Getting Acquainted

In the last issue of The Humane Society News, I discussed several areas in which The HSUS was broadening its animal welfare programs and intensifying its efforts to prevent cruelty and suffering to animals. Now we have filled the positions in which new staff was needed to effectively carry forward our goals and objectives. Briefly, I wish to identify these persons to you.

Anita Coburn now serves as Director of Education for The HSUS. Anita holds a M.A. Ed. from the University of Missouri and has completed course work for an Ed.D. In her capacity as Director of Education, she will coordinate our Kind and NAAHE programs as well as establish new liaisons with state boards of education throughout the country.

Our new Director of Public Relations is Betsy Dribben-Gutman. Prior to joining The HSUS staff, she served in a similar capacity for the past several years with the League of Women Voters of the U.S. She is a graduate of Wheaton College in Norton, Mass., and has completed course work for a Master of Science degree in journalism at the Boston University School of Public Communications.

Julia Rovner has been engaged as special program assistant, working primarily in the area of communications. She is a recent graduate of the University of Michigan holding a B.A. degree in political science. Julia has an extensive background as a newspaper reporter and managing editor. Also serving as a special program assistant is Bob Baker, who distinguished himself as author of The Misuse of Drugs in Horse Racing, a book that has had significant impact in exposing the cruelties associated with pre-race drug-ging of horses. Bob holds an A.B. degree from Cardinal Glennon College, St. Louis, Missouri.

Jeanne Roush has been added to our staff to assist Sue Pressman in her work in the area of captive wildlife. She holds a B.A. degree in anthropology from Ohio State University and a M.A. degree in anthropology from the University of Oklahoma.

Mark Solomon, recently awarded an M.A. degree in physical anthropology from Yale University, and holding a B.A. degree from Dartmouth College where he graduated cum laude, will serve as The HSUS laboratory animal specialist. In this capacity, he will work closely with Dr. Andrew Rowan of the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems in identifying and challenging the unnecessary cruelty and suffering inflicted upon laboratory animals.

Another recent graduate, Natasha Atkins, with a Masters of Forest Science degree from Yale University and a B.A. with a major in anthropology from the University of Washington, was broadening its animal welfare programs and intensifying its efforts to prevent cruelty and suffering to animals.
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John A. Hoyt
An Ounce of Prevention

When the time rolls around for your dog to get its yearly shots, make sure your veterinarian adds a new one to the list.

In addition to his or her rabies and distemper boosters, your dog should also be protected against a new disease called canine parvovirus.

The disease, which was first recognized by scientists at Cornell University’s Skakker Institute in 1978, is a viral infection which is very contagious. It can be transmitted by contact with contaminated material such as the feces of an infected dog. You can bring the virus home with even a minuscule bit of fecal matter on the sole of your shoe, so even if your dog is kept mostly in its own yard and has no contact with other dogs, it should be vaccinated against parvovirus.

Puppies are most vulnerable to the disease and the mortality rate for them is high. Older dogs, with proper treatment, can survive the disease. However, even a successful recovery can leave aftereffects such as a weakened heart, so this is definitely a case where an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

If your dog shows symptoms of the disease—depression or listlessness followed by a lack of appetite, vomiting, and bloody diarrhea, you should seek veterinary help immediately. Chances are it’s not parvo virus, but if it is, early treatment vastly increases the animal’s chances for survival.

Because the disease is so new, pharmaceutical companies which develop and manufacture vaccines were caught off guard. This summer, many dog owners were near panic because of the scarcity of the only FDA approved vaccine for parvovirus, manufactured by an Omaha, Nebraska firm. Many vets who could not obtain the canine vaccine began giving dogs the vaccine for cat distemper, which was thought to be of some use in preventing canine parvovirus, since the viruses in each case are similar. (Parvovirus cannot be given to cats, however, nor are humans affected by it.) Use of the feline vaccine should be regarded as an interim measure only, because its effect lasts no more than 3 months.

The drug company now reports that it is able to fill nearly all of its orders, so if your dog has not been vaccinated yet, or if it received the feline vaccine, it is probably time to ask your vet about the animal vaccinated. If your dog did receive the feline vaccine, you should walk at least six weeks before having it vaccinated with the canine version.

Irish at Home: As reported in the Summer issue of The News, Irish, the polar bear who spent 14 years in a small cage at the Naval Arctic Research Laboratory in Barrow, Alaska, has found a new home. Shown here in his spacious "habitat" at the Roger Williams Zoo in Providence, Rhode Island, Irish is reported to be adjusting well to the extra freedom and his companions, two young female bears. Sue Pressman, HSUS' Director of Wildlife Protection, has made plans to move the Alaska facility closed, leaving the laboratory bear homeless.

First in the Nation: In late July, Florida Governor Robert Graham signed into law the first state statute requiring the neutering of both dogs and cats that are adopted from animal control agencies and humane societies. Although a few such ordinances exist on the local level, and California and Illinois have bills covering either one or the other species, no other state has passed a bill so comprehensive in its effects. Shown with the Governor is Belita Morton, state legislative coordinator of the Florida Federation of Humane Societies, who worked tirelessly to guide the bill through the legislature, and Bill Flynn, the state representative who introduced the bill. Don Coburn, then director of HSUS' Southeast Regional Office, testified at hearings in both the House and Senate and consulted with staff and party leaders while working for passage of the bill.

Two Societies Receive Accreditation

Congratulations are due to two animal welfare groups that recently were accredited by HSUS. The Humane Society of Wichita County, Wichita Falls, Texas, and the Humane Society of Sarasota County, Inc., Sarasota, Florida, received their Accreditation Certificates after meeting stringent requirements covering shelter facilities, education programs, staff training, and field operations.

The Humane Society of Sarasota County, operating out of their recently built shelter, and the female management of Elizabeth Rae Snow, was particularly commended for their active education program in the local schools, in-service workshops for teachers, and employee training programs. They are doing an excellent job in promoting responsible pet ownership in the community.

The Humane Society of Wichita Falls is somewhat unique in that all the staff except two weekday and two weekend kennel cleaners are volunteers. Working with Executive Director Tony DeStefano, the society last year managed to raise enough money to build a new "Animal Reclamation Center" where dogs and cats picked up by Wichita Falls animal control warden shelters are detained and made available for adoption or reclamation by owners. The society is known throughout the community because of their excellent education programs.

These societies join 15 other shelter and education groups currently accredited under HSUS' program. In the three years since the program was launched, more than 40 groups have applied for accreditation. Each receives a personal inspection and evaluation by one of our accreditation associates. Although many have not yet met the standards, their efforts to reach that goal have resulted in significant improvements in animal treatment and outreach programs.
Dog bites are:
1) A national health problem;
2) Apparently on the increase;
3) Often preventable by education and common sense;
4) All of the above.

If you answered "All of the above," give yourself a bone. The fact that some dog bites are news to no one but the immediate community—problem—it is one of the nation's most reported health problems—has seemed to escape the attention of the public as well as government officials and the health community.

"Dog bites don't really sound like a health problem; it's just something people seem to accept," said Dr. William Winkler, a veterinarian from the U.S. Center for Disease Control in Atlanta. Winkler has studied the incidence of dog bites and the problems associated with them for several years.

"My perception is that it is an increasing problem, and that its importance and magnitude has not been fully recognized," Winkler said.

While nationwide statistics are not available on the subject, Winkler estimated that each year some one million dog bites which require medical attention are reported. Adding to that the minor bites which are treated at home and other unreported bites, the public's accepting attitude towards dog bites would seem a bit out of place.

When one considers the vast numbers of unreported bites—owners who don't want to admit they've been bitten by their own dogs; neighbors who would rather 'keep the peace' than call in officials to report the next-door dog; or those whose bites never get medical attention—"the number of bites which occur each year may be as much as double the number reported." Most statistics are available bear out some striking characteristics of dog bites:

1) Most dogs that bite people are owned, rather than strays. A 1978 study by the Prince William County (VA) Department of Animal Control reported that 75.6% of the animal control cases reported were from owned pets.

2) A majority of victims were familiar with the dogs that bit them. A Tompkins County (NY) Health Department 1979 report found that 60% of the dog bite victims either were owners of or acquainted with the animals that bit them.

3) Most victims are women, most are under age 20, and most are under age 10. In Tompkins County, 77% of facial wounds were suffered by children under age 10.

4) Bites from large dogs are reported more frequently than bites from smaller dogs. In the Tompkins County study, 52% of the biters were large breeds, mostly German shepherds and shepherd crosses. Medium and small breeds together comprised only about 38%, while the rest were unknown.

