Grand Prize Winner
1981 HSUS Annual Photo Contest
Standing of animal-welfare issues as the only view worthy of serious consideration. As so often with religion, there is a certitude born of personal convictions and beliefs that allows for no other view or opinions. Even when compared with those held by groups of similar persuasion, we are loath to concede that someone else may possess insight and understanding we have missed.

We are loath to concede that someone else may possess insight and understanding we have missed.

Unfortunately, FOA would have us believe this subcommittee would have approved H.R. 556 in its entirety except for the influence of The HSUS. The fact of the matter is that The HSUS and FOA are but a small portion of the various interest groups petitioning this subcommittee with their particular views and concerns. To pin one’s hope for favorable response on a single bill, as FOA is advocating, is to tread on very thin ice. To refuse to support any other bill, as FOA is counseling, is to refuse to help laboratory animals unless it is done "my" way. Such a position is not only naive; it is also irresponsible.

It is indeed regrettable that Friends of Animals has chosen to conduct a public campaign falsely condemning The HSUS because it may not get precisely what it wants. What Friends of Animals is getting is precisely what our common adversaries want—a public confrontation within the animal-welfare community which, as another animal-welfare leader has stated, furthumane movement.

The HSUS has continuously indicated and demonstrated its willingness to work in concert with our sister animal-welfare groups on various animal-welfare issues. Indeed, the outstanding success of the Draize campaign is largely attributable to the cooperative endeavors of both national, regional, and local animal-welfare groups. So, also, is the work of The Council for Livestock Protection, Monitor, and various other formal as well as ad hoc cooperative efforts. Yet a willingness to work in concert with others must be reciprocated in a spirit of mutual respect and cooperation. It is only through this kind of united effort that we can in the future proceed to even greater successes in securing protection from suffering and abuse for animals.
Another Spring

With the warm weather come car, boat, and RV shows; and with car, boat, and RV shows come Victor the Wrestling Bear, Willard the Boiling Kangaroo, the nameless Diving Mule and a number of other wild animals forced into service as promotional gimmicks and novelty acts. These shows pose unusual problems for humane societies because they blatantly exploit the animals used as shills and are a serious public safety problem. People who are confined to their traveling cages—often just big enough to accommodate them and offering neither room to exercise nor contact with other animals—for most of their lives. Brought out of these cages for their performances, they are subjected to the raucous environment of crowded, noisy, public places. It is not surprising that injuries to the gullible public by animals goaded into aggressiveness during “contests” have occurred. You would think anyone foolish enough to wrestle a full-grown bear to the ground for nothing more would deserve whatever he got, but unqualified trainers with no business handling wild animals in the close quarters of shopping malls and boat shows must share the blame. One recent case of injury caused by a performing animal resulted in a suit brought against the animal’s owner and the host of the show where the act appeared.

Unfortunately, the USDA doesn’t ban these acts, although the HSUS believes the Animal Welfare Act regulations would allow it to do so. Humane societies should continue to monitor these exhibitions and enforce anti-cruelty statutes when it’s possible. If their local statutes do not specifically prohibit contact between the public and performing wild animals, they may find allies in the public health officials or members of civic organizations who will join in protesting wild animal acts.

Silver Spring Update

The monkeys seized from the Institute for Behavior Research last September (see The HSUS News, Winter, 1982), remain at the National Institutes of Health’s Poolsville (Maryland) facility. Permanent disposition will likely be decided when Dr. Edward Taub’s appeal is heard in circuit court the week of June 14, 1982. The HSUS is working with the State’s Attorney’s office in preparation for the hearing and will cover the travel expenses of out-of-town witnesses for the prosecution. Dr. Michael Fox, HSUS Scientific Director, is expected to testify on the lack of necessary veterinary care for the monkeys, the charge of which Taub was decided. We urge HSUS members to write to NIH and request that Taub’s grant (paid for by tax dollars) not be reinstated and that the monkeys not be returned to his custody (Acting Director, NIH, 9000 Rockville Pike, Office Building #1, Room #124, Bethesda, MD 20205).

Seals would be saved if the EEC passes a ban on harp seal products in member countries.

Seal Ban in Sight

Just as the News was going to press, we learned a major step towards ending the annual clubbing of 200,000 harp seal pups off the coast of Canada had been taken by the European Parliament. That body, part of the European Economic Community (formal name of the “Common Market”) voted to ban the importation of sealskins and other related seal products from Canada and Norway.

Of the 190 members from 10 countries, 160 voted for the ban, 10 against, and 20 abstained. While the vote was not binding and must still be ratified by the EEC, it seemed likely it would be approved.

If the ban is imposed, it would effectively choke off the major markets for harp seal products, mostly novelty items, popular in Europe. Under the U.S. Marine Mammal Protection Act, harp seal pelts and products are not permitted to enter this country. Reaction in Canada to the European Parliament action was swift and strong. The legislature of Newfoundland, where most of the seal slaughter takes place, passed a resolution objecting to the Parliament’s action and urged the Canadian government to revoke its recently signed fisheries treaty with the EEC.

“The vote is a tremendous step towards ending demand for harp seal products and one welcomed by the HSUS,” said Patricia Forkan, Vice President for Program and Communications. “It is a great psychological victory: now the Canadian government will know Europe wants the seal hunt stopped and is willing to put its feelings on the record.”

Survey Success

Our Fall, 1981 readership survey drew over 900 responses (some continue to trickle in) and brought us a great deal of valuable information. Seventy-two percent of all respondents read The News cover-to-cover, 79 percent rate it as excellent; captive wildlife, shelters, cruelty investigations, and legislative issues led the list of topics of greatest interest. Although a fair number of you said The News was distressing to read at times, most members felt covered of problems in-depth gave them a better understanding of the issues in animal welfare today. To all of you who said, “Keep up the good work!” we say “Thank you!”

