinterpretation" (p.12).

Using their particular method of evaluation, the researchers reported that respondents indicated that coming to the zoo was both a tradition and a regular family activity. Parents took their children because they felt the children loved animals and considered a trip to the zoo to be a treat. Visitors also went to the zoo to relax and enjoy the scenery, to be entertained, and for educational reasons. These researchers stated outright what the other studies described in the preceding paragraphs only alluded to: that "learning is not always work. Learning is frequently play!" (p.17).

Where the exhibits were concerned, the researchers found that visitors were very concerned that they meet the needs of both visitors and animals. To do so, visitors felt, the exhibits had to meet the conflicting criteria of allowing animals to behave naturally and also be active, while having adequate privacy in large enclosures. At the same time, visitors wanted to be able to observe the animals easily. The most important criterion expressed by zoo visitors was that "captivity must be comfortable" (p.22). Additionally, the researchers reported that:

People will accept an artificial environment if the animal, in their view, behaves 'normally.' What people perceive to be neurotic or aggressive animal behavior is attributed mostly to captivity and the animal's less than natural habitat (p.23).

Visitors also expressed concern about the cleanliness of the exhibits and the zoo in general, and concern for the quality of care the animals received.
Early in the report the research team expressed its own favorable impression regarding "how knowledgeable many people are about zoos in general and about this Zoo in particular." They concluded that:

Visitors have a great deal to offer in terms of generating thoughts and ideas that could help the Zoo realize its ultimate potential. Not many institutions can boast of such an informed and interested clientele and we view this as an important factor that zoo staff should take into consideration when they engage in program planning and exhibit development (p.12).

If they found visitors knowledgeable, the researchers also found them eager to learn. They reported that "the message that was consistent across the majority of respondents is the desire and receptivity for information." Respondents indicated their preference that information come from "animal keepers and moving guides" (p.40).

The findings of Wolf and Tymitz that zoo visitors have strong interest in the welfare of animals have been borne out by a three year study conducted by Sociologist Stephen Kellert of Yale University's School of Forestry and Environmental Studies for the Department of the Interior. Among the data in this massive study of American attitudes toward animals, Kellert gleaned interesting information about the attitudes, knowledge, and social characteristics of zoo-goers.

Kellert (1979) revealed that "zoological parks, without question, constitute one of America's most important and frequently used sources of contact between people and wildlife." Kellert based this conclusion on the fact that 46% of the respondents (more than 3,000 randomly selected Americans over 18 years of age from the 48 contiguous states) reported having visited a zoo during the previous two-year period.
Kellert classified zoo-goers according to their reasons for attending zoos. He found that 36% went "primarily for the educational benefits to their children"; 26% visited zoos "mainly as a leisure activity involving family or friends"; 25% attended "primarily because of their personal fascination with wild animals"; and 11% of visitors "attended mainly because of the aesthetic appeal of the animals" (p.89).

Kellert found, as had Hill, Cheek, and Kuehl, that zoo visitors seem to be younger than non-zoo-goers. He also determined that 60% are female, primarily mothers who attend for what they believe to be the educational benefits to their children.

His discovery that "a significantly greater proportion of zoo visitors, especially those who frequently attended, resided in areas of more than one million population" (p.90), appears to support the contention of Hediger and others that zoos fulfill the need of urban dwellers for contact with nature.

Kellert also found, as had Cheek and Kuehl, that zoo visitors are "significantly more likely than non-visitbrs to have had a college education and to have higher incomes" (p.90).

Unlike the others, Kellert attempted to quantify the overall knowledge of animals of zoo-goers as compared to other "animal activity" groups. Although zoo visitors appear to be more knowledgeable than a representative sample of the general public, Kellert found that they ranked lower than groups such as bird-watchers, members of humane organizations, trappers, sports hunters, and fishermen. He reported that:

Zoo enthusiasts were characterized by slightly more interest and
knowledge of wildlife and natural ecosystems, and substantially greater affection, moral concern and opposition to utilitarian exploitation than the general public. However, these tendencies—except for strong humanistic affection for animals—were considerably less pronounced than among most other wildlife-related activity groups such as birders, scientific study hobbyists, nature hunters and backpackers (p.92).

He concluded that zoo-goers appeared to be "motivated more by generalized affection for animals than by specific intellectual curiosity regarding wildlife" (p.91). Of interest to animal welfare advocates is Kellert's finding that zoo visitors were "quite sympathetic to issues of animal welfare and rights," with more than 70% of "zoo enthusiasts" opposed to hunting for sport.

Kellert also determined that zoo-goers were supportive of the protection of endangered animals "even at the expense of increased energy development costs. Indeed, frequent zoo visitors were even more disposed toward protecting endangered wildlife, although this willingness varied considerably by animal species..." (p.92). He concluded that the status of zoos as "one of America's most important sources of contact between people and wildlife" can "be enhanced as zoos strive to promote a more biologically informed and ecologically aware citizenry, with regard to wildlife and natural habitats" (p.93).

There is good reason to believe that zoos will strive to fulfill the expectations of their supporters. These findings would also seem to reinforce The HSUS's contention that it represents a constituency of Americans who need the contact with wildlife that zoos provide, but at the same time expect that contact to be educational to themselves and not harmful in any way to the animals. That a majority of zoo-goers appear to have a strong interest in animal welfare is an
excellent reason for The HSUS to pursue a catalytic effort to draw zoos and animal welfare organizations closer together, and to provide zoo-goers with information that can enable them to assist in improving zoos and aquariums.
Part III
Conclusions and Recommendations

The HSUS has made significant headway in the past nine years in raising the public's level of awareness of the presence of unsatisfactory conditions in zoos and the reasons for those conditions. It has made the public aware of the differences among zoos and given general guidance to the humane movement to make the very important distinction between zoos which should remain and be upgraded and those which should be closed. The HSUS has also singlehandedly brought about specific improvements for animals in certain cases and helped to expedite pending improvements in other cases. It has made itself known nationally to the public, the news media, municipal officials, and to local humane organizations as the one national animal welfare organization which does more than give "lip service" to zoo reform.