5) Of course this doesn't mean small dogs don't bite, too. However, people may not report these bites as often because they tend to be less serious. In a study done by officials in Palm Beach County (FL), poodles bit more than Irish setters. The Toronto Humane Society held 125 dogs for rabies quarantine during a recent year, and only seven were Dobermans.

6) Why Does It Happen?

There is little question that when a dog bites a person, it is the dog that is punished, whether by being put in rabies quarantine, muzzled, or even put to sleep. While such things must often be done in order to protect human health and welfare, is biting really the dog's fault?

Even with the large number of dogs that do bite once, or more than once, there are millions more that never sink a tooth into human flesh, and many that even perform acts of heroism to protect or save a human friend. What traits do biters have that other dogs don't, and how did they get them? What situations might cause an otherwise normal dog to attack a person?

Dr. Michael Fox, director of the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems, says that part of the increase in dog bites in recent years is attributable to the fact that there are both more dogs to bite, and more people to get bitten, all crowded into less space by urbanization. However, he feels much of the blame for the pervasiveness of the problem lies with ill-educated people and faulty breeding practices.

Dr. Fox says, "You may convince the dog you are afraid—something you want to avoid to a safe place, such as a nearby car. If the dog is growling and staring hard, be prepared to defend yourself. Pick up a stick or wrap a jacket around your arm to fend it off. If you can, call its bluff. Yell 'sit,' 'stay,' and 'go home.' You might convince the dog you are the stronger one in the situation. The best way to avoid being bitten is to avoid getting yourself into a situation where a dog is likely to bite. For instance, never approach a dog through a fence to pet a strange dog. Never approach a mother dog with puppies. Never try to snatch a stick, bone, or food from a dog. Never try to pet a strange dog that's tied up with no one around. Never try to intervene in a dogfight with your bare hand. Finally, never put your hand through a fence to pet a strange dog. If you are around small children around, be sure they know these rules also.

Breeders—Are They Also to Blame?

Making people more aware of dog behavior, however, is only half the problem. The irresponsible or uncontrolled breeding of dogs by puppy mills and backyard breeders for fun or profit is another major source of trouble, with no emphasis on quality control—is pro-
Continued from the President's Perspective

biological anthropology from Har­vard College, has been added to our staff as wildlife biologist. In this capacity, she will direct our programs to monitor and conserve wildlife including the very important areas of trapping and predator control.

Amanda Hardy, a graduate of Wesleyan University in Middletown, Connecticut, with a B.A. degree in Science in Society Pro­gram, has joined the staff of the Na­tional Association for the Advance­ment of Humane Education as an assistant editor of the Humane Edu­cation magazine. Kathy Savyesky, editor of the magazine, has recently assumed the position of Director of NAAHE. Mr. John Dommers, for­merly the Director of NAAHE, has assumed responsibilities as Multi­Media Coordinator for The HSUS.

Donald Coburn, field director of non-captive wildlife, has joined the staff of The HSUS. Donald Coburn, field director of The HSUS Southeast Re­gional Office, has also joined our headquarters staff. He will serve both as Director of Development, as­isting Paul Irwin, and coordinator of state legislative activities. Coburn provided outstanding leadership in both these areas through the South­east Regional Office.

Mr. Bernard Weller, also trans­ferred from the Southeast Regional Office, replaces Mr. Rick Collord as


cruelty investigator for the Gulf States Regional Office.

Obviously, this brief description of these various persons and their work cannot begin to acquaint you with the enthusiasm, dedication and qualifications they bring to the work and programs of The HSUS. They represent the strengthening of a staff of many other able and ded­i­cated people enabling The HSUS to make ever greater strides in seeking to prevent cruelty and suffering to animals.

I am confident each of you joins me in being grateful for the talent and commitment of these many fine persons who so effectively serve the cause of animal welfare.

Inbreeding causes problems because, by reducing the gene pool, it increases the chance for hereditary traits to be passed on. Inbreed­ing is commonly blamed for the large increase in cases of hip dys­plasia among members of the larger breeds. It also may account for the growing number of high-strung, ner­vous, or too-aggressive dogs often implicated in bite incidents.

Where Do We Go From Here?

It is clear that we cannot deal with the dog bite problem by pretending it doesn’t exist, or by punishing the animals who may merely be acting out of instinct.

Attacking the dog bite problem is a task for breeders, owners, animal control workers, and even potential victims. Breeding must be done with more awareness of the temperament and emotional stability of the pups being produced. Owners must restrain and control their own pets, so others are not needlessly endangered. Everyone—a potential vic­tims—should learn a little about the ways to avoid being bitten. And animal control workers must both enforce laws requiring that pets be held under control and help educate the public about the dog bite situation.

With a little education, understand­ing dog bites,” says Fox, “and a renewed sense of responsibility, the majority of friendly and harmless dogs need not suffer the disgrace of the ignominious reputation earned by those dogs who do “bite the hand that feeds them.”

A very special record album is now available to HSUS members—Paul Winter’s Callings. The Paul Winter Consort, well-known to jazz and blues fans, has combined their own music with the voices of whales, dolphins, seals, and other sea creatures to produce Callings. The double album tells of the mystic journey of a sea lion pup during its first year of life. Included is a 16-page booklet of photographs, story narrative and educational information about each sea mammal. The album is available for $15, plus $2.00 postage and handling charge.

This album was recorded with the digital process, for the most extraordinary sound quality possible on a record.
Chico is a chimpanzee. He lives in a zoo in a large metropolitan area. His life in the zoo is not exactly like what it would have been in the wild, but it is remarkably similar.

No bars separate Chico from the visitors who come to see him. He lives in a large, open area with grass on the ground, trees to climb on and swing from, and rocks to play on and hide behind when he's tired of people watching him.

Chico does not lead a lonely life. Occupying his miniature jungle habitat with him are a large assortment of siblings, aunts, uncles, and mere acquaintances. His social situation is similar to that of his relatives in Africa.

People who come to see Chico have opportunities for learning as well as entertainment. Separated from the animals by a clever architectural design, they feel they could practically reach out and touch the chimps. They can't, however, which protects both the people from the chimpanzees and vice versa. What the people can do is watch the chimps interact, and read the carefully designed behavioral signs that surround the chimp exhibit. By the time they leave, most visitors have learned something new about one of man's closest relatives.

Jimmy is also a chimpanzee. He also lives in a place called a zoo. Others would call it a jail.

Jimmy's home is a small squallid cage. He has no room to play, and no one to play with. When visitors come to see Jimmy, he is often sitting in the middle of his cage, doing nothing. But sometimes the boredom and frustration get to Jimmy. He jumps up and begins shaking the bars on his cage, raping and screaming furiously. Some visitors are frightened by these outbursts. Others think this pathetic reaction is funny.

In fact, people think many of the things Jimmmy does are funny. They laugh as his owner feeds him cola and candy, or when he smokes a cigar. After all, if his owner doesn't care about providing him with proper housing or nutrition, why should they?

Visitors who come to see Jimmy can learn something about chimpanzees except that they can be so easily exploited by man. Those who are not entertained by his exploits may feel depressed at the obvious cruelty. Impressive children may come away with the feeling that it is perfectly acceptable to capture wild animals so humans can laugh or gape at them.

Yet the homes of both these animals fall under the catch-all term "zoo." But what is a zoo? Is there ever a humane justification for keeping animals in cages to be poked, prodded, and gaped at? Is this any way to foster a respect for animals? These are not new questions. And they don't have easy answers. In order to address the problems posed by the huge difference in quality among the nation's zoos, HSUS, in 1971, created a department of Wildlife Protection. Sue Pressman, a highly experienced professional who had spent the previous seven years as Supervisor of Animal Health for three Massachusetts zoos, was brought in to head up the program.

In her nine years with HSUS, Pressman has visited nearly 400 zoos all over the country. Some of her inspections came as a result of complaints from citizens who worried that animals in their local facilities were receiving substandard care. Some inspections came at the request of the zoo officials themselves, who hoped expert advice and suggestions might convince tightfisted municipal governments to allocate more money, or who were simply trying to upgrade their operations.

According to Pressman, a major thrust of many good zoos is the study of animal behavior, which is the first step in conserving wildlife. In order to study wildlife properly, however, it is necessary to closely approximate an animal's natural environment. A difficult task made even more difficult when you are trying to keep a polar bear in San Diego or a gorilla in Providence.

Some zoos, says Pressman, have been very successful at duplicating environments. By applying knowledge obtained from field studies of animals in the wild, zoos can design exhibits which provide for the physical and social needs of their animals.

Thus, behavioral studies done in captive situations can sometimes yield data which correlates well with studies done in the wild.