Seals would be saved if the EEC passes a ban on harp seal products in member countries.

Canine Kudos

For the second straight year, the HSUS was honored by the Dog Writer’s Association of America at its annual awards banquet in New York. The HSUS this year shared DWA’s National Public Service Award with the American Animal Hospital Association. In presenting The HSUS’s award to staff writer Julie Roaner, DWAA spokesman Maxwell Riddle cited The HSUS’s outstanding work towards ending dogfighting and exposing inhumane conditions in the nation’s puppy mills. The HSUS News and two articles (“Fighting the Flea,” Summer 1981, and “Puppy-Mill Misery,” Fall 1981) were chosen as finalists in the writing categories.

Typo Revealed

A spokesman for the Mennen Company has written to set the record straight on the cosmetic manufacturer’s position on alternatives to the Draize test (see “Tracks,” Fall 1981 HSUS News). In response to a reader’s letter of concern, Mennen had said the Cosmetic, Toiletry, and Fragrance Association had formed a committee to develop techniques “to maximize the discomfort to the animals involved in cosmetic testing.” The Mennen representative tells us this was a typographical error; maximize should have been minimalize. In fact, Mennen has pledged $15,000 to the CFA’s fund for developing alternatives to the Draize test. The fund has already been tapped to set up a Center for Alternatives to Animal Testing within Johns Hopkins University.

One of the “Silver Spring” monkeys seized in Maryland. The Nih! facility in Poolsville, MD: the monkey’s fate remains uncertain.
The HSUS public-awareness campaign draws nationwide attention to the plight of milk-fed veal calves.

"Before you choose veal...think twice," read the headline on a half-page ad in the New York Times last December 17. That ad, describing the miserable existence of the more than one million calves raised in confinement every year to produce expensive milk-fed veal, kicked off one of The HSUS's biggest campaigns. Response to the campaign—from the farm industry, the press, the general public, and animal-welfare supporters—has been overwhelming.

"The public needs to be made aware of how its food animals are being produced, and the veal industry needs to know the extent to which the public values humaneness in animal production. These are the goals of our campaign," wrote HSUS President John Hoyt in a letter to the editor of Feedstuffs, a leading agricultural newspaper. "...We find this industry's continuing efforts to foster public demand for pale or 'white' veal inexcusable, particularly as industry leaders have acknowledged that the color of veal has no effect on taste. To subject calves to the current regimen partly to perpetuate what is, in essence, a marketing device suggests an insensitivity to animals and disregard for the sensibilities of consumers."

The HSUS launched its campaign in a carefully thought-out effort to make sure the public knew how the "best" veal served in the most exclusive restaurants was produced. Quite probably, their tempting, high-priced entree was once an animal that had spent all but a few days of its 16-week life in a unbedded, narrow, wooden stall too small for the animal to take more than a single step forward or back.

The HSUS veal campaign was the result of an intensive, year-long study of the veal industry conducted by HSUS staff. While, in recent years, concern has been growing about the plight of all food animals raised in intensive-confinement systems—systems known as factory farming—milk-fed veal-raising practices have probably drawn the most attention. In order to produce an animal with the palest flesh possible, male dairy calves are confined to crates and fed twice a day on a milk substitute purposely low in iron so the flesh does not develop its natural pinkish color.

The HSUS study, which included a survey of all the major U.S. milk-fed veal companies, concluded methods of veal-raising in the U.S. produce the most deprivation for the least justifiable reasons—to produce an exclusively luxury food. Even more galling is that economical alternatives—including the so-called group-pen system now gaining popularity in England—are available.

Only public pressure on veal producers can provide an impetus for
change. Without public awareness, there can be no public pressure, thus, the campaign began by bringing the public to know. Without public awareness, there can be no public pressure, therefore, the campaign was sent to the American Farm Bureau Federation countered with an ad of its own in the same paper. Headlined “Think twice before you are mislead (sic) on veal!” the ad purported to answer our claim by describing veal calves as “animals for which there are limited uses,” and veal raisers as “family farmers” who would be “shortsighted if they mistreated their animals.”

But the farm industry was not alone in its quick response. Newspapers across the country printed stories about the campaign. By early March, The HSUS had distributed some 200,000 “NO VEAL THIS MEAL” cards. The campaign has tapped a vein of public concern for food animals,” said Peter Lovenhjem, HSUS Counsel for Government and Industry Relations, who is handling the campaign for The HSUS. “People not only want to hear how farm animals are raised, but they also want to want to do something about it.” Lovenhjem described the stacks of letters he’s received from concerned individuals anxious to report firsthand information about veal production and marketing in their area. As of early March, almost 100 local humane societies and animal-welfare groups had lent their names to a growing list of organizations supporting the HSUS veal campaign. “We salute you vigorously for attacking ignorance and cruelty on so many fronts and wish you every success in promoting better treatment for the milk-fed calves,” wrote the Washington (D.C.) Animal Rescue League. “Once the public is better informed as to how the white meat is obtained, I feel they will demand reform.”

The Humane Society of Rowan County (North Carolina) wrote: “We feel the U.S. veal industry needs to move quickly toward exploring alternative methods, such as group pens and more frequent nutritional intake, which are certainly more humane and seem more economical for the producer. We do not believe that expediency justifies the inhumanity.”

While we don’t have complete information on restaurateurs’ response to the “NO VEAL THIS MEAL” cards, a person-to-person survey of a few of Washington, D.C.’s most respected restaurants touched off surprisingly emotional responses. “It’s just absurd,” said one owner when asked his opinion of the cards. “There are so many other atrocities, I can’t worry about that. I don’t want any protests in my restaurant.”

Another prominent restaurateur admitted milk-fed veal’s color was “a marketing gimmick,” but also said he wouldn’t stop selling it unless the government outlawed it. “If I saw one or two cards I’d just say they [people leaving cards] were crackpots,” he said, but “It depends on how big the protest is. If I had 50 pickets outside I might change the menu, but most people just don’t care. If they do, they just won’t order veal.”