The HSUS has also made the public aware of the presence and intent of the Animal Welfare Act, as well as the shortcomings of USDA in enforcing the provisions of the Act with respect to captive wild animals. The constant pressure on USDA is beginning to show some results, but there is no reason to believe that there will be massive improvements or closures of class 3 zoos anytime soon.

The HSUS has also attempted to communicate to the members of the zoo profession the perspective of that segment of the humane movement, doubtless the majority, which wishes to see good and potentially good zoos improved and incorrigibly bad zoos eliminated. The HSUS's sincerity has been subject to question in this regard because it has failed to reinforce the work of good zoos with praise. This has been done by Sue on an individual basis, and articles of a positive nature have appeared in KIND and Humane Education, but these have not been sufficient to
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counteract the impression that HSUS merely tolerates even the best of zoos.

The zoo profession in America has made many steps forward in defining its responsibilities regarding modernization of exhibits, education, professional ethics, and conservation. The HSUS has, Sue Pressman feels, helped get "their" message across to a segment of the public they would probably not have reached otherwise. But while the good and better zoos have gotten even better, the menageries at the bottom of the scale (both public and private), while getting no worse generally, have stayed the same. The "new attitude" of USDA toward the enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act has not yet filtered down to the level at which animal care is actually improved. The communications between The HSUS and the zoo profession have improved since 1975, but need to be improved further. Given their present preoccupation with professional ethics, the voices of the "best and the brightest" within AAZPA should be strengthened and reinforced by The HSUS.

There is no reason to believe that HSUS constituents have lost interest in zoo reform as an issue. The public's interest in zoos has appeared to grow rather than diminish and the trend toward more naturalistic exhibitions, breeding of endangered species, and better education programs will probably insure that the level of interest remains high. The public is becoming increasingly sophisticated in its understanding of wild animals. The zoos are becoming more sophisticated in their approach to exhibition, conservation, and public education. The HSUS Zoo Program should likewise become more sophisticated to keep pace with these trends.

The Zoo Program Should Not Continue As It Is

Since the Wildlife Department was created in 1971, the responsibilities of its
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one staff member have grown beyond the investigation of zoos. For several years, Sue Pressman has been responsible for The HSUS efforts to uncover and correct abuses to performing animals in circuses, motion pictures, and television. She has also, since the death of Frank McMahon, been responsible for observing and reporting on the world's major seal hunts. Additionally, she has been responsible for problems involving wildlife relocation and "exotic pets." All of these activities, some more than others, have generated correspondence and inquiries from the public, local humane societies, and the news media.

During this period zoo problems have continued to require investigation and to generate considerable correspondence and inquiries from HSUS constituents, both local and national humane organizations, the AAZPA, and the news media. With the added responsibilities described in the preceding paragraph, less time has been available in recent years to react to zoo problems than was possible in the program's early days. With no other national animal welfare organization having an active program of zoo investigation, the public, the zoo profession, humane societies, and municipal officials have nowhere else to turn but to The HSUS.

With the growth of The HSUS staff since the mid-1970's, Sue has had to spend more time providing information to other departments regarding a variety of wildlife related issues or legislation. Considerable time must be spent also coordinating the zoo-related work of the regional directors and their investigators. While the regional office staffs are able to handle many problems with respect to class 3 zoos, they are less well prepared to deal with class 2 zoos.

A great deal has been accomplished on a reactive basis with zoos, yet it seems
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clear, given the present direction of The HSUS toward a more controlled, analytical approach to animal welfare problems generally, the Zoo Program as it is presently conducted is too superficial to continue as it is. The continuation of a one-person Wildlife Department reflects an apparent lack of commitment on the part of The HSUS to wildlife-related issues.

Recommendations

The HSUS should take the advice of William Conway and decide whether it wants to "fish or cut bait" where zoos are concerned. The HSUS must decide as an organization whether the keeping of animals in captivity in zoos constitutes a justifiable use of wildlife. If The HSUS recognizes that good zoos are needed in our culture to provide necessary contact between people and animals; to perpetuate animals faced with extinction in the wild--even in cases where restocking the wild with captive-bred animals is unlikely; to contribute to the public's knowledge of animal life and ecology; and to inspire an appreciation for animals and understanding of the urgent need to preserve them and their habitat, then it should, logically, commit itself to "making American zoos the best in the world."

Either zoos are necessary to our culture or they are not. The HSUS will have to make its support of good zoos evident if it is to lead its constituents to evaluate them effectively. A position of mere tolerance of even the best aspects of zoos is not likely to inspire the general public to become involved with class 2 zoos to the extent necessary to elevate them to class 1.

Having made the public aware of the shortcomings and problems of zoos, The HSUS should take the next logical step and prepare a detailed publication or "Manual for
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Zoo-goers," to enable them to distinguish between zoos that can be improved to an acceptable level and those that cannot, and how to assist effectively in bringing about improvements or closure. Such a booklet should contain: The HSUS policy statement on zoos; a description of The HSUS system for rating zoos; and a statement of The HSUS's belief that zoos must have an operating philosophy which expresses a sincere commitment to conservation, education, research (but only that which will benefit animals in the collection or in the wild), and the welfare of its animals.

The booklet should also make some statement about the efforts of the AAZPA to improve zoos and the zoo profession through its Accreditation Program, code of ethics, guidelines for the disposition of surplus animals, sanctions against members who violate the ethics code, and so forth. Comparison should also be made between the number of institutions that are members of AAZPA and the number of exhibits licensed or registered by the USDA. The booklet should contain photographs to illustrate the difference between "zoos" and "menageries," a distinction which The HSUS should take the lead to initiate (see the discussion which follows in this section). The booklet should also indicate, apropos of the distinction between zoos and menageries, that zoos must have a sufficient number of professionally trained staff members with the authority necessary to make decisions regarding the institution's exhibits and programs.