Of course there is still much we don't know or understand about wild animals and their needs in the wild as well as in captivity. That is no excuse, however, for not providing care as up-to-date as possible. "While we don't know, for example, how much water a polar bear needs to have to swim in, we do know that he needs to swim," says Pressman. It is these kinds of studies that separate the good zoos from the bad ones. It is no coincidence, therefore, that the survival of the animals, but the desire to provide them with environments as close to what they had in the wild as possible.

Many people take zoos for granted. Like the used car lot and the backyard barbeque, they are regarded as simply another fixture of modern American culture.

But taking zoos for granted can be dangerous because it may allow the public into accepting substandard facilities as the norm. Presently, The HSUS is the only animal welfare organization in the nation which operates a full-time zoo program. Our emphasis is not only on upgrading adequate zoos and closing bad ones, but on instilling in zoo officials a sense of morality towards the animals. That is unique in the animal welfare community.

"The zoo problem is terribly complex," Pressman says, "but right now we're the only ones outside the zoo community who are working totally on the animals' behalf. It's taken us a long time to be able to recognize the problems, but now that we've isolated them, it won't be nearly so hard to solve them."

A very basic difficulty is that too many facilities which keep captive wildlife call themselves zoos. In fact, most zoos seem to fit one of three types: the true zoological garden or park; the municipal menagerie, whose habitats have been obliterated by man. Careful research can ultimately benefit not only the animals at that zoo, but animals in other zoos as well as in the wild. Finally, educational and outreach programs can help foster the respect that wild animals deserve and familiarize the general public with the important role those animals play in the planet's ecosystems.

First rate zoological parks are run by professional administrators with an eye to the future rather than the present. Although a few of the better zoos are municipally run, most are controlled by a zoological society, a group which sets its priorities in terms of the animals rather than its budget.

Zoological parks employ professionally trained personnel in a varie...
ty of fields. Animals are cared for by zoologists and veterinarians. Professional security personnel make sure the animals are protected from the public and vice versa. Educators develop programs for everyone from grade schoolers to graduate students. Some good zoos have facilities which are not open to the public, but are important for the function they try to fulfill. The National Zoo in Washington, D.C., maintains a breeding farm for endangered species in nearby Front Royal, Virginia. The Bronx Zoo in New York owns an island off the coast of North Carolina. Nearly all good zoos maintain outreach programs which involve the community in the zoo's activities. These programs range from providing opportunities for college students to earn credits doing work at the zoo, to sponsoring festivals or animal art shows.

“A good outreach program adds to the exhibits,” maintains Pressman. “More and more, zoos are finding themselves playing a variety of cultural roles in their own communities—making zoos more meaningful to the public.”

Municipal Menageries

The vast majority of zoos, however, cannot measure up to the complex demands put on them. Many municipalities maintain facilities they call zoos, but which are really just random collections of animals kept in cages. Although these animals may be well-fed, adequately housed, and properly cared for, these facilities lack a philosophy or proper direction. In many cases, these “zoos” were begun by accident, perhaps by a park's person who felt a zoo would be a nice thing to have, and acquisition of animals was usually haphazard at best. Hampered by lack of funds and professional planning, many municipal zoos have no more right to exist than the most filthy roadside “feed the bear” parks, yet because they can look all right, city administrators allow them to continue.

Using taxpayers’ funds, animals are exhibited with no guiding impression, and exhibits are seldom educational. Keeping these animals in cages with no consideration for conservation or education is of benefit to no one, and constitutes merely city-run prisons for animals.

Many of the zoos in this category, according to Pressman, could be helped by bringing in professional planners and making some changes. Often, when asked for suggestions, she recommends that the facilities reduce the number and variety of animals and concentrate on fewer good exhibits.

“We felt back in 1971 that it doesn’t matter what you exhibit, as long as you exhibit it well,” Pressman says. The idea has spread.

One example of this is at the Cincinnati Zoo. There, according to Pressman, people wait in line not to see the gorillas or tigers, but the bug exhibit.

“It’s really amazing,” she says. “They have a butterfly aviary, movies showing the life cycle of insects, and giant blow-up pictures.”

Roadside Menageries

In 1978, The HSUS began receiving complaints about a roadside zoo in Boiling Springs, Pennsylvania. Pressman decided to go have a look for herself.

“It was really awful,” she remembers. “It was dark and full of muck and mire. It was so bad that the swill ran from the outside into the cages and then back out again.”

Pressman said animals were running around loose inside the facility and many were in need of medical care.

The security at the facility was so lax, the owners freely admitted that on at least one occasion, vandals had broken in and shot some animals with bows and arrows.

Pressman said a few recommendations as to how the “zoo” could be improved, but to no avail. While the owners continued to stall instead of making needed improvements, Pressman continued her campaign.

This August, HSUS investigator Bernie Weller made a follow-up trip to Boiling Springs. Weller said the facility was still full of debris, and animals were still running loose, but this time there was a difference. Posted outside was a small paper sign which merely read Closed Due To Pressure. Weller said the owner told him she was sick and tired of being hassled, mainly by Sue Pressman. Some of the facility’s animals had already been sold to legitimate zoos. Others were in the process of being placed.

The closing of an inexusable facility like the Boiling Springs zoo is a victory for The HSUS’ zoo program. Unfortunately, however, there are many more like it—estimates range somewhere around 1,100. These roadside menageries—calling them zoos is a mark of respect they do not merit—lurk everywhere, operated either by money-hungry “entrepreneurs” who use the presence of animals to entice the public to their gas station, gift shop, or hotel, or by ignorant amateurs who think it “fun” to have a few wild animals around.

The term roadside menagerie encompasses everything from a person who charges tourists to feed a single animal in a cage, to elaborate “parks” with extensive advertising along the highways on which they are located. All roadside menageries, however, lack the same thing—justification for existence.

Many menageries exhibit similar characteristics. Some of these include:

Amateur Operators

Don’t let the fancy outfits fool you. Virtually every owner and operator of roadside menageries lacks the knowledge or expertise to properly meet even the most basic survival needs of wild animals in captivity. To make matters worse, many operators don’t care, either, and view their animals the same way other businesspeople view inanimate inventory.

Improper Nutrition

Even experts are not sure of the nutritional needs of some wild animals. Yet we do know that animals need more to be healthy than simply a diet of soda and candy. Many menageries subsist on whatever is cheapest for the owner to feed them, with no consideration for animals with special nutritional needs.

Substandard Housing and Care

The horror stories about the conditions under which many of these animals “live” is practically endless. The wolf whose cage consisted of bare for walls, floor, and ceiling; the lion whose cage was so small it could scarcely turn around; the bear whose cage was so low it could not stand up completely on its hind legs. Animals under this type of stress, with no outlet for exercise or companionship, frequently exhibit bizarre reactions. One chimp in a menagerie became so bored that it pulled out all of the hair on one of its arms and legs. With no professionals to spot irregular behavior, sick animals often suffer until it is nearly too late before veterinary help is brought in.

As cruel as these menageries are to the animals (Pressman calls them a waste of wildlife) they are equally cruel to the public, whose natural curiosity about animals is exploited by clever opportunists. Instead of instilling a respect for animals and a belief in the need for their conservation, menageries can actually prove a negative learning experience.

“Menageries evoke the wrong sensitivities,” says Pressman. “Either you come out feeling brutalized, or else you’re anti-zoo. Children may come out with the impression that animals are merely something you put in a box to stare at.”

Legislation to Protect Zoo Animals

Many roadside and municipal menageries should be closed. Yet recognizing a problem and bringing about a solution are two different things. A major barrier to helping animals has been the ineffectiveness of anti-
A major thrust of professional zoos is to educate the public about animals, which is what the insect display at the Cincinnati Zoo does. The aim of most roadside menageries is to sell something, using the animal as a come-on.

cruelty and other legislation, both on state and federal levels. The basic problem with state legislation is its vagueness and a lack of uniformity. Too often, cruel operators and owners are prosecuted and then acquitted because the state's laws are too vague to obtain a conviction.

Congress, recognizing this problem, added amendments to the federal Animal Welfare Act in 1970 to cover and protect zoo animals. In ten years since the passage of the amendments, however, enforcement has unfortunately been disappointing.

The act, which covers most of the warm-blooded animals in zoos (cold-blooded animals, rodents, and birds are excluded from the act's jurisdiction), requires exhibitors of wild animals to meet specific minimum standards for such things as food, water, sanitation, shelter, and veterinary care. These standards, however, are vaguely worded, leaving too wide an area of interpretation for inspectors. Worse, federal inspectors have used the vaguely worded, leaving too wide an area of interpretation for inspectors.

The Animal Welfare Act is not the only piece of federal legislation that protects zoo animals. The Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act protect endangered species by requiring facilities to have a permit to obtain, lend, or sell a member of any species on the endangered species list. The HSUS routinely reviews applications to determine if the facility requesting the animal has a record of being a responsible exhibitor, and if the species as a whole will benefit from breeding or research programs the facility might operate. If the application does not meet the above criteria, the agency charged with the enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act.