Not unexpectedly, the agricultural community immediately began to attack on the HSUS campaign. In January, Neal Black, president of the Livestock Conservation Institute and a leading spokesman for the farming interests, called the campaign “a slap in the face for the livestock industry.” Wrote Black in a press release excerpted in agricultural publications across the country, “Some livestock producers feel [the veal campaign] is part of a campaign in discouraging the eating of meat, with a final goal of imposing vegetarianism on the public.”

Response from veal companies has been even more vehement. Provimi, Inc., the nation’s largest producer of milk-fed veal, has called for a boycott of The HSUS. The president of another major veal company wrote in a letter to a concerned individual. “All of us in the veal industry are portrayed as torturers, rivaling Hitler, Torquemada, and the Shah of Iran in cruelty and sadism. Nothing could be further from the truth.”

“I think the abuses [of veal calves] are there, but they’re much fewer than they’re purported to be,” said Howard Frederick of the American Food Manufacturers Association in an interview with The HSUS News. “I don’t think it’s cruel to raise a veal calf in a crate, but that animal should not be abused.”

“We in the agricultural community have spent the past 30 years developing systems—and whether they’re right or wrong I won’t pass judgment—that prove we can provide milk, eggs, and meat cheaply. We did it by taking the animals out of their brutal settings and putting them inside in crates or cages. The problem is, we’ve never told the American public what’s going on. It’s really an awareness problem.”

Agricultural response to the campaign has not been completely negative. We have heard from several farmers who decided against or abandoned the use of intensive confinement systems to raise veal for economic reasons. One New York farmer who raises his calves in a group-pen system wrote, “We have been very happy with the program. It seems to provide a healthy environment for the calves and gives the public a wholesome product completely free of the aftermath of medication so often necessary in a closed building environment.” Another farmer using group-pens wrote he had raised his calves on grain instead of milk-replacer. “The carcass color is pink rather than white but the taste and nutritional quality of the meat is excellent,” he reported.

Another result of the campaign is a renewed interest in H.J. Res. 305, introduced in Congress last year by Ohio Congressman Ronald Motl. The bill, if passed, would create a commission to study intensive livestock-raising in the U.S. Two cosponsors, Richard Ottinger of New York and James Howard of New Jersey, have signed onto the bill since the veal campaign was launched, and Rep. Motl’s staff has reported a growing number of inquiries about it.

The veal campaign continues. If you haven’t already received our veal materials, you can order them from the publications list bound into this issue of The News.
Now we know what many of you have been doing all year long: taking pictures of pets, wildlife, farm animals, and fish with enthusiasm, skill, and obvious affection.

Cats were this year’s overwhelming favorite: of the 25 photographs winning prizes in the two pet categories (color and black-and-white), 12 had cats as subjects. Even our grand prize winner included a dog and a cat. Some of our winners are pictured here. Other entries appear in the article beginning on page 20.

All of us were struck by the good-natured cooperation you were given by your photogenic models, whether dressed in funny clothes or caught unawares during their daily trips through your backyard.

Congratulations to all winners and thank you for entering.

First prize, Pets, B&W:
Marta

Second prize, Pets, B&W:
Margie Bell

Honorable Mention:
Joseph R. Spies, Arlington, VA (2)
Stephanie Rodgers, Pennington, NJ (2)
Amber Francis, Oroville, CA
Sterling Vinson, Tucson, AZ
Cindy Bidagain, Tucson, AZ
Shirley Levine, Phoenix, AZ
Debra Thoren-Roth, Denver, CO
Hildegard Adler, Madison, WI

Non-Pets, Color
First Prize
Mr. and Mrs. Brian Pendergraft, Riverview, MI

Second Prize
Peggy Bristol, Bishop, CA

Honorable Mention
Jim Elder, Evergreen, CO
Kyle Binning, St. Petersburg, FL
Marta Turek, Naperville, IL (2)
Robyn Michaels, Chicago, IL
Sam H. Gould, Sun City, AZ
Penny Marcieil, Gall, CA
Donna Dennis, Mobile, AL
Jerry Strieger, Holiday, FL
Kathy Nall, Kalamazoo, MI

First prize, Non-pets, B&W:
Diane Trumbull

Second prize, Non-pets, B&W:
Mike Roy

Honorable Mention:
Will and Angie Rumph, Pacifica, CA
Shirley Levine, Phoenix, AZ
Robert M. Priddy, Felton, CA
Valerie Matthews, Canyon Lake, TX
Pamela Pitlanish, Detroit, MI
Elizabeth Stallard, Lancaster, OH (2)
Joseph R. Spies, Arlington, VA (3)
designed to protect them, wild horses face a government threat to trim their numbers and send thousands to an uncertain fate.

Anyone involved in animal protection ten years ago will remember the elation and satisfaction that followed passage of the Wild, Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act of 1971. Tremendously popular legislation designed to protect a vanishing part of America’s heritage, the Act was a milestone in the history of species preservation. The twenty-year-long fight to save dwindling herds of wild horses holed up in the canyons of the Western states was legendary. It created its own heroines—people like Hope Ryden and “Wild Horse Annie” Velma Johnston—and its own controversies, and legislative maneuverings threatening to undo whatever good the Act has brought about.

Now, a new threat looms: weakening amendments to the Act, proposed by BLM Director Robert Burford, are winning support not only from pro-ranching interests but also from some conservation groups that historically have opposed protection of feral species. The HSUS is fighting these amendments and hopes other animal-welfare groups will stand fast in their support of wild horses protected by the Act.

Eleven years after passage of the Act designed to protect them, wild horses face a government threat to trim their numbers and send thousands to an uncertain fate.