The booklet should state The HSUS's views on those aspects of zoos which are of the greatest concern to animal welfare advocates. The following questions should be answered from the animal welfare perspective: Where do zoo animals come from? How
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are they captured in the wild? Who regulates the capture? What is the mortality among wild-caught animals during capture? Are zoos a drain on wild populations? Is there any justification for zoos to continue taking animals from the wild? How can animals from different climates adjust to zoos? Can the social and behavioral needs of animals be met in captivity? How important is the mortality rate in a zoo? Is there any type of research on zoo animals which is justifiable? How should zoos handle their surplus animals? Why do zoos have surpluses of animals? Is there any justification for breeding endangered animals in zoos if they can never be returned to the wild? What laws govern zoos and how are they administered? Why are zoo societies needed? How do zoos teach about animals?

The booklet should also describe The HSUS's continuing efforts to improve the class 2 and eliminate the class 3 zoos, and it should encourage humane organizations to participate in cooperative education programs with their local zoos.

Sue feels that she has not adequately prepared humane societies to deal with their local zoos. Yet these societies are in a far better position than The HSUS representatives ever will be to monitor the progress of a zoo. Local societies cannot be expected to know instinctively when progress is truly underway and moving at a reasonable pace, or whether a municipality or zoo officials are hiding behind an ambitious "master-plan." Sue believes she could make more progress in this regard by participating to a greater extent in The HSUS workshops which draw members of humane societies and federations from all over the country.

The HSUS Education Department should keep up with the advances in zoo education programs and continue to stress the common purposes of humane society education
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programs with those in good zoos and aquariums. The HSUS should pursue the suggestion made by Warren Iliff to form a national committee of humane society and zoo leaders to explore the ways in which the objectives of both zoos and animal welfare organizations overlap and complement one another. The recommendations made by such a committee could result in expanded and more meaningful education programs for both groups.

Additional suggestions have been made by other members of the zoo world which would improve The HSUS's credibility and effectiveness in dealing with zoos generally, as well as strengthen the bonds which exist between The HSUS and those in the zoo profession who share animal welfare concerns. The HSUS should take Dr. Wayne King's suggestion to present the AAZPA with a general statement expressing what The HSUS expects a zoo to be, and AAZPA should be asked to publish this statement in its newsletter. The HSUS should also take Phyllis Moore's suggestion to make the full scope of its interest, concerns, and activities known to AAZPA members. Her specific suggestion to provide each member of AAZPA with a copy of The HSUS Policy Manual is probably not financially feasible, but a less ambitious alternative means of accomplishing the same end could be devised.

Unfortunately, even the AAZPA members who evince the greatest sympathy for The HSUS seem to know relatively little about the structure of the Society and the scope of its activities.

The Rating System Should Be Revised

The rating system should be expanded from its present range of 1 through 3 to 1 through 5 to emphasize the differences which presently exist in all those institu-
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tions currently lumped together under class 2. Those at the top would, presumably, remain there, while those presently considered to be 3's would be reclassified as 5's. This would serve to emphasize how far away they are from justifying their existence. Since 2's would be closer to excellence, they might perhaps be inspired to make the changes necessary to become 1's. 3's would be solidly in the middle: half-good and half-bad. The number 4 classification might be reserved for those zoos such as Central Park which, if radically changed in concept, might be considered worth saving. The HSUS should continue to stress the fact that this rating scale is not considered to be either an alternative to, or rival of, the AAZPA Accreditation Program.

The Wildlife Department Should Have a "Master Plan" For Zoos

The Wildlife Department should devise a twofold plan for dealing with zoos, one aspect of which would be directed to a campaign to eliminate "roadside" zoos (most of which are not members of the AAZPA), and the other entailing AAZPA member institutions of all calibers. The HSUS should monitor the AAZPA's Accreditation Program closely and register official protests whenever class 3 zoos are accredited. The HSUS should also notify AAZPA of serious animal welfare problems it is having with AAZPA member-institutions. The Association should be encouraged to use its influence to improve these institutions or bring about their closure. AAZPA should also be encouraged to include a section of the humane movement in its course material for its Management School. Presently, that material appears to reflect only a negative view of animal welfare advocates.

Because the term "roadside zoo" has proved to be inadequate to describe all the
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zoos considered by The HSUS to be without justification, The HSUS should consider discouraging the use of the term. It is popular but it seems to connote only commercial establishments in the minds of most people. It would be more appropriate to speak only in terms of "zoos" (which are acceptable) and "menageries" (which are not). This would more effectively define these two types of operations by what they do rather than be appearing to emphasize where they are. This would also help to reinforce The HSUS's contention that wild animals do not belong in the hands of "amateurs" either as pets or for exhibition purposes.

Since the majority of class 3 zoos are not subject to the sanctions of the AAZPA, the efforts to eliminate them will have to be centered around the Animal Welfare Act. There is some feeling within the zoo world that AAZPA and The HSUS could--and should--work together to eliminate these operations which are a source of indignation to animal welfare advocates and give all zoos a bad name. Wayne King appears to feel strongly that a lawsuit by The HSUS against USDA to force a more strict interpretation of the Animal Welfare Act would produce the desired result. The AAZPA might be willing to join such a suit if a satisfactory definition of a "minimum zoo" could be created (Wagner, Personal Communication).

A select list of "problem" zoos should be compiled. These would be zoos which have resisted all efforts to improve them. The worst one among them should be singled out for legal action. The HSUS has threatened to file suit against a municipal zoo since it began the Zoo Program. The only legal action The HSUS has taken against a zoo entailed charges of cruelty under what were probably highly unusual circumstances; that is to say the situation did not entail the sort of sustained municipal apathy or resistance to improvement which most often character-
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izes the worst city-operated zoos. A successful lawsuit, or even an unsuccessful one, would be very likely to have a salutary effect on The HSUS's efforts to inspire cities to improve their zoos or close them.