On many occasions, clearly substandard facilities have been given passing grades by USDA inspectors. Owners of these offensive places have used the USDA reports as justification for not making needed improvements. In licensing these inexcusable places, the U.S. government has actually sanctioned their existence.

Besides the problems of vague wording, uneven enforcement, and too many inspectors who seem more interested in the financial benefits of their positions, the HSUS also recognizes that "inhumane conditions in the zoo, when seen by an impressionable child, can result in a future predator of animals." The HSUS also recognizes that "inhumane conditions in the zoo, when seen by an impressionable child, can result in a future predator of animals." Since 1975, the HSUS has had a written policy on zoos. This policy recognizes the "unique opportunity for conservation and wildlife education," and the need of the zoo as a "survival center for endangered species that would otherwise be extinct." The HSUS also recognizes that "a facility in your area.

We have found that our inspections and ratings can be of great use to the zoo we inspect. It can inspire competition among zoos, pushing them towards improvements, and can instill a civic pride when a good rating is achieved. When the Baltimore, Maryland zoo managed to pull itself from a #3 rating to a #1 rating, Sue Freeman was given the key to the city. In addition to inspecting and rating zoos, The HSUS zoo program concentrates on working with organizations such as USDA and the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums (AAZPA). By promoting good relations, concerned groups can work together to solve common problems.

There is much that still needs to be accomplished, however. In the months ahead, the HSUS will work to increase public awareness of what constitutes a good zoo as well as how to recognize a pointless menagerie. We will encourage local humane societies to get involved with the zoos and menageries in their areas, especially by educating themselves and their citizens as to the needs of wild animals in captivity. Finally, we will continue to push for better enforcement of the state and federal wildlife laws to protect zoo animals. To bring about our goals of making America's zoos the best in the world, we need your help. Visit the facility in your area. If it is a first rate zoological park, it probably has a zoo society through which you can work to keep up its high standards. If it is a more than a menagerie, contact local legislators and urge that it be closed. The following checklist can help you decide which category your zoo falls into:

- Did you learn anything about wildlife or its habitat from your visit?
- Were the exhibits and grounds clean? Did the animals appear clean and healthy?
- Were the exhibits interesting and informative and did the animals have opportunities for activity (i.e. could climbing animals climb and swimming animals swim?)
- Did the animals have places to hide from view in their exhibits, or were they constantly exposed to public scrutiny?
- Were there keepers or other zoo staff members or volunteer workers new bumper stickers (see page 16)? With your help, we can relegate these establishments to their own endangered species list, while at the same time encouraging the respect for wildlife that it deserves and emphasizing its importance to all life, including ourselves.
The Campaign Against the Draize Test—A Personal View
by Andrew Rowan, Associate Director of the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems

The recent campaign against the Draize test (which assesses eye irritancy in albino rabbits), the brainchild of a New York English teacher, Henry Spira, has demonstrated clearly what can be achieved through coordinated and carefully orchestrated efforts of a coalition of humane organizations. Spira has used the tactic of developing single-issue coalitions before and there were a number of features which pointed to the Draize eye irritancy test as being the most suitable target for the next coalition campaign.

First, the test has been criticized widely in the scientific literature. Although it provides a crude index of human eye irritancy, its reproducibility and reliability is highly questionable.

Second, the test is aimed at detecting a specific effect—namely, irritancy—the initial reaction of which occurs at the cells on the body (eye) surface. Therefore, one should be able to identify the initial cell reaction leading to irritation and to develop a cell culture test. Professor David Smyth, in his book Alternatives to Animal Experiments, notes that there is "a good case for a major attempt to find an alternative to the Draize test." (Note: Professor Smyth was a leading British advocate of animal research.)

Third, the test produces immediately visible and horrible effects in the rabbit eye when an irritant substance is tested. In addition, the Draize test is commonly and routinely performed on cosmetic and household products. As the cosmetic industry is now discovering, the public does not like to see the results of these tests suffering so that a multi-million dollar company can market a new mascara, even if it is slightly less irritant than the previous formulation.

During the initial stages of the campaign, now supported by over 400 humane groups, Spira established a dialogue with Revlon in an effort to get them to use some of their profits and/or leverage with the rest of the industry to start looking for alternatives to the Draize test.

At Revlon's request, we submitted a formal proposal outlining the details of what we hoped they would do for us (and for the rabbits). Specifically, we asked Revlon to approach the Cosmetics, Toiletries and Fragrances Association (CTFA) with a proposal that the CTFA organize a collaborative effort by the cosmetic industry to develop a non-animal alternative to the Draize test. We also asked Revlon to demonstrate their commitment to the idea by promising financial support to the tune of one hundredth of one percent of their gross sales (approximately $170,000). Revlon responded with their now famous statement that they had forwarded the proposal to the CTFA's committee on pharmacology and toxicology, but that "neither Revlon, nor any other single company, can give any assurance as to what action, if any, this committee...may take on this matter, except to say that it will receive consideration." Needless to say, neither The HSUS nor the other coalition members were satisfied with this response.

At this point, a letter-writing campaign was started and The HSUS distributed a Close-Up Report on the Draize test to over 200,000 individuals and organizations. While the companies were obviously discomfited by the mail, the real turning point was a full-page advertisement in the New York Times, taken out by The HSUS, which focused specifically on Revlon.

Revlon lashed out at the unfairness of the advertisement, arguing that their rabbits receive tender loving care before and during the tests. However, Avon, with 22% of the market, produced a much more constructive response of their own. At about the same time, the CTFA set up a special Task Force to investigate more humane alternatives and the potential for developing a non-animal irritancy test. They have also organized a workshop of scientists, including me, to discuss the current state of the art and identify promising lines of research. The Consumer Product Safety Commission established a 90-day moratorium on Draize Testing while they investigated the feasibility of using anesthetics (local) to eliminate immediate suffering.

There is still a long way to go before we see research into an alternative to the Draize test, but the campaign has already had noteworthy success. I consider our success to be due to three factors:

First, the initial campaign was based on a very specific issue involving obvious suffering and widespread criticism from both animal welfare advocates and scientists. Furthermore, virtually no research had been attempted on an alternative although prospects were good, if not excellent.

Second, and very important, the campaign was supported actively and vigorously by a large number of organizations and individuals.

Third, the organizing abilities of Henry Spira and his dedication to the campaign were another vital element in their success. I consider our success to be due to these three factors.

Bo-Tree calendars portray the many characteristics of animals, and we know the Humane Society of the United States works hard to make the environment better for all animal life.

We are happy to once again donate a portion of the proceeds from our 1980 calendar sales to HSUS, and will also make a donation from our 1981 Bless The Beasts, In The Company of Cats, Doggone!, Horses and Whales and Friends calendars.

These beautiful 12" x 12" full-color calendars have lots of writing room, and they make great gifts for friends, too. So, save money and help HSUS at the same time. Help us help HSUS.

Order Now
- Purchase 1 calendar; just $6.50 postpaid
- Buy 3 or more; just $5.50 each, postpaid (This represents more than a 15% discount)
- Let us mail calendars for you to friends. Enclose names and addresses; we'll do the rest; $6.50 postpaid

Enclosed is $ . Please send the following calendars to: Name _____________________________________________
Address _____________________________________________
City ____________________________ State __ Zip ________________________________________________________________________________________________

[ ] I've enclosed addresses of friends and a list of calendars I'd like sent to them.

Clip and mail to: Bo-Tree Productions, Dept. HS 1817 Union Street San Francisco, CA 94123

Animals are proud, loving, independent, magnificent and often in need of our help.
Spread The Word

PAMPHLETS

Each of the pamphlets in the "ANIMALS" series introduces you to an animal welfare issue, tells what you can do to help and what HSUS is doing.

GREETINGS

Order our Christmas cards before November 1st and you'll have them in time to use this year—or order to be ready for next Christmas. The black and white artwork is bordered in green and gold, with "Seasons Greetings" printed inside. Cards come in boxes of 25, with envelopes, at $5 per box.

STICKERS AND DECALS

Printed on vinyl in bright colors to 1/10", 50/$4, 1000/$50.

FLYER CARDS

Handout flyers to get the message across quickly and effectively. Order 100 for just $2.00.

POSTERS

Brand new from HSUS, these big (17" x 23") colorful Leash and License posters explain the basics of responsible pet ownership. The License poster includes space to fill in information on how to get a dog licensed in your area.