The government agency responsible for administering the Act, proceeded to bungle its job in an all-too-often illegal, callous, and unprofessional series of bureaucratic missteps. The HSUS and other organizations that fought so hard for the Act’s passage have been rewarded by ten years of court battles, scientific controversies, and legislative maneuverings threatening to undo whatever good the Act has brought about.

The World of the Wild Horse Before 1971

The horse is not considered a native of America, although it evolved here, it is a species that disappeared mysteriously 10,000 years ago, just after man appeared in this hemisphere. The horse didn’t return until he was brought back by the Spanish conquerors in the 16th century. Because of that brief interruption, the horse is not considered a “wild” animal indigenous to the U.S., but a ferai species not covered by laws designed to protect wildlife. That the wild horse was in need of protection is evident: although there were millions of wild horses roaming the plains in the mid-19th century, by 1967, only 9,500 would remain, according to some BLM estimates. Tough, wily little mustangers were blamed for deteriorating range conditions and thought to compete for forage on public lands with the domestic cattle and sheep there, under provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act. As a result, ranchers encouraged their destruction, capture, and slaughter.

The Act is Passed

Enter Wild Horse Annie. In the early 1960s, she marshalled support for a federal law to protect wild horses bound for the pet food processors. By 1971, she had gathered enough support from sympathetic individuals and organizations like The HSUS to see the Wild, Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act signed into law. The Act prohibited:

- removal of wild horses or burros from public land without authority;
- acquisition of wild horses or burros by private individuals without government permission;
- malicious death or harassment of such animals;
- processing or permitting the processing of an animal or its remains into commercial products;
- sale of an animal or its remains; and
- violation of regulations issued to carry out the Act.

A crucial stipulation was that excess horses were to be relocated only to those areas where wild horses existed at the time of the Act’s passage; be humanely destroyed; or placed in private custody. The BLM and the Forest Service were to administer the Act. At the time, no one defined what constituted an “excess” horse—the BLM was allowed to use its own judgment. This would prove to be a critical omission, the basis of bitter controversy in subsequent years.

BLM Management Breaks Down

Within months of the Act’s passage, the BLM proved itself a poor steward. In 1973, Idaho ranchers using snowmobiles and aircraft rounded up horses with BLM approval. The Act provided little protection for these animals—between 7 and 10 of the original 20 were run over cliffs to their deaths, according to HSUS Chief Investigator Franz Dantler’s eyewitness account. The “Howe Massacre” prompted an outraged HSUS and American Horse Protection Association to file suit against the Department of the Interior for failure to enforce the 1971 Act by allowing illegal round-ups to take place. (This suit was eventually settled by having the surviving horses placed in AHPA custody, then in adoptive homes.) In 1976, a hard-fought battle by those organizations resulted in a permanent injunction against the BLM’s round-up operations.
Wild Horse Reading List

An excellent account of wild horse history prior to 1971 can be found in America's Last Wild Horses by Hope Ryden, available in paperback from E.P. Dutton. The HSUS's Legislative and Management Act provided the BLM with the authority to use helicopter means of capturing animals, supposed to care for starving foals born in the Pryor Mountain Wild Horse Refuge and, in spring of 1972, had placed the foals in carefully selected foster homes. This was the beginning of the Adopt-A-Horse program, a plan the BLM took over officially in 1975 and turned into its primary means of placing "excess" wild horses in private hands. The Adopt-A-Horse program ran into trouble as well. It fell prey to bureaucratic snarl-ups and mismanagement once the BLM took over. Horses adopted—sometimes by the hundreds—by supposedly well-screened individuals mysteriously ended up in slaughterhouses or disappeared completely. Costs skyrocketed. Horses held for months awaiting adoption ran up substantial feed bills before being placed or destroyed. By January of 1979, 9,500 horses were in captivity and the BLM was confronted with the biological impossibility of such an increase given the 9,500 horses estimated to need protection in 1971. It argued the original figure must have been much greater than it thought previously. But when the BLM asked for the numbers of wild horses to be reduced to 1971 levels, it estimated that the 1971 figure must have been far lower than the 9,500. Approximately, the BLM wanted as few protected wild horses as possible, through one argument or the other.

Legislative Onslaught

Two important legislative developments changed the original Act. In 1976, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act provided the BLM with the authority to use helicopter means of capturing animals, supposedly to care for starving foals born in the Pryor Mountain Wild Horse Refuge and, in spring of 1972, had placed the foals in carefully selected foster homes. This was the beginning of the Adopt-A-Horse program, a plan the BLM took over officially in 1975 and turned into its primary means of placing "excess" wild horses in private hands. The Adopt-A-Horse program ran into trouble as well. It fell prey to bureaucratic snarl-ups and mismanagement once the BLM took over. Horses adopted—sometimes by the hundreds—by supposedly well-screened individuals mysteriously ended up in slaughterhouses or disappeared completely. Costs skyrocketed. Horses held for months awaiting adoption ran up substantial feed bills before being placed or destroyed. By January of 1979, 9,500 horses were in captivity and the BLM was confronted with the biological impossibility of such an increase given the 9,500 horses estimated to need protection in 1971. It argued the original figure must have been much greater than it thought previously. But when the BLM asked for the numbers of wild horses to be reduced to 1971 levels, it estimated that the 1971 figure must have been far lower than the 9,500. Approximately, the BLM wanted as few protected wild horses as possible, through one argument or the other.