The other zoos on the "problem" list should receive more deliberate attention from HSUS, but not necessarily of a legal nature. Where appropriate the AAZPA and local humane organizations should be asked to assist The HSUS in seeking to improve or close zoos. The AAZPA should be kept informed of The HSUS's view of its member institutions, particularly those which are accredited. It should be made clear to local humane societies just what can and cannot be accomplished by HSUS with respect to a local zoo. Disappointment has resulted in the past when local organizations have expected changes to take place more quickly than was actually possible.

The Wildlife Department should develop a slide program on zoos to show at regional seminars and conference workshops. This could also be useful in dealing with zoo people who are under the impression, as many of them seem to be, that the majority of "roadside" zoos have been eliminated by the Animal Welfare Act.

The Wildlife Department should continue to monitor legislation affecting the acquisition, transportation, handling, and housing of zoo animals. If the USDA's "new attitude" towards its enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act proves not to result in improved conditions for animals, and litigation against USDA is considered premature or unfeasible, then The HSUS should consider other alternatives such as urging Congress to call oversight hearings on the Act, or sympathetic Representatives or Senators could be asked to submit legislation to strengthen the Act's provisions
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(these have in fact been under consideration for some time to one degree or another). In order to effect a "master-plan" for zoos it will be necessary to add at least one full-time staff member to the Wildlife Department. A full-time secretary is also a necessity for a Department which generates such a large volume of correspondence. The present system under which the secretary of the Wildlife Department shares her time with the Research and Data Services Department is unsatisfactory and makes the production of the printed materials described in the preceding paragraphs an impossibility.

Files should be kept on issues surrounding zoos as well as on the individual zoos themselves. This would facilitate locating information on such subjects as the disposition of surplus animals, captive propagation of endangered species, zoo education programs, AAZPA's policies which pertain to animal welfare issues, trends in zoo exhibit design, and so forth.

The Zoo Program's Potential for Funding

Despite the oft-repeated criticism that The HSUS has used its Zoo Program as a "gimmick" or "ploy" to raise money, the opposite appears to be true. The professional firm of Oram Goldstein Associates, Inc., retained by The HSUS in 1975 to analyze its programs and publications from the standpoint of their fund-raising potential, listed the Zoo Program fifth among the organization's priorities and indicated that it had good potential for funding from individuals, foundations, corporations, and even selected municipal governments. The Oram Goldstein analysts also pointed out that over a 2-1/2 year period only four special reports out of seven had earned $20,000.00 or more: The 1975 Special Report on Zoo Reform was listed second
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from the top on a descending scale.

Oram Goldstein recommended that the Zoo Program should be "maintained on a long range basis," or "at the very least, it should be made an intensive five-year project" (HSUS Files). Yet, despite this recommendation the program has not been conducted intensively, and with no special report since 1975, and with less frequent mention of the program in The HSUS News than was common in the Program's early days, its fundraising potential has remained undeveloped.

The HSUS should send out another Special Report (or Close-up Report) on zoos to determine whether The HSUS constituents are still concerned enough to offer their financial support to the Program. This report should contain good news about zoos as well as bad.
APPENDIX A
Birmingham Zoo
Birmingham, Alabama

Montgomery Zoo
Montgomery, Alabama

Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum
Tucson, Arizona

Gene Reid Zoo
Tucson, Arizona

Phoenix Zoo
Phoenix, Arizona

Cheetah Unlimited
Phoenix, Arizona

Ollson's Rare Bird Farm
Glendale, Arizona

The Research Ranch
Elgin, Arizona

Tropic Gardens Zoo
Phoenix, Arizona

Alligator Farm
Hot Springs, Arkansas

Animal Wonderland
Hot Springs, Arkansas

Bob Jacobs Roadside Zoo
Hartman, Arkansas

Dogpatch, U.S.A.
Little Rock, Arkansas

Earl Tatum Zoo
Eureka Springs, Arkansas

Funland Zoo
Jonesboro, Arkansas

I.Q. Zoo
Hot Springs, Arkansas

Little Rock Zoo
Little Rock, Arkansas

Little Rock Museum
Little Rock, Arkansas

RATED

II
II
I
II (upgraded from III)
II
Unrated-Breeder
Unrated-Breeder
Unrated-Breeder
III
III
• III (closed)
III
III (closed)
III
III
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoo Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magic Springs Theme Park</td>
<td>Hot Springs, Arkansas</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Wilderness</td>
<td>Gentry, Arkansas</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa U.S.A.</td>
<td>Thousand Oaks, California</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Rentals</td>
<td>Baldwin Park, California</td>
<td>Animal Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Lindsey Museum</td>
<td>Walnut Creek, California</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Animal Entertainers</td>
<td>Littlerock, California</td>
<td>Animal Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Animal Park</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>II (closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applegate Park Zoo</td>
<td>Merceo, California</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busch Gardens</td>
<td>Van Nuys, California</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Alligator Farm</td>
<td>Buena Park, California</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Paddock Zoo</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo, California</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cougar Hill Ranch</td>
<td>Littlerock, California</td>
<td>Animal Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cougar Mt. Game Reserve</td>
<td>Yucaipa, California</td>
<td>Animal Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Discovery Center</td>
<td>Fresno, California</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enchanted Village</td>
<td>Anaheim, California</td>
<td>III (downgraded from II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Flags Magic Mountain</td>
<td>Valencia, California</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom City Zoo</td>
<td>Folsom, California</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ZOOS