HOW TO ORDER

List the items you want with code numbers, the quantity of each, and the price on a separate sheet of paper. You must specify code number for each item (for instance, PM2035 is the code number for the Leash poster). Total the costs, and include a check or money order in that amount payable to The HSUS. Be sure to write your name and address on your order. Large orders cannot be delivered to P.O. boxes, so give your street address.

Mail your order to:
The HSUS, 2100 L St. N.W., Washington D.C., 20037.
by Wendy Boyd

Shots that ring out in the Australian bush begin a night of agony for scores of kangaroos. Many of these nocturnal animals will suffer from gunshot wounds until daylight, when they will be picked up and tagged by “sportsmen,” industry hitmen, or rangers protecting graziers’ interests. The animals are left to suffer all night because that way hunters can save on refrigeration costs, and because a warm animal is easier to skin than an animal that has been dead a long time.

Next they will be processed into pet food, leather goods, trinkets for the tourist trade, and even fur products. Neither adult male, pregnant female, nor mother carrying her “joey” (or baby kangaroo) are spared the carnage.

Until June of 1980 the United States had chosen, under a five-year import ban, to have no role in this exploitation and suffering of the kangaroo. Early in 1974, in Utah, served the U.S. Department of Interior began to bow to kangaroo industry pressures to once again become the world’s largest importer of kangaroo hides. It was U.S. importation of as many as 1.5 million hides per year, prior to 1974, that depleted kangaroo numbers sufficiently for the U.S. Department of the Interior to place the species in their Endangered Species List. However, the Interior decided finally to list the kangaroos as "threatened" rather than "endangered," saying that the species were not in immediate danger of extinction.

Still, the Interior Department instituted the five-year ban on kangaroo imports in 1974 in keeping with the Endangered Species Act of 1973. The purpose of the act is "to provide a means whereby the ecosystems upon which...threatened species depend may be conserved (and) to provide a program for the conservation of such...threatened species." The Kangaroo Protection Cooperative, Ltd., based in Sydney, has said, "Joey" was probably as large as the legal trade.

A more likely reason for the lifting of the ban could be that the U.S. base William Amer Company would once again become one of the largest kangaroo tanneries in the world. Expansion of the kangaroo industry by convincing Interior that the Australian government had a more adequate regulatory system (which meant that tags were issued to ration the number of kangaroos that could be legally hunted) than it had in 1974. This may be true, since there were no regulatory systems in 1974, but only some of the states have even partially developed this system, and even Dr. Anderson agreed that the illegal trade would continue as large as the legal trade.

Aerial surveys cannot provide exact estimates, since they have not been collected at any phase of the harvest. Aerial surveys have been done in 1975 and 1977. The scientist who conducted the aerial surveys was one of the few scientists who have been skeptical of the study. He estimated that the kangaroo population estimates for two of the four states have been broken down into any of the three species of kangaroos under consideration. Aerial surveys cannot provide exact estimates, since kangaroos take cover in the bush during the day. Moreover, Dr. Anderson estimated that the kangaroo population increased in New South Wales from seven million in 1965 to nine million in the last five years, while Dr. Caughley, who had done the only scientific survey of the area, asserts that "kangaroos are on the decline." It is important that Interior be alerted to the strength of the opposition to their action. HSUS has joined with the Society for Animal Protective Legislation (SAPL) in soliciting the help of a prestigious law firm to call for a full hearing on the matter. The firm, Hogan and Hartson, in a formal petition to Interior, challenged the legality of Interior’s action, saying that the petition had violated the purpose and spirit of the Endangered Species Act. At the end of the 30-day comment period on the Interior’s proposed rulemaking, representatives of HSUS and SAPL presented a letter stating their positions to Charles Atkins, the associate assistant to President Carter, at the gate of the White House. Also present was the President, a 100-foot petition signed by Australian citizens opposing the lifting of the trade ban. The signatures were gathered by a representative of the Kangaroo Protection Cooperative, Ltd., in just eight weeks.

The majority of the Australian people, as well as the major Australian conservation groups, including the Australian Conservation Foundation (the largest group) are opposed to the lifting of the ban. HSUS will continue to drive to save these threatened species from further suffering and endangerment.

You can help this cause by writing to the Secretary of the Interior Cecil Andrus, telling him that you oppose the lifting of the ban on kangaroo products. Address your letter to the Department of the Interior, C Street between 18th and 19th, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20240.
The Myth: Anyone with a bit of sensibility and sensitivity can successfully raise a wild animal in the home, be it a country farm or a city apartment. Thousands try exactly that every year.

The sequence of trapping, shipping, selling, buying, owning, and dying has been unbroken for a thousand years or more. The wildlife business is booming more than ever despite the problems of survival faced by wildlife everywhere in the world. Promoting the myth while suppressing the truth, wildlife dealers and pet traders actively encourage the inexperienced, uniformed, and often innocent prospective owner to buy whatever strikes his or her fancy (the greater the rarity, and therefore the price, the better), stressing that a wild or exotic pet will bring much private pleasure and public reward. After all, each person can contribute to saving the world’s endangered species by breeding a few at home, so why not buy two from the wild instead of just one? No one doubts the simple truth that this is a difficult, time-consuming, often heartbreaking task requiring tremendous patience and perseverance is rarely realized until disaster strikes.

Hundreds of thousands of animals caught in the wild are imported annually to the U.S. for sale as pets. Exotics are in the vast majority of these animals do not survive the first year of captivity. The adage that wild animals in private homes. Inclusion on that list are the American Veterinary Medical Association, the Center for Disease Control, (U.S. Public Health Service), American Association of Zoos, Parks and Aquariums, and various state veterinary medical groups. The strongest position taken by these agencies concerns the high incidence of transmittable disease carried by wild and exotic species, though injury to or death of the owner is also frequently cited as a prevalent hazard.

There are, of course, arguments that wild animals have a value as pets. Ownership of such animals, especially in one’s childhood, can foster a naturalist's perspective. To be sure, nurturing and observing wild animals can provide mental and emotional satisfactions to varying degrees, depending on the strength of one’s interest in the subject as well as an awareness of another animal’s complexities. But the keeping of a wild animal in an unnatural, sterile, and alien environment rarely affords a real opportunity to understand animal behavior and biology. Accordingly, owners can become disinterested or frustrated about the inability to communicate with their pets, and especially those exotics whose needs are exceptionally disinterested or frustrated. As they mature they quickly become unmanageable, however, and when no longer intimidated by their owner's commands they can be openly destructive to people and possessions. Primate pets have been known to inflict severe and even fatal bite wounds; a few years ago a small 20-pound capuchin monkey attacked and killed a boy, age 4, whose father had purchased the pet three months earlier.

Aside from numerous ethical considerations surrounding the ownership of wild animals, primarily the violation of a wild animal’s freedom to live according to its natural inclinations and abilities, there are practical issues to be weighed. Some are highlighted below.

**Dietary Concerns**

Many wild animals, especially exotics, have strictly defined dietary requirements. Those may vary according to age and sex, individual physical condition and level of activity. Even purpose of ownership may be important, as animals kept for breeding often need special food supplements. These and other factors play a role in determining what the animal requires to remain healthy.

The problem faced by many pet owners is that accurate nutritional information is very limited even among local veterinarians. For example, how does one determine when a raccoon is malnourished or when a hero...
Dystrophy, hepatic necrosis, and cystic fibrosis occur as the result of these deficiencies. Parrots, parakeets, and other birds kept indoors require a given vitamin supplement containing vitamin D3 as they will not get any from their food and do not have access to ultraviolet light.

Mineral deficiencies are just as deleterious as vitamin D deficiencies. Even relatively hardy species such as ferrets can have problems with bone mineralization when owners take them off the prescribed cat or dog food.

Conservation Concerns

International trade and trafficking in wildlife for the pet industry is a multibillion dollar enterprise. In 1979 alone, the U.S. imported 358,156 mammals, 456,619 birds, 261,491 reptiles, 623,699 amphibians, for a total of 30,465,620 animals. A large percentage of these animals were imported for the pet trade, and although the Department of Interior (DOI) does not systematically categorize the purpose of all imports, an Interior official estimates that 100% of the reptiles and amphibians and approximately 90% of the birds were imported solely for the pet trade.

Such demand for wildlife in conjunction with high postcapture morbidity and mortality rates make the wasteful captivity method capable of decimating entire populations of wildlife in just a few years. It is true that as a species a local population reaches a critically low level, importation of wild trade laws and enforcement of these laws exist to buffer the extinction process, but these legal restraints are often grossly inadequate. Many countries still do not have laws protecting their wildlife, and those that do do not have the means to enforce them. Moreover, laws are easily circumvented by unscrupulous dealers who may make large profits on rare species.