Wild Horse History

The HSUS's involvement in the wild horse controversy has been described in the issues of The HSUS News listed below:
- "Wild Horses Threatened by Wild Horse Program," Winter 1976
- "Wild Horses Victimized by BLM," Spring 1978
- "HSUS Sues to Protect Wild Horses," Summer 1978
- Federal Report, Fall 1978
- Law Notes, Summer 1979
- "ABC Expose Plight of Wild Horses," Spring 1979
- "Senate Investigates Wild Horse Program," and Law Notes, Summer 1979
- Law Notes, Fall 1979

up was even necessary. The court agreed. (Although the injunction has been modified over the years, it basically still stands.) In 1976, Dant­zler inspected the BLM holding fa­cility at Palomino Valley, Nevada, and was profoundly disturbed by what he saw: at least 300 of 2000 wild horses being held for possible adoption had died in the facility in the preceding 14 months. It wasn’t hard to see why: sick horses mangled freely with healthy animals for months on end in filthy, mud-choked, overcrowded pens. The horses had to eat hay thrown on the ground and developed sand colic; many were destroyed as a result. Once again, The HSUS and AHPA sued Interior for mismanagement and cruelty in its Nevada wild horse operation. (The courts found against us in this suit, but it remains on appeal.) In 1979, an organization called WHOA! (Wild Horse Organization As­sistance) had received BLM permis­sion to care for starving foals born in the Pryor Mountain Wild Horse Refuge and, in spring of 1972, had placed the foals in carefully selected foster homes. This was the beginning of the Adopt-A-Horse program, a plan the BLM took over officially in 1975 and turned into its primary means of placing "excess" wild horses in private hands. The Adopt-A-Horse program ran into trouble as well. It fell prey to bureaucratic snarl-ups and mismanagement once the BLM took over. Horses adopted—sometimes by the hundreds—by supposedly well-screened individuals mysteriously ended up in slaughterhouses or disappeared completely. Costs skyrocketed. Horses held for months awaiting adoption ran up substantial feed bills before being placed or destroyed. By January of 1979, 9,500 horses were in captivity and the BLM was confronted with the biological impossibility of such an increase given the 9,500 horses estimated to need protection in 1971. It argued the original figure must have been much greater than it thought previously. But when the BLM asked for the numbers of wild horses to be reduced to 1971 levels, it estimated that the 1971 figure must have been far lower than the 9,500. Approximately, the BLM wanted as few protected wild horses as possible, through one argument or the other.

Legislative Onslaught

Two important legislative developments changed the original Act. In 1976, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act provided the BLM with the authority to use helicopter means of capturing animals, supposedly to care for starving foals born in the Pryor Mountain Wild Horse Refuge and, in spring of 1972, had placed the foals in carefully selected foster homes. This was the beginning of the Adopt-A-Horse program, a plan the BLM took over officially in 1975 and turned into its primary means of placing "excess" wild horses in private hands. The Adopt-A-Horse program ran into trouble as well. It fell prey to bureaucratic snarl-ups and mismanagement once the BLM took over. Horses adopted—sometimes by the hundreds—by supposedly well-screened individuals mysteriously ended up in slaughterhouses or disappeared completely. Costs skyrocketed. Horses held for months awaiting adoption ran up substantial feed bills before being placed or destroyed. By January of 1979, 9,500 horses were in captivity and the BLM was confronted with the biological impossibility of such an increase given the 9,500 horses estimated to need protection in 1971. It argued the original figure must have been much greater than it thought previously. But when the BLM asked for the numbers of wild horses to be reduced to 1971 levels, it estimated that the 1971 figure must have been far lower than the 9,500. Approximately, the BLM wanted as few protected wild horses as possible, through one argument or the other.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the Act mandated the National Academy of Sciences to establish an impartial program to investigate wild horse populations and report its findings by January, 1983. The claims about wild horse populations, their reproduction rates, and their impact on public lands would finally be addressed by a neutral scientific body. The HSUS supported this amendment.

In 1980, the new administration's pro-rancher, pro-exploitation attitude and budget cuts spawned efforts to "make the [wild horse] program self-sufficient." The HSUS
Before the BLM separated stallions from mares and foals in their holding pens, herds would fight one another in the close confinement to protect their harems. Injuries often resulted.

What You Can Do

The fate of wild horses and burros has never been more uncertain. You can assist in protecting these magnificent animals by writing to your congressman and senators urging them to oppose any changes in the Act until the National Academy of Sciences study is completed.

Below are the names of the chairmen and ranking minority members of the House and Senate committees likely to consider any changes in the Act. Write them as well.

Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
James A. McClure, Chairman
Henry M. Jackson

House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs
Morris K. Udall, Chairman
Manuel Lujan, Jr.
MMPA Given New Life

After almost a year of battling and negotiations, the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) was reauthorized for an additional three years when President Ronald Reagan signed it into law on February 22, 1982. The HSUS worked with a coalition of groups to obtain renewal of this vital conservation law. Although amendments were adopted that will allow incidental killing of marine mammals, the act, happily, many more reasonable amendments were not.

The legislation retains the act's original goal: reducing the accidental deaths of porpoises caught during yellowfinning, tuna fishing operations to levels approaching a zero-mortality rate. However, a new amendment added language specifying that this goal can be satisfied through the use of "the best marine-mammal safety techniques and equipment that are economically and ecologically practicable." Thus, the current allowable kill of 20,500 porpoises per year in most cases will not have to be reduced any further unless there is a technological breakthrough making it "practicable." Responding to animal welfare counter-demands on this issue, Congress provided financial assistance for research into new methods of catching tuna without the accidental killing of marine mammals.

Another major change simplified procedures for return of management of marine mammals to the states. Alaska, in particular, lobbyed to make state management more expedient by eliminating certain hearings. In which the HSUS and other animal-welfare groups had previously participated.

While these changes will make it much more difficult for us to monitor protection of marine mammals, because quick decisions will be made in the states themselves, the moratorium on killing these animals will end in most cases.

In response to criticism of the expensive to protect such species as the bobcat from international exploitation, Grandy said: "You must recall that it was neither the Humane Society, the U.S. Court of Appeals, nor the Humane Society of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and the Convention on International Trade in Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES) (see article on the ESA on page 30).