Fort Roosevelt
Hanford, California

Gentle Jungle, Inc.
Saugas, California

Hanna-Barbera Marineland
Rancho Palos Verdes, California

Henry's Chimps
Cerritos, California

Horton's Wonder Bears
San Diego, California

Hermosa Reptile & Wild Animal Farm
Hermosa Beach, California

Howling Wolf Zoo
Leggett, California

Jett's Petting Zoo
Fontana, California

Knott's Berry Farm
Buena Park, California

Lion Country Safari, Inc.
Laguna Hills, California

Lions, Etc.
Acton, California

Living Desert Assn.
Palm Desert, California

Los Angeles Zoo
Los Angeles, California

The Madonna Inn
San Luis Crispo, California

Marine World
Redwood City, California

Marriott's Great America
Santa Clara, California

Micke Grove Zoological Gardens
Lodi, California

Mo DiSesso Acting Animals
Newhall, California

RATED

Animal Trainer

III

Animal Trainer

II

II (upgraded from II)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZOOS</th>
<th>RATED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Orchard Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modesto, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto Junior Museum</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roeding Park Zoo</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Zoo</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Science Center &amp; Jr. Museum</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Zoo</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Wild Animal Park</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escondido, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Zoological Gardens</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Baby Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara Zoological Gardens</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea World, Inc.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoia Park Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinhart Aquarium</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Martin's Working Wildlife</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acton, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twentieth Century Fox Marineland, Inc.</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Palos Verdes, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal City Animal Park</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosemite Wild Animal Park</td>
<td>III (closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coarsegold, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Wayland Vaughan Aquarium-Museum</td>
<td>Unrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Jolla, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripps Institution of Oceanography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZOOS</strong></td>
<td><strong>RATED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nole Marshall Lions</td>
<td>Animal Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acton, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Oxley’s Animals</td>
<td>Animal Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acton, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Martin’s Working Wildlife</td>
<td>Animal Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acton, California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheyenne Mountain Zoological Park</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs, Colorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Zoological Gardens</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, Colorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Falls National Gorge</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Falls, Colorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pubelo Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pubelo, Colorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa's Workshop Colorado Company</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Pole, Colorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf Country Foundation</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder, Colorado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beardsley Zoological Gardens</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport, Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Museum of Hartford</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hartford, Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.L. Emerson</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington, Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown Nature Center</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown, Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moran Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New London, Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystic Marinelife Aquarium</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystic, Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old McDonald Farm</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich, Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood Forest Zoo</td>
<td>III (closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford, Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOOS</td>
<td>RATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford Museum &amp; Nature Center</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford, Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Game Farm</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington, Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rock Nature Center</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven, Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington, Delaware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Zoological Park</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Safari Park</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naples, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alligator Farm</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Augustine, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alligatorland Safari</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissimmee, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC LIFSURF Attractions</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooksville, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradenton Museum</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradenton, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busch Gardens Zoological Park</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. Schreiber's Chimpanzees</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Augustine, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Florida Zoological Park</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Kulaqua</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Springs, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress Gardens</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Haven, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The New Dade County Zoological Park</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney World</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Island, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreher Park Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Palm Beach, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOOS</td>
<td>RATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engesser's Exotic Felines Trenton, Florida</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everglades Gatorland South Bay, Florida</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everglades Wonder Garden Bonita Springs, Florida</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flipper's Sea School Marathon Shores, Florida</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Reptile Land Perry, Florida</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabegon Monkey Sanctuary Branford, Florida</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gator Jungle Christmas, Florida</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gator Jungle Plant City, Florida</td>
<td>II (Research)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gator Land St. Augustine, Florida</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gator Land North Kissimmee, Florida</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatorama Palmdale, Florida</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houser Zoo Melbourne, Florida</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville Zoological Park Jacksonville, Florida</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungle Larry's African Safariland, Inc. Naples, Florida</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jungle Queen Village Fort Lauderdale, Florida</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Kong Zoo Masaryktown, Florida</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion Country Safari West Palm Beach, Florida</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowry Park Zoo Tampa, Florida</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOO</td>
<td>RATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissamme Zoo</td>
<td>III (closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham Park Zoo</td>
<td>II (low)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marineland of Florida</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masterpiece Gardens</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Seaquarium</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkey Jungle</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkeyland</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of the Sea &amp; Indian</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noell's Ark</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean World</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrot Jungle</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet Village</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer Park</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Allen Zoo</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Panthers</td>
<td>III (closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savage Kingdom</td>
<td>III (breeder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea World of Florida</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Land</td>
<td>III (closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOCS</td>
<td>RATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serpatarian</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama City, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Springs</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocala, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunken Gardens</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarpon Springs Zoo</td>
<td>II (closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarpon Springs, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater of the Sea, Inc.</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamorada, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson's Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clewiston, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tropiquarium, Inc.</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Miami, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zooland</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Breeze, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles P. Chase, Co. Inc.</td>
<td>Animal Dealer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Johnston</td>
<td>Animal Dealer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxahatchee, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John C. Noyes</td>
<td>Animal Dealer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lauderdale, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Steele Animal Promotion</td>
<td>Animal Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loxahatchee, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina's Royal Palace Leopard</td>
<td>Animal Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herriott's Performing Animals</td>
<td>Animal Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringling Brothers</td>
<td>Circus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stebring Royal European Circus, Inc.</td>
<td>Circus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Beatty-Cole Brothers</td>
<td>Circus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Park, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanneford Family Circus</td>
<td>Circus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nokomis, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOOS</td>
<td>RATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahia Shrine Camel Herders</td>
<td>Circus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando, Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Zoological Park</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chehaw Wild Animal Park</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany, Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillside Chimp Farm</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont, Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin-Rich Animal Pet'em Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellerslie, Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkey Palace</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany, Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Flags Over Georgia</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Mountain Game Ranch, Inc.</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone Mountain, Georgia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise City Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise, Idaho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Park Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocatello, Idaho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tautphaus Park Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Falls, Idaho</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookfield Zoo</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookfield, Illinois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John G. Shedd Aquarium</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Park Zoo</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller Park Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomington, Illinois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lords Park</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin, Illinois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Prairie Park</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria Heights, Illinois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Oak Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoria, Illinois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niabi Zoo</td>
<td>Rock Island, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Farm</td>
<td>Rockford, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Animal Farm</td>
<td>Wheaton, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hume's Exotic Wildlife Ranch</td>
<td>Arlington Heights, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Wayne Children's Zoological Gardens</td>
<td>Fort Wayne, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis Zoological Park</td>
<td>Indianapolis, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potowatami Zoo</td>
<td>South Bend, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Park Zoo</td>
<td>Michigan City, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amishville USA</td>
<td>Geneva, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Museum, Inc.</td>
<td>Indianapolis, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesker Park Zoo</td>
<td>Evansville, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Miller Park</td>
<td>Richmond, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill Haven Game Farm &amp; Zoo</td>
<td>Terre Haute, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbian Park Zoo</td>
<td>LaFayette, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf Park-American Wildlife Foundation</td>
<td>Battleground, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Claus Land, Inc.</td>
<td>Santa Claus, Indiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines Children's Zoo</td>
<td>Des Moines, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carey Park</td>
<td>Hutchinson, Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOOS</td>
<td>RATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Mitchell Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence, Kansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Zoological Park</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan, Kansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedwick County Zoological Park</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, Kansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-American Zoo</td>