An article that appeared in the May 1980 Veterinary Practice probably characterized the unregulated pet industry this way. "Most people do not realize that captive-bred wild animals can have the same effect on their offspring as wild-caught animals. The offspring of captive-bred animals are often more dangerous to the family members. They may even be more aggressive and difficult to handle."

According to Jean-Yves Domalain, a former wildlife exporter in South Asia and the author of the book Animal Connection, "This drain on wildlife is readily explained: the last thing the traffickers are lacking is ingenuity and the financial stakes are so high that corruption inevitably evades scrutiny, especially in countries in which the animals originate. The resources available to the inspection services are ludicrously inadequate or, in some areas, nonexistent."

Concerning capture, he goes on to say, "The local trapper does a great deal of damage to his catch: through ignorance and incompetence, but mainly through lack of concern."

Worldwide, snakes are the most commonly employed method of capture, and with the recent introduction of metal wire to replace natural fiber, this method has resulted in great carnage as no animal can escape or be released harmlessly.

Health Concerns

Wild mammals indigenous to the U.S. are not being bred to supply the ever-expanding and lucrative trade in unusual pets. Baby skunks, ferrets, and raccoons are now commonly seen in pet shops and suppliers claim they are domesticated, clean, friendly, and easy to maintain and feed. In fact, these captive bred animals are not well predisposed to being kept in private homes. Ferrets and raccoons exude a pungent musk odor once they reach maturity. Skunks, of course, must be desensitized. All of these animals are nocturnal and frightened by strange sights and sounds. Their responses are unpredictable and often include scratching, biting, and digging.

The advent of captive breeding centers for wildlife species such as skunks and ferrets has also created a false sense of security for many potential clients because dealers and pet shop owners claim the animals are free of rabies. As there is no wildlife rabies vaccine marketed, there can be no such assurance. Witness the case last year of a Minnesota skunk breeder whose shipments of 3,000 skunks had gone to 30 states before it was discovered that some were rabid. By the time the various state officials were notified, the skunks had been distributed to pet shops all over the country, necessitating an extensive notification. The Center for Disease Control (CDC) in Atlanta, Georgia, ranks rabies as such a serious health threat that they specifically recommend that states adopt legislation making it unlawful to keep wild animals as pets.
even state laws restricting the ownership of wild animals as pets. Still, unusual animals, especially "exotic" species, remain popular. In just the past few years several human deaths were caused by pets such as the largest arachnid, the giant constrictor, pythons, and even raccoons. John Walsh, Director of Field Services for the International Society for the Protection of Animals, states, "Raccoons should keep an exotic pet who doesn't know how. And that eliminates practically everyone."

Then there is the issue of intentional and unintentional cruelty to wild animals. The behavior of wild animals routinely changes as they mature. While some owners are willing to make the adjustments, others feel forced to restrict the animal's freedoms even further.

One impulsive and misguided owner, who eventually had to get rid of his pet bobcat, first took a file to the animal. "Nobody had become afraid of it. In a moment of frustration and fear, she hit the animal over the head with a frying pan to keep it away from her. When the humane society investigator went out to the house, the monkey had died due to a fractured skull."

Another woman, in Massachusetts, bought a baby cheetah and noticed that as the animal grew he had progressive difficulty in walking and finally could not get up at all. X-rays revealed dozens of broken bones. The diagnosis—severe diet deficiency. The woman did not understand the nutritional needs of the animal and had fed it a diet of red meat, not realizing that the cat needed essential supplements of vitamins and minerals.

More common are the cases of owners tired of the responsibilities that proper care entails, taking their pets out in the backyard with a month's supply of food and leaving for what is justified as a much needed vacation. Concerning overt cruelty, there is little question that decreased communication between animal and owner results in increased frequency of conscious abuse by the owner.

Idealizing exotics as pets is done at the considerable expense of the animal and owner. Why then does a segment of the public crave the untrainable, untamable pet, even when educated about the problems? As Roger Caras, noted pet authority, recently stated in an article for The American Magazine, "Exotic pet owners see themselves as part of an elite; a group of select people able to spend the money, run the risks, help educate the masses, save a species, contribute in some unique way." None of these reasons qualify as acceptable given the failure rates involved.

Breeding

Persons owning exotic animals (and persons trying to sell them) often claim they are doing the species a service because the animals will be used for breeding, eventually perhaps to restock the wild populations which are under severe pressure from habitat destruction. Ideally, this is a commendable, but unrealistic pursuit. In a letter to the Department of Environmental Protection, Dr. William Conway, General Director of the World Wildlife Fund, stated the basic criteria for a legitimate propagation program:

1) Proof of the long-term nature of the program. The breeder must be able to show that the program has financial stability and that in the event of his death the program and facilities will be maintained.

2) Professional expertise. The breeder must be familiar with the basic principles of breeding the species in question, conversant with pertinent legislation, capable and able to demonstrate successful programs with species of lesser value before undertaking those of a different species. The breeder must be able to successfully submit his expertise to peer review.

3) Adequate facilities. The breeder must provide facilities responsive to the breeding biology of the species to be bred and extensive enough to maintain a significant number. Facilities designed for only a pair of animals do not meet these requirements. The breeder must be able to pass professional review.

4) Appropriate care program. The breeder must be able to specify, maintain and support an appropriate program of animal and daily care.

According to Dr. Conway, those who have been successful in breeding exotic animals, "should not claim they are breeding a species for its own good..."

Disposal of Exotics

Dr. Fred Soifer, former President of the American Veterinary Medical Association, contends that "usually the exotic animal owner is completely unaware of the simple feeding and management of his pet." When the animal becomes too much of a burden, a simple disposition can be difficult. A tamed animal cannot be released in the wild. Zoos are wary of taking discarded pets as they are often in poor health, overly temperamentally wild, and unable to socialize with others of their own kind. The few wildlife orphanages throughout the nation that attempt to provide care for unwanted or abandoned pets are frequently overstocked. Euthanasia is often the kindest solution. The problems arise when owners choose less permanent, less stressful disposal methods.

In Columbia, South Carolina, a monkey was found badly burned after being left in a microwave oven. A police investigator found that the animal had been given a 25% alcohol content promotion, but the winner refused to accept the prize, so the animal was simply turned loose in the pet trade and further state legislation to restrict the ownership of indigenous wild animals is the most restricted routes, but individuals protecting what wild animals are left as well as restricting further exotic species cannot thrive. Some species pose a direct danger to humans."

None of the few cities where exotic pets are frequently overstocked. Euthanasia is often the kindest solution. The problems arise when owners choose less permanent, less stressful disposal methods.

In Columbia, South Carolina, a monkey was found badly burned after being left in a microwave oven. A police investigator found that the animal had been given a 25% alcohol content promotion, but the winner refused to accept the prize, so the animal was simply turned loose in the pet trade and further state legislation to restrict the ownership of indigenous wild animals is the most restricted routes, but individuals protecting what wild animals are left as well as restricting further exotic species cannot thrive. Some species pose a direct danger to humans."

Foreign fish are not the only ones becoming established because of careless or accidental release from captivity. A mid-August 1980 special of cage birds have been established in the continental U.S., among them a Burrowing parakeet, Monk Parakeet, both of which cause severe agricultural damage, especially to fruit crops. Lizards, iguetas, ocelots, and monkeys are now established in some areas within the U.S. Burrowing mammals such as ferrets and gerbils can potentially do tremendous damage to crop lands. Eradication of these pests is time-consuming and in many, if not most cases, proves to be excessively costly and rarely successful.

What is the solution?

Ideally, people should turn to nature instead of a pet shop when they wish to enjoy wildlife. However, as our wilderness areas shrink dramatically year by year, this is not always feasible. We must become willing, then, to make intelligent, self-restricting decisions when they choose to invest the time, money, and effort to enjoy wildlife. Protecting what wild animals are left as well as restricting further exotic species cannot thrive. Some species pose a direct danger to humans."

Foreign fish are not the only ones becoming established because of careless or accidental release from captivity. A mid-August 1980 special of cage birds have been established in the continental U.S., among them a Burrowing parakeet, Monk Parakeet, both of which cause severe agricultural damage, especially to fruit crops. Lizards, iguetas, ocelots, and monkeys are now established in some areas within the U.S. Burrowing mammals such as ferrets and gerbils can potentially do tremendous damage to crop lands. Eradication of these pests is time-consuming and in many, if not most cases, proves to be excessively costly and rarely successful.

What is the solution?

Ideally, people should turn to nature instead of a pet shop when they wish to enjoy wildlife. However, as our wilderness areas shrink dramatically year by year, this is not always feasible. We must become willing, then, to make intelligent, self-restricting decisions when they choose to invest the time, money, and effort to enjoy wildlife. Protecting what wild animals are left as well as restricting further exotic species cannot thrive. Some species pose a direct danger to humans."