The Reagan administration continues to pump for reauthorization of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and its enforcement by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, it remains one of the most important animal programs administered by the federal government. If the Reagan budget for the FHA is accepted by Congress, however, APA enforcement as we know it will cease completely. The Animal Health and Wildlife Health Inspection Service (APHIS), responsible for enforcement of the APA, would have its budget reduced by 70 percent from fiscal 1982 levels.

A DEA budgetary summary released in February reported that APHIS would no longer be able to conduct routine compliance inspections of zoos, puppy mills, and laboratories under the proposed budget. Procedures designed to implement sections of the APA banning dog and cockfighting would be eliminated and the 1982 budget would be cut by more than two-thirds, to 1.5 million dollars.

Plan to fight the upcoming vote. Hearings will continue during late March. The HSUS intends to testify as an expert on the Endangered Species Act, time is running out for other important bills. Although there is no clear way for effective enforcement, 1983's reduction would be cut nearly in half. If you want action taken.

...authorities are adequately funded. The Reagan administration spent the early part of this year trying to sort out budget proposals, these members and their staffs considered time and effort on legislative matters related to animal welfare. Please take a few minutes to thank them for making a stand.

• Senator Lowell Weicker for introducing and getting passed a resolution to declare March 1, 1983, National Day of the Seal; and

• Senator Alan Cranston of California for his strong and consistent leadership in the fight to prevent renewed use of compound 1080.

Setting the Agenda

Now that the 97th Congress has returned from its mid-term recess, we hope its members will devote more time and effort to enacting legislation on crucial animal-welfare issues affecting racing and dog racing, humane transportation of horses, and factory farming. While this Congress has made some progress in the fight to help animals (by enacting the Marine Mammal Protection Act, time is running out for other important bills. Although there is widespread support for animal-welfare legislation, Congress has many more thousands of bills to consider than it can possibly accommodate, and we fear important legislation could get lost in the shuffle. Issues that will definitely see action include the Animal Welfare Act, the Endangered Species Act, 1982, which must be reauthorized this year. Other issues will go unaddressed unless you let your legislators know you want action taken.

Lab Changes Sought

In February, the HSUS filed a petition seeking changes in regulations at the USDA on the animals they use in painful experiments. The 39-page document, the result of several years of work by HSUS staff labor, suggests ways in which to improve the quality of information given by USDA without spending any more of the taxpayers' money. The petition, politically seeks to decrease the "pain" and "distress" in USDA regulations and guidelines and asks that USDA require research facilities to provide more complete information on why pain-reducing drugs are withheld from some animals during painful experiments.

Grandy Testifies for ESA

On February 22, 1982, HSUS Vice President for Wildlife and the Environment John W. Grandy represented testimony before the House of Representatives Subcommission on Endangered Species, the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and the Convention on International Trade in Wild Flora and Fauna (CITES) (see article on the ESA on page 30). The Reagan administration continues to pump for reauthorization of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) and its enforcement by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, it remains one of the most important animal programs administered by the federal government. If the Reagan budget for the FHA is accepted by Congress, however, APA enforcement as we know it will cease completely. The Animal Health and Wildlife Health Inspection Service (APHIS), responsible for enforcement of the APA, would have its budget reduced by 70 percent from fiscal 1982 levels.

A DEA budgetary summary released in February reported that APHIS would no longer be able to conduct routine compliance inspections of zoos, puppy mills, and laboratories under the proposed budget. Procedures designed to implement sections of the APA banning dog and cockfighting would be eliminated and the 1982 budget would be cut by more than two-thirds, to 1.5 million dollars.

Plan to fight the upcoming vote. Hearings will continue during late March. The HSUS intends to testify as an expert on the Endangered Species Act, time is running out for other important bills. Although there is no clear way for effective enforcement, 1983's reduction would be cut nearly in half. If you want action taken.
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The HSUS's rally on the steps of the U.S. Capitol, featuring musician Paul Winter and members of his Winter Consort, highlighted the second annual International Day of the Seal on March 1. While more than 250 spectators braved Washington, D.C.'s chilly winds, thousands of people across the country helped celebrate the birth of nearly half a million harp seal pups off the coast of Canada.

Other protests, rallies, and candlelight vigils were scheduled throughout March to increase the general public's awareness of the plight of the harp seal pups and the value of the world's 33 species of seals. "For centuries, man has preyed upon the seal for its prized fur, for its meat, or because he believed it competes with him for the fish it needs to live," Vermont Congressman Jim Jeffords had said last December while introducing H. Con. Res. 236, to declare March 1 National Day of the Seal. "In a few cases, this plundering of seal populations is driving some species toward the brink of extinction...We cannot allow this trend to continue; not only for the future of the seals, but for the future of ourselves as a species."

Although the resolution was not considered by the full U.S. House of Representatives in time for Seal Day, it did attract more than 100 co-sponsors. Bureaucratic tie-ups prevented a companion resolution, S. Res. 266, introduced by Connecticut Senator Lowell Weicker, from reaching the floor in time for this year. However, on March 4, the full Senate amended the resolution and, without objection, declared March 1, 1983, National Day of the Seal.

Participants in the Capitol Hill rally were treated to helium-filled balloons imprinted with harp seal insignia while they listened to the music of Paul Winter and members of the Winter Consort. The HSUS was represented by President John A. Hoyt, who acted as master-of-ceremonies, and Vice President for Program and Communications Patricia Forkan, among others. "We are here to celebrate seals, not club them," Forkan told the crowd. "Certainly these animals have committed no crime to deserve such treatment. Their only sin is being beautiful."

"Should these animals be reduced to mere things with no value beyond the price of a pelt?" she asked. "For, in all the seal hunts, the principal products are luxuries rather than necessities...with cruelty as a by-product."

Also speaking at the rally were Congressman Jeffords and Rhode Island Congresswoman Claudine Schneider. Jeffords movingly described his trip to the Canadian seal hunt as a member of a congressional delegation in the early 1970s. "As I stood there in the pristine arctic beauty, I was shocked at the brutal killing to obtain seal skins," he said.