<td>III (closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie Village, Kansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gage Park Zoo</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topeka, Kansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear House Truck Stop, Inc.</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunker Hill, Kansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brit Spaugh Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Bend, Kansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.E. Markley</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca, Kansas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville Zoological Gardens</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville, Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria Zoological Park</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria, Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audubon Park &amp; Zoological Garden</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans, Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Purchase Gardens &amp; Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe, Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Baton Rouge Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge, Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Forest Park</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York Beach, Maine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludlow Bear Farm</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houlton, Maine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallop's Animal Ranch</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houlton, Maine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea World</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterville, Maine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson's Animal Park</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick, Maine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOOS</td>
<td>RATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumford Wild Animal Park</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumford Point, Maine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aqualand Wildlife Park</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewster, Maine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore Zoo</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Maryland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catoctin Mountain Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurmont, Maryland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury Zoo</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury, Maryland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquarium of Cape Cod, Inc.</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Yarmouth, Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Museum of Science</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buttonwood Park Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Redford, Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James P. Heady Children's Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughing Brook Ed. Center &amp; Wildlife Sanctuary</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampden, Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capron Park Zoo</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attleboro, Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Museum</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pittsfield Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsfield, Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Park Zoo</td>
<td>III (downgraded from II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield, Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Park Zoo</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorchester, Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Hill Park</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester, Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Audubon Society</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln, Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Aquarium</td>
<td>I (upgraded from II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoos</td>
<td>Rated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealand of Cape Cod, Inc. Brewster, Mass.</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwick Birds &amp; Animals Blackstone, Mass.</td>
<td>Animal Dealer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield Science Museum Springfield, Mass.</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter D. Stone Memorial Zoo Stoneham, Mass.</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester Science Center Worcester, Mass.</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War 1 Memorial Park North Attleboro, Mass.</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Zoological Park Detroit, Mich.</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan L. Clinch Park Zoo Traverse City, Mich.</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ball Zoological Gardens Grand Rapids, Mich.</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter Park Zoo Lansing, Mich.</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Zoological Garden Apple Valley, Minn.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Como Park Zoo St. Paul, Minn.</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamper Park &amp; Zoo Hattisburg, Miss.</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Zoological Park Jackson, Miss.</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Animal Productions, Inc. Biloxi, Miss.</td>
<td>Animal Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anheuser-Busch, Inc. St. Louis, Miss.</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal World Eldon, Miss.</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buena Vista Exotic Animal Paradise</td>
<td>Strafford, Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickerson Park Zoo</td>
<td>Springfield, Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-H Ranch</td>
<td>Cape Girardeau, Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City Zoological Gardens</td>
<td>Kansas City, Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Allen's Zoological Park</td>
<td>Eldon, Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Zoological Park</td>
<td>St. Louis, Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Doorly Zoo</td>
<td>Omaha, Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cody Park Zoo</td>
<td>North Platte, Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas Valley Zoo</td>
<td>Las Vegas, Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquis Chimpanzees</td>
<td>Las Vegas, Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bensons Wild Animal Farm, Inc.</td>
<td>Hudson, New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enchanted Forest</td>
<td>Laconia, New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storyland</td>
<td>Glen, New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storybook Forest</td>
<td>Meirs Beach, New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Actors, Inc.</td>
<td>Washington, New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comanzick Zoo</td>
<td>Bridgeton, New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietch Animals</td>
<td>Fair Lawn, New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOOS</td>
<td>RATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Adventure</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allentown, New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunts Circus, Inc.</td>
<td>Circus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence, New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Wild Animal Farm</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex, New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Lou Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotch Plains, New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turtle Back Zoo</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner Brothers Jungle Habitat</td>
<td>I (closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Milford, New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadwalader Park Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton, New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda Park Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almogordo, New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Grande Zoological Park</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flying W's Exotic Game Farm</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington, New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquarium of Niagara Falls, USA, Inc.</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara Falls, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo Zoological Gardens</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnet Park Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsyth Park Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catskill Game Farm, Inc.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catskill, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flushing Park Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lollypop Farm of Rochester, Inc.</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOOS</td>
<td>RATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. J. Zeehandelaar, Inc. New Rochelle, New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Island Game Farm Manorville, New York</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppenheim Zoo Niagara Falls, New York</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Aquarium Brooklyn, New York</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Zoological Park Bronx Park, New York</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca Park Zoo Rochester, New York</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staten Island Zoo Staten Island, New York</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Park Zoo Binghamton, New York</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson Park Zoo Watertown, New York</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica Zoo Utica, New York</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Harrison Memorial Park Harrison, New York</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson's Zoo &amp; Animal Farm Smithfield, North Carolina</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina Zoological Park Asheboro, North Carolina</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinlan Marine Attractions Lincolnton, North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Line Zoo Star, North Carolina</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tote-Em-In-Zoo Wilmington, North Carolina</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Country Safari Port Clinton, Ohio</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron Children's Zoo Akron, Ohio</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Crackers Park</td>
<td>Lock Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati Zoo</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Zoo</td>
<td>Powell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton Museum of Natural History</td>
<td>Dayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Island</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagoon Deer Park</td>
<td>Sandusky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metroparks Zoological Park</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaworld of Ohio</td>
<td>Aurora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo Zoo</td>
<td>Toledo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo Ranch</td>
<td>Afton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carson &amp; Barnes Circus, Inc.</td>
<td>Hugo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chickasha Zoo</td>
<td>Chickasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma City Zoo</td>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa Zoological Park</td>
<td>Tulsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wintersmith Park</td>
<td>Ada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Coast Safari</td>
<td>Siletz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Park Zoo</td>
<td>Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Safari</td>
<td>Winston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Deer Park</td>
<td>Cave Junction, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiling Springs Zoo</td>
<td>Boiling Springs, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmwood Park Zoo</td>
<td>Norristown, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie Zoo</td>
<td>Erie, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg Game Park</td>
<td>Fairfield, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hershey Zoo America</td>
<td>Hershey, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Zoological Garden</td>
<td>Philadelphia, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg Zoo</td>
<td>Pittsburg, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocono Wild Animal Farm</td>
<td>Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton Zoo</td>
<td>Scranton, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Amish Farm</td>
<td>Lancaster, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enchanted Forest of Rhode Island</td>
<td>Hope Valley, Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Williams Park Zoo</td>
<td>Providence, Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slater Park Zoo</td>
<td>Pawtucket, Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle C Animal Farm &amp; Zoo</td>
<td>Campobello, South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet-A-Pet Farm</td>
<td>West Columbia, South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverbanks Zoological Park</td>
<td>Columbia, South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoxville Zoological Park</td>
<td>Knoxville, Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOOS</td>
<td>RATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis Zoological Park</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis, Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilene Zoological Park</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilene, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarillo Story Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarillo, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell Zoo</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centex Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waco, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comanche Gap Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comanche Gap, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cougars Unlimited</td>
<td>Dealer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas Zoo</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso Zoological Park</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Trout Zoo</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lufkin, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exotic Wildlife Unlimited</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Station, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Flags Over Texas</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth Zoological Park</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Buck Memorial Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladys Porter Zoo</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownsville, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Zoological Garden</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Village</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion Country Safari Park</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Prairie, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOOS</td>
<td>RATED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midland Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midland, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Park Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilene, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio Zoological Park</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Arama Marineworld</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galveston, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinton Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinton, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake Farm</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braunfeis, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaton Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaton, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprink Lake Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texarkana, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Kennel Game Farm</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising Star, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivo Animals - Leon Leopard</td>
<td>Dealer (closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorena, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Texas Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World of Animals</td>
<td>III (closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesquite, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife International</td>
<td>Dealer (closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zooland Petting Zoo</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odessa, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogle Zoological Gardens</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Aviary</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City, Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa's Land, Inc.</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putney, Vermont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childress Snake &amp; Monkey Farm</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Market, Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Blue Bird Gap Farm
Hampton, Virginia