Foreign fish are not the only ones becoming established because of careless or accidental release from captivity. A mid-August 1980 special of cage birds have been established in the continental U.S., among them a Burrowing parakeet, Monk Parakeet, both of which cause severe agricultural damage, especially to fruit crops. Lizards, iguetas, ocelots, and monkeys are now established in some areas within the U.S. Burrowing mammals such as ferrets and gerbils can potentially do tremendous damage to crop lands. Eradication of these pests is time-consuming and in many, if not most cases, proves to be excessively costly and rarely successful.
The 1980 International Whaling Commission meeting opened in Lon­don this year with more of the member nations committed to a total moratorium on whale killing for the eighth time in that many years. Although a majority (13) of the member nations voted in favor of it, the required three-quarter ma­jority was impossible to achieve. A bloc of countries, often including Canada, squashed most attempts towards total protection of the world’s remaining great whales. In fact, Canada’s “no” vote on a total moratorium on killing sperm whales defeated the measure. As a result more than 14,000 whales are sched­uled to die in the 1980-81 season.

For the first time, however, killer whales (orcas) have been put under the IWC quota system, to their ben­efit. Since the Soviet Union killed over 1000 of these whales in the Antarctic whaling season, the IWC adopted an indefinite moratorium on all taking of killer whales by factory ships. With the Soviets now stopped on that front, the total num­ber of whales actually saved (includ­ing orcas), compared to last year, is 2700.

For many years we have called for an end to commercial whaling and based on the cruel and inhumane methods used for killing whales. The worst weapon of all is the cold harpoon. This device carries no explosive so that when it strikes the fleeing whale, it wounds but doesn’t kill. The animal writhe and jumps in agony only to be pulled back to the boat and shot with a gun. The whale can suffer for up to an hour before finally consciousless or dead, and public opinion. The hard realities of economics, jobs, and the general difficulties of international negotiations soon took over. Hopes of whale conservation groups for a big win on a total moratorium were quickly dashed, and we were forced to dig in to a type of trench warfare, saving whales by tens or twenties rather than by the thousands.

A total moratorium on all com­mercial whaling went down to defeat for the eighth time in that many years. Although a majority (13) of the member nations voted in favor of it, the required three-quarter ma­jority was impossible to achieve. A bloc of countries, often including Canada, squashed most attempts towards total protection of the world’s remaining great whales. In fact, Canada’s “no” vote on a total moratorium on killing sperm whales defeated the measure. As a result more than 14,000 whales are sched­uled to die in the 1980-81 season.

For the first time, however, killer whales (orcas) have been put under the IWC quota system, to their ben­efit. Since the Soviet Union killed over 1000 of these whales in the Antarctic whaling season, the IWC adopted an indefinite moratorium on all taking of killer whales by factory ships. With the Soviets now stopped on that front, the total num­ber of whales actually saved (includ­ing orcas), compared to last year, is 2700.

For many years we have called for an end to commercial whaling and based on the cruel and inhumane methods used for killing whales. The worst weapon of all is the cold harpoon. This device carries no explosive so that when it strikes the fleeing whale, it wounds but doesn’t kill. The animal writhe and jumps in agony only to be pulled back to the boat and shot with a gun. The whale can suffer for up to an hour before finally consciousless or dead, and

The IWC did take the first step toward outlawing the cold harpoon. The U.S.A. voted to forbid its use on all whales except the Minke, beginning next season. The poor little Minke are the ones most often caught using this method, but some nations compl­ained that the explosive harpoon destroys too much meat. In larger whales the loss amounts to a small percentage of the total meat, but Minke whales are relatively small and will only yield reasonable quantities of meat if killed by the cold harpoon. That, at least, was the cold-blooded argument of those nations voting against the total ban: Brazil, Ireland, Iceland, Japan, Republic of Korea, Nor­way, and the U.S.S.R.

An Australian resolution non­bindingly was adopted by a majority calling for an end to the cold harpoon for killing Minke whales by 1982 and called for another vote to make it binding at the 1981 IWC meeting.

The U.S.A., faced with new scientific evidence this year that the very endangered bowhead whale will probably continue to decline in num­bers even with zero catches by our Alaskan Eskimos. The Eskimos have argued that quotas should not be set by IWC for their tribal catch (as distinguished from commer­cial). It is felt by most whale conserv­ation groups, however, that inter­national cooperation is imperative when trying to save whales as well as dolphins and porpoises. The U.S.A. in hopes of continued cooperation among the Eskimos, the govern­ment, and conservationists, and a compromise was struck whereby IWC set a three-year bowhead whale quota. The Eskimo community is expected to work out how many whales will be taken each year within the limits set by the IWC. Given the con­cern about the bowhead population, estimated to be only 2000 indi­viduals, it is also expected that the Eskimo community will seek alter­natives to the killing of bowhead whales over these three years.

Finally, the eighth vote on all whales—large and small—brought up a great deal of debate this year. Just as the size of the whale species being hunted has moved down the scale from the giant blue whales to the relatively small Minke as the argu­ments over quotas of the year, IWC has claimed jurisdiction to set quotas no matter what whales were killed. However, as most coastal states now claim certain rights over resources within a 200-mile zone of their shores, the IWC’s right to set quotas to protect cetaceans (whales, porpoise, or dol­phins) within those zones is hotly disputed.

The U.S. position, with which we agree, is that all cetaceans which are directly hunted should be considered by the IWC, which should take ac­tion to protect them if needed. The only coastal state that might follow IWC regulations would be to submit their own stronger regula­tions to protect cetaceans more fully. This is exactly what the U.S. has done by declaring “no whaling” limits of 200 miles.

Canada is bitterly fighting this ap­proach claiming they alone should be allowed to set quotas during which many belugas or narwhals are killed within their 200-mile zone. Their ap­proach is to designate the ice water, as well as the danger of over­population. The HSUS sent field serv­ices personnel Frantz Dantzler and Eric Sakach to the scene to help them in this great effort. The Cow­litz County Humane Society of Longview, Washington, was the cen­ter of much of this activity, organiz­ing emergency care and facilities for animals caught in the disaster.

Dantzler, who is director of field services and investigations at HSUS, got clearance for Sakach and himself to accompany a group of reserve workers and journalists on an Army helicopter flight to study the damage around the volcano. As could be seen in Dantzler’s photogra­phs, it was apparent that the ex­plosion had been terminal for all the wildlife nearby and millions of acres of wilderness habitat were des­troyed. Because of the incredible destruction of plant and animal life in the area, HSUS recommended to the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife that all hunting in the area cease immediately.

Back on the ground, arrange­ments were made to obtain feed for livestock stranded in the mudflow from the explosion. Stunned and in­jured animals were treated where possible. Fresh drinking water had to be obtained for the animals, and respiratory problems treated.

After the danger was past, Sakach received a letter from Barbara Mat­tila, Board Secretary of the Cow­litz County Society. It read, in part:

“The day of May 18 is still vivid in our minds as well as the two really hectic weeks that followed that took so full of turmoil at our Shelter. We assume that to anyone who works
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Leghold Trap Ban Progresses in Connecticut

For many years humanitarians in Connecticut have introduced bills in the state legislature to ban the use of the leghold trap. The last year's bill got further than ever before it was stopped by the hunting and trapping groups. The trap was killed by a 16-16 tie vote on the floor of the Senate. The defeat was particularly disappointing because the vote was taken during the legislature’s adjournment. The anti-trapping forces changed their minds at the last minute and voted against the ban when, earlier, they had voted for a humane bill. The legislators in that state have only had a report of one, or maybe, two rabbits being caught by the leghold traps. The legislators, however, forwarded their letter to the Fish and Game Board so they may be aware of your concerns. The Governor does not have the legal authority to repeal a Fish and Game Regulation, but the Governor does not have the legal authority to repeal a Fish and Game Regulation.

The Vermont Federation of Humane Societies will work for a legislative ban on the program in the next session of the Vermont General Assembly.

Trapping Issues Big On West Coast

Oregon citizens will have an opportunity to outlaw steel traps by voting "Yes" on Ballot Measure 51 in the November general election. The West Coast Regional Office has been working closely with the city council and friends to help Oregonians against trapping. "Trapping is not getting out the vote," said a member of the council. "Oregon has several places for rabbits to hide and escape, such as brush piles, holes in the ground, etc. Over the years there have been reports of animals being caught by the leghold traps. We have only had a report of one, or maybe, two rabbits being caught by the leghold traps. The legislators, however, forwarded their letter to the Fish and Game Board so they may be aware of your concerns. The Governor does not have the legal authority to repeal a Fish and Game Regulation, but the Governor does not have the legal authority to repeal a Fish and Game Regulation.