Even though Seal Day is over for another year, The HSUS will continue to protest seal hunts taking place not only in Canada, but also in South Africa and Alaska, where some 25,000 North Pacific fur seals are to be clubbed in late June.

Public rejection of the cruelty in these unnecessary "harvests," which produce such products as key fobs and glove linings for the European market, is still our best hope for ending seal hunts all over the world. Events such as Seal Day can mobilize public sentiment against all hunts.
The Anti-Cat Cult?

by Julie Rovner

A rash of anti-cat books prompts an emotional response from cat lovers and feline-phobes alike.

Sally Quin hates cats. “I never met a cat I liked,” she says. “They smell and you can’t get the smell out of anything. They’re not honest or outgoing. They’re also hypocritical and sneaky.” Untrue, says Sue Warner, who has owned many cats over the years. “They’re not hypocritical, they’re merely discriminating. And when they choose you, it makes you feel special. I like cats because they’re small, quiet, and under control. They can make their own entertainment, and, unlike dogs, they don’t whine when you leave them and gnaw when you come home.”

There are two types of people in the world—cat lovers and cat haters.

Few folks feel neutral about America’s second-favorite house pet. In the past year, though, the American public has been littered with kitty books, most of them anti-cat. The debate about cats has taken on the proportions of, well, a catfight.

It really began as a joke, claims cartoonist Skip Morrow, author of The Official I Hate Cats Book. “I was at a friend’s house one day, and his cat was sitting in his lap. Suddenly, for no apparent reason, the cat reached out and scratched my friend. I grabbed the cat by the neck with both hands, held it up at eye level with its eyes bugging out, and said ‘Don’t you ever do that again.’”

Little did Morrow realize the cartoon version of that scene would inspire a series of books and novelties that would earn him the hatred of animal lovers all over the country. His two ‘I Hate Cats’ books and ‘I Hate Cats’ calendar, each depicting imaginative ways to torture felines, became instant best-sellers. They, in turn, inspired 101 Uses for a Dead Cat (also a best-seller) and The Cat-Hater’s Calendar.

It was the latter that blew the top off the bubbling pot of anti-cat hysteria. While Morrow and the ‘101 Uses’ author used cartoon images, the originators of The Cat-Hater’s Calendar took photographs of cats supposedly being barbecued on a grill, dropped into a pot of boiling water, and used as the bull’s-eye on a dart board. The resulting furor (which included protests from The HSUS and its members) was so intense that the calendar was soon pulled from the market.

“I think, with cartoons, people know it’s not really happening,” explains Morrow. “If you throw someone against a brick wall in a cartoon, he’s going to be fine in the next scene. But when you start using photographs...”

All of these books concern those in the animal-welfare community: they believe impressionable people, especially children, will be encouraged to torture cats.

Wrote HSUS President John Hoyt Fox in a letter to the publisher of The Official I Hate Cats Book, “I’m sure you would have readily rejected a manuscript that fostered the abuse of children. Yet, surprisingly enough, you have published one which fosters the abuse of animals.”

Since publication of The Official I Hate Cats Book in early 1981, The HSUS has received dozens of letters protesting cat-hating paraphernalia.

“I hope something can be done to prevent vileness of this sort,” wrote one outraged member about The Cat-Hater’s Calendar. “For the jackasses who created this vile thing to be such cretins that they feel they are dealing in humor is dumberfounding.”

What is it about cats that makes them the object of such intense emotion—both positive and negative—from people? “The cat is a symbol of the paradox of love and hate,” says HSUS scientific director and animal behaviorist Dr. Michael Fox. “Cats give love, but they’re independent. Many people don’t like cats because they’re unpredictable, inscrutable, and subtle. Some people appreciate their independence and envy their self-reliance. Others interpret their independence as aloofness.”

Fox also thinks people may hate cats because they can’t be controlled. “Dogs are less dualistic than cats. They’re loyal, obedient, trustworthy, and predictable. Many people only love those they can control or who need them. Cats are neither.”

“Cats frustrate people a whole lot,” says Morrow (who admits to owning two cats of his own and actually liking them). “The cat is one of the few domestic animals that..."
Cats do have a predisposition for exploring interesting places, particularly additions to home décor.

doesn’t speak the same language we do. Can you imagine having a full-fledged conversation with your cat? I can’t.”

Morrow didn’t realize how sensitive was the nerve he was hitting when he first began to circulate his drawings where he worked as a musician. After all, he admits, the book was almost called I Hate French Poodles. People always identified most strongly with the doodle of his friend nearly strangling his cat. “They’d take one look and say ‘I’ve always wanted to do that to a cat.’”

Cats have only been kept by humans since about 1,500 B.C. Scientists aren’t exactly sure how cats became domesticated, but it may be correct that, as novelist Rudyard Kipling theorized, they domesticated themselves. According to Kipling, women domesticated man, dogs, horses, and cows, but not cats. While the other animals offered loyalty in exchange for food and shelter, the cat killed mice and amused children in exchange for the right to sit by the fire but refused to give up its freedom.

However domestication came about, it’s clear the early Egyptians revered cats (who, by the way, just happened to be useful at keeping rodents out of the granaries), and accorded them not only great respect in life, but also after death, burying them in magnificent crypts.

Excellent mousers, cats were considered valuable commodities in Europe during the Middle Ages. In the tenth century West Wales, a hamlet was legally a hamlet only if it contained a cat. In one famous case, a king with a rat problem was said to have paid a fortune in jewels for a single cat.

The post-renaissance “war on witchcraft” was probably the origin of the modern problem of cat abuse. Cat historian Muriel Beadle writes that, at the coronation of Queen Elizabeth I, a dozen cats were stuffed into an effigy of the queen, paraded through the streets, and incinerated. Cats were burned in bonfires, their ashes doled out to townspeople to take home as good luck charms.