LaFayette Zoological Park
Norfolk, Virginia

Kings Dominion
Richmond, Virginia

Natural Bridge Zoological Park
Natural Bridge, Virginia

Pet-A-Pet Farm Park, Inc.
Vienna, Virginia

Wilson's Pet Farm
Winchester, Virginia

Northwest Trek
Eatonville, Washington

Point Defiance Zoo
Tacoma, Washington

Woodland Park Zoological Garden
Seattle, Washington

Oglebay's Good Zoo
Wheeling, West Virginia

Acqualand of Door County, Inc.
Ephrain, Wisconsin

Henry Vilas Park Zoo
Madison, Wisconsin

Milwaukee County Zoological Park
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Racine Zoological Park
Racine, Wisconsin

Ranch Petting Zoo
Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin

Jardin Zoological Garden
Mayaguez, Puerto Rico

Safari Park, Inc.
Rayamon, Puerto Rico
APPENDIX B: The HSUS Ratings of AAZPA Accredited Zoos

Date Accredited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accredited Institutions as of April 1980:</th>
<th>The HSUS Rating:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham Zoo, Birmingham, AL (1976)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary Zoo, Calgary, Alberta, Canada (1978)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati Zoo, Cincinnati, OH (1978)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Zoological Gardens, Denver, CO (1976)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso Zoological Park, El Paso, TX (1980)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Wayne Children's Zoo, Ft. Wayne, IN (1976)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Worth Zoological Park, Ft. Worth, TX (1977)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Baton Rouge Zoo, Baker, LA (1977)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogle Zoological Garden, Salt Lake City, UT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Park Zoological Gardens, Chicago, IL (1976)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Zoo, Los Angeles, CA (1979)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville Zoological Garden, Louisville, KY (1980)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller Park Zoo, Bloomington, IL (1978)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee County Zoological Park, Milwaukee, WI (1976)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Zoological Park, Washington, D.C. (1977)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England Aquarium, Boston, MA (1980)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Zoological Park, Bronx, NY (1979)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladys Porter Zoo, Brownsville, TX (1978)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverbanks Zoological Park, Columbia, SC (1979)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roeding Park Zoo, Fresno, CA (1979)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis Zoological Park, St. Louis, MO (1977)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: The HSUS Ratings of AAZPA Accredited Zoos