The movement to ban the leghold trap is making slow but steady progress.

The Washington State antitrapping, legislative drive will begin.

"The intent is not to injure or destroy the rabbits. These large areas have several places for rabbits to hide and escape, such as brush piles, holes in the ground, etc. Over the years there have been reports of animals being caught by the leghold traps. We have only had a report of one, or maybe, two rabbits being caught by the leghold traps. The legislators, however, forwarded their letter to the Fish and Game Board so they may be aware of your concerns. The Governor does not have the legal authority to repeal a Fish and Game Regulation, but the Governor does not have the legal authority to repeal a Fish and Game Regulation."
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Ohio Bans Decompression Chamber

Ohio has become the thirteenth state to outlaw the use of the high-altitude decompression chamber. The bill was signed into law on July 22 and will go into effect on October 20, 1980. Shelters now using decompression chambers will have until January 1, 1981, to find a more humane means of euthanasia. This summer the Great Lakes region was the site of several workshops on matters of importance to animal welfare workers. Along with an HSUS sponsored workshop on "Solving Animal Problems in Your Community," there were also seminars on time and stress management and investigations, and a workshop on chemical capture techniques.

A new addition to the staff of HSUS’s Great Lakes Regional Office is Tim Greyhavens, working as a research investigator. Greyhavens comes from the Athens (Ohio) Humane Society where he served in the past as president of that organization. He also managed the animal shelter and served as county humane agent. Greyhavens is now in charge of animal control for the city of Athens.

At the Great Lakes office, he will be working on investigating cases and issues of national importance, and will continue to do investigations, testimony and technical assistance to local humane societies and animal control facilities.
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Even so, many important animal welfare issues remain to be addressed. Federal legislators may return to Washington for a legislation that will further strengthen the Animal Welfare Act. The 96th Congress is almost over. In recent months, activity surrounding the Animal Welfare Act has intensified. Significant developments have occurred with an impact on the program, which is administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, include HSUS’ suit against USDA for non-enforcement of the animal fighting sections of the law, critical problems of funding, and review of regulations governing animal care in research facilities, puppy mills, zoos, and circuses.

Regulations Under Review

During July, the USDA held public meetings in Hyattsville, Maryland, and Kansas City, Missouri, to solicit public input on current Animal Welfare Act regulations and to aid in the development of new regulations. HSUS submitted its extensive comments on the proposed regulations, which included an impact study on animal welfare programs. Yet, many of the regulated parties consider the regulations to be unnecessary and unreasonable, and an infringement on their freedom to conduct business, and make suggestions to curb the program under the guise of abolishing unnecessary regulations. This possibility necessitates careful monitoring of the entire process by ourselves and other animal welfare organizations to maintain the progress already made in federal protection of animals.

Budget Cuts Threaten Enforcement

The Animal Welfare Act has never been adequately funded, is not adequately funded now, and will not be adequately funded in the foreseeable future. The outlook for an increased appropriation has never looked bleaker because of the serious fiscal problems confronting Congress. Low funding in the past has left federal animal welfare programs even more vulnerable than most government programs to the effects of budget cuts.

During the first part of the past year, USDA overspent its budget on animal research to the point where the deficit before the end of the year, with a supplemental appropriation. Well-intentioned USDA officials were motivated to spend on animal welfare because they were aware of the serious failure of USDA to enforce the act. They knew many of the regulatory problems were suffering in USDA regulated facilities and concentrated more resources on inspection activities than could be justified for the new budget appropriation. Eventually, the deficit ran to approximately one million dollars.

Not only was the hoped-for supplemental appropriation not forthcoming, Congress actually slashed the budget further, forcing drastic curtailment of enforcement activities from July to October, 1980. Scores of special part-time employees were furloughed, others were detailed to other programs where existing money was available, and the program activity in general decreased.

HSUS believes Congress will be unwilling to increase the budget for Fiscal Year 1981 which begins on October 1, 1980. We also know the competition for any additional USDA dollars within that department is keen, and it is not likely the department will transfer money from their other activities to animal welfare. There will, of course, be some money for enforcement activities, but USDA officials will not risk deficit spending again in anticipation of extra money that may not be forthcoming.

The gain may set worse. There is currently discussion on the Hill about proposed 1981 budget cuts in the USDA appropriation. HSUS will be keeping close tabs on Congress and its appropriating committees, and will work to mitigate potentially harmful effects of the cuts.

Continued on page 32

Bird Poisoning Program Protested

The HSUS Legal Department received the following letter from an individual over the phone: "I am writing to protest the bird poisoning program of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service concerning that agency’s recent action to place the National Wildlife Refuge, an island off the southern end of Cape Cod. Beginning in January, the Service had begun a program of poisoning the herring and great black-backed gulls, since these birds are encroaching upon and displacing smaller birds including various species of terns and smaller gulls.

In its protest, HSUS recognized that the tern and smaller gull colonies were in need of some relief from the pressures provided by the herring and larger gulls. However, HSUS noted its extreme concern that possible alternatives to the poisoning were not satisfactorily explored. The Fish and Wildlife Service did not publicly respond to non-lethal control methods suggested to it by the Massachusetts Audubon Society, choosing instead to begin use of the poison.

HSUS maintained that the Service should have investigated further the possible environmental impact of the poisoning plan. The Service did issue an eighteen-page Environmental Assessment of the proposed program in February. The poisoning would have no significant environmental impact on the area. The HSUS was concerned that the HSUS believes that the Service did not make sufficient study of areas of environmental concern, including that this constituted a violation of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Endangered Species Act. As the court papers went on to state, "In light of the history of studied inaction in the record with respect to §26 has been a..." There are also numerous offers of assistance and potential enforcement of the Act. The court ruled that the Service issued a 23-page report... submitted to defendant the... enforcement... established an enforcement program and procedure, and have made numerous efforts of assistance and cooperation in the laboratory. Out of this, there has been virtually no enforcement activity in the last two years. In addition, little discernible activity among defendants in Washington to initiate and establish a program of enforcement.

On April 21, 1980, plaintiff HSUS submitted to defendant Justice a 23-page report... containing the extensive factual information on dogfighting activities in the United States, the results of plaintiff’s investigative efforts over the past year and a half. In the report were descriptions of the leading promoters and breeders of fighting dogs in the sixteen states where most of the blood sports occur in the United States...and their activities. Plaintiff has furnished to the United States Department of Justice with this report to assist that defendant in formulating an enforcement policy. Copies were furnished to defendant USDA.

Virtually no enforcement action followed. HSUS finds that the Department of Justice was incapable of using the information supplied to it because USDA and Justice had neglected to establish any enforcement policy, internal procedures, operating instructions, and legal machinery necessary to even begin enforcing the Act. As the court papers went on to state, "To date, defendants’ enforcement record with respect to §26 has been a..." There were no enforcement actions in the face of an abundance of information and other assistance offered by the HSUS to the defendants. As of the date of the filing of this Complaint, over four years after §26 was enacted, defendants are still incapable of re
specific dogfighting events have occurred corresponding with any meaningful fighting activity in general has enforcement measures in the field, and HSUS attorneys decided that the point of unreasonable delay had been reached which would justify resenting to the courts.

The suit asks the court to declare that the agencies are legally obligated to enforce the animal fighting provisions of this statute, and requests that the court order and compel the agencies to establish all necessary inter- and intra-agency procedures, cooperative agreements and take any other steps necessary to begin enforcement of the Act. The Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and the International Society for the Protection of Animals also joined HSUS as co-plaintiffs. The three organizations brought suit on behalf of those of their members "who have a personal stake and intense interest in the suppression of animal blood sports in this country and in the alleviation of the suffering, cruelty, and waste of life inherent in such activities, and in the preservation and promotion of the civilized human values which the Animal Welfare Act was enacted to uphold and protect." and "on behalf of these animals, principally canines, which §26 (the animal fighting provisions) of the Animal Welfare Act was enacted to protect."

This is probably the first time a suit has been brought in federal court explicitly on behalf of animals and to enforce "rights," so to speak, which Congress has bestowed upon a particular class of animals.

Compiled by Murdough Stuart Madden, HSUS General Counsel, and Roger Kindler, Associate Counsel.

• Send a sample of Kind to help you decide.
• Send a gift card to the young people with the Nov.-Dec. issue, informing them of your gift.
• Send you the Nov.-Dec. issue so you can personally wrap it and give it to the young people. Naturally, we’ll send the remaining five issues to the recipients’ homes.

Please make checks out to Kind.

P.S. Why not give Kind to your local library, too? One gift to the library can enrich the lives of a great many children.
Good zoos do not insult the intelligence of their animals or the public.