Accredited Institutions as of April 1980:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accredited Institutions</th>
<th>The HSUS Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Zoo, Sacramento, CA (1979)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salisbury Zoo, Salisbury, MD (1976)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio Zoological Gardens and Aquarium, San Antonio, TX (1975)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Wild Animal Park, Escondido, CA (1977)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Zoo, San Diego, CA (1977)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Zoological Gardens, San Francisco, CA (1977)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Seattle Aquarium, Seattle, WA (1979)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca Park Zoo, Rochester, NY (1979)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John G. Shedd Aquarium, Chicago, IL (1978)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo Zoological Gardens, Toledo, OH (1976)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa Zoological Park, Tulsa, OK (1976)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Public Aquarium, Vancouver, B.C., Canada (1975)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(rated by special request)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Vilas Park Zoo, Madison, WI (1976)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Park Zoo, Portland, OR (1974)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: Individuals Interviewed

Mr. Timothy Anderson  
Executive Director  
Boston Zoological Society  
Boston, Massachusetts  
4 October 1979

Mr. Earl Baysinger  
Special Assistant to the Deputy Director  
USFWS/DOI  
Washington, D.C.  
[Former Assistant Chief, Office of Endangered Species and International Activity, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife]  
21 January 1980

Mr. William Conway  
General Director  
New York Zoological Park  
Bronx, New York  
[Board Member of World Wildlife Fund and Council Member of IUCN]  
22 January 1980

Mr. Toby Cooper  
Defenders of Wildlife  
Washington, D.C.  
24 January 1980

Ms. Nicole Duplaix  
Director  
Traffic (U.S.A.)  
1601 Connecticut Avenue N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20009  
[Former Editor of the International Zoo Yearbook]  
2 August 1979

Mr. John Grandy  
Defenders of Wildlife  
Washington, D.C.  
24 January 1980

Mr. Stefan Graham  
Director  
Druid Hill Park Zoo  
Baltimore, Maryland  
[Former Director, Salisbury, Maryland Zoo]  
17 October 1979

Ms. Karen Hensel  
Curator of Education  
New York Aquarium  
Coney Island, New York  
31 July 1979
APPENDIX C: Individuals Interviewed

Mr. Warren Iliff  
Director  
Washington Park Zoo  
Portland, Oregon  
[Former Executive Director, Friends of the National Zoo]  
4 October 1979

Dr. F. Wayne King  
Director  
Florida State Museum  
Gainesville, Florida  
[Former Director of Zoology & Curator of Conservation, New York Zoological Society. Also Assistant Deputy, Survival Service Commission (SSC), International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN)]  
14 February 1980

Ms. Phyllis Moore  
Curator of Education  
Houston Zoological Park  
Houston, Texas  
[AAZPA's Humane Association Liaison]  
20 March 1980

Dr. Phillip Ogilvie  
[Former Director, Oklahoma City Zoo; Former Director, Washington Park Zoo, Portland Oregon; Former Director, Metro Toronto, Canada Zoo]  
Washington, D.C.  
3 August 1979

Mrs. Cecile B. O'Marr  
[Former Field Representative, Defenders of Wildlife]  
Washington, D.C.  
30 July 1979

Theodore H. Reed, D.V.M.  
Director  
National Zoological Park  
Smithsonian Institution  
Washington, D.C. 20008  
3 August 1979

Dale F. Schwindaman, D.V.M.  
Senior Staff Veterinarian  
Animal Care Division  
USDA/APHIS  
Hyattsville, Maryland  
24 January 1980
APPENDIX C: Individuals Interview

Mr. George Steel
Executive Director
ZOOACT
1320 Nineteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.
31 July 1979

Mr. Robert O. Wagner
Executive Director
American Association of Zoological Parks & Aquariums
Oglebay Park
Wheeling, West Virginia
19 February 1980

Mrs. William G. Whitehurst
2427 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C.
18 October 1979
APPENDIX D: Sample Letter Sent to National Welfare Organizations

Dear ________________:

I am preparing a paper on zoos and aquariums in America and would appreciate any information you could give me regarding your organization's involvement with these institutions. I am interested in such things as: any official statements of policy your organization has made concerning captive wild animals; a brief description of any on-going inspection programs your organization may conduct of these institutions; minimum standards you might have drawn up for the housing and handling of captive wild animals; your organization's stand for or against zoo related legislation; and copies of your organization's publications dealing with zoos generally or describing conditions in zoos and aquariums that your field representatives have encountered.

I should be happy to pay for any duplicating and mailing costs you might incur in filling this request. While I am eager to have as much information as possible, I realize that you have many pressing concerns, and I shall be grateful for any information at all you can provide on this subject. Please let me know also if you can suggest other people and organizations I might contact in this regard. Thank you very much for your assistance.

Yours very truly,

(Mrs.) Anna Fesmire

Replies received from:

Mr. Dennis White
Director of Animal Protection
American Humane
5351 S. Roslyn Street
Englewood, Colorado 80110

Ms. Cheryl Mouras
Investigator
Animal Protection Institute of America
5894 South Land Park Drive
Sacramento, California 95822

Ms. Kathryn J. Szymanski
Administrative Assistant
Friends of Animals
11 West 60th Street
New York, N.Y. 10023

Ms. Sheryl Sternenberg
Publications Secretary
Animal Welfare Institute
P.O. Box 3650
Washington, D.C. 20007

Ms. Cheryl Mouras
Investigator
Animal Protection Institute of America
5894 South Land Park Drive
Sacramento, California 95822

Ms. Eleanor Seiling
President
United Action for Animals, Inc.
205 East 42nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10017

Ms. Helen Jones
President
Society for Animal Rights, Inc.
421 South State Street
Clarks Summit, Pennsylvania 18411
SELECTED REFERENCES

All references to the Newsletters of The HSUS, other Animal Welfare Organizations, and AAZPA are cited within the text.


SELECTED REFERENCES


SELECTED REFERENCES


SELECTED REFERENCES


SELECTED REFERENCES


SELECTED REFERENCES


SELECTED REFERENCES


(1970) Care of Animals Used for Research, Experimentation, Exhibition, or Held For Sale as Pets. House of Representatives: Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Livestock and Grain, 91st (2nd), 8 & 9 July.


SELECTED REFERENCES