Probably the most horrifying cat ritual was the cat organ, a device which involved tying the tails of 20 or so cats to cords attached to a keyboard. When the keys were pounded (usually by a trained bear) the cats’ tails would be pulled, and they would mew. This “entertainment” continued to be popular for more than 100 years.

Cat abuse is still a real problem, with or without what one columnist calls the “cat-bashing books.” Reports of drowning, burning, and other more “imaginative” tortures are not uncommon at local animal shelters.

According to Dr. Fox, most cat abusers are people who need to feel superior. “Abusing cats gives you a sense of power and control,” he says.

Cats are also unpopular with a growing number of people who suffer from ailurophobia, a morbid fear of cats.

Jeryll Ross, clinical director of the Phobia Program of Washington (D.C.), reports treating cases of cat phobics. “A tremendous number of people are frightened by cats,” she says. “People who are phobic tend to have very controlling personalities, and they see cats as unpredictable.” Unlike people who are afraid of dogs because they might bite or knock them down, cat phobics are usually reacting to irrational fears, according to Ross.

Ross says that while she treats comparatively few cases of ailurophobia, she’s sure it is not an uncommon condition. Many people don’t seek treatment, since it is an ailment unlikely to affect a person’s daily living. Fear of cats is “socially acceptable. All phobias are fears of the unknown, and cats have that aura of mysterious which prompts that fear.”

Of course there are a lot of cat lovers out there, too. Current estimates show there is a minimum of 27 million owned cats in the U.S. (as opposed to 45 million dogs). Perhaps a positive effect of the anti-cat books, and certainly one the authors never intended, is that they are bringing cat devotees out in droves to defend their precious pets.

I love cats because they’re quiet and under control,” Sue Werner says.

“They’re fine when they’re alone, and when you come home they pay attention to you.”

Says Phyllis Wright, cat owner and HSUS director of sheltering and animal control, “Cats are easier pets than dogs. They don’t need to be walked. They’re much better for apartments, and they’re superb companions.”

Even with all the current media hoopla, it’s likely that, like hula hoops and pet rocks, cat-hating in print will fade away. But you can be sure cats won’t. Says HSUS President Hoyt, “Long after the public has ditched those pathetic scribblings in the back-alley trash cans, cats will be with us. After all, some authors come and go because the public realizes who has talent and who’s out to make a fast buck. On the other hand, cats manage to have plenty of consistent fans—because they have so many worthwhile qualities.

Let Your Will to Help Animals Live on Through Your Will

We urge you to include in your will a bequest to The Humane Society of the United States. Your decision will be important to us—the animals.

Send for our new booklet:
“Your Will to Help Animals”
The HSUS
Donald K. Coburn
2100 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037

A Matching Gifts Program

Recently, The Humane Society of the United States received contributions from two members who are employed by companies with matching-gift programs. In those instances, both companies’ programs matched the HSUS members’ contributions two-for-one. One member’s $100 gift became a $200 contribution and the other’s $1500 gift was increased to $3000.

Educational institutions, hospitals, arts organizations, and other such groups may participate as recipients in a company’s matching-gift program if they are non-profit and tax-exempt. (All matching-gift programs, however, may not have a two-for-one feature.)

We do not have a list of companies with such programs, nor do we know where our members may be employed, but our guess is that many of you may be affiliated with companies involved in matching-gift programs. We wanted you to be aware of this potential opportunity for increasing your contributions to The HSUS and its important work.

We suggest you ask your company’s employee-relations manager or personnel department whether such a program exists and what the procedure is for participation. If no such program exists where you work, why not suggest one?

For more information, contact Donald K. Coburn, The HSUS, 2100 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.
A third triumph was the scheduling of Congressional hearings on the subject of laboratory animals in general. These were held by the Science, Research, and Technology Subcommittee of the House Science and Technology Committee. We had, for years, pressed for such hearings, knowing full well that no legislation of any kind in either house could ever be passed without them. The hearings which took place last October, although tied directly to neither H.R. 556 nor H.R. 4406, were welcomed by The HSUS. Our staff presented extensive testimony (as described in Federal Report, Winter 1982 HSUS News).

That these hearings took place at all is a great victory in the long, often discouraging fight to help the laboratory animals in this country. No hearings of any kind had been held since 1970—almost 12 years ago—and much has changed in laboratory research in that time. However, gratifying the two days of hearings were, we know that they were only the first step in a long, difficult, and, all too frequently, disappointing legislative process. We had been through a similar struggle on the trapping issue.

Working on national legislation is only for the stout-hearted and truly devoted. It is rare—if not impossible—to push any bill, no matter how worthy or carefully constructed, through a legislative body unmodified. That is how the legislative process in this country works.

Following the October lab-animal hearings, therefore, we were not surprised to learn that some bill on the subject of laboratory animals might be possible, but not either of the two bills as then structured. Even though H.R. 556 and H.R. 4406 would most probably appear as we knew them, the subcommittee would write a whole new bill.

The task before us was to make sure the subcommittee's version was both as strong and as meaningful as possible. We took encouragement from the fact that a number of legislators, Subcommittee Chairman Doug Walgren, Rep. George Brown, and Rep. Tom Lantos among them, very much want to help laboratory animals. The HSUS is giving high priority to sitting down with congressional staffers, the congressmen themselves, and other humane groups to provide input on the new bill. We have been working, virtually on a daily basis, with no fewer than seven major, national, animal-welfare groups toward this end.

What Next?
The HSUS will not give up the fight to help lab animals simply because the bills we originally supported may not win committee approval. Even the President of the United States has to make changes in the bills he submits to Congress, and we can expect no different treatment! Our next task is to get as strong a bill as possible supported by the House Committee on Science and Technology, which held the October hearings. That bill will then go to the full committee, where we have another chance to have it strengthened further. Once it has passed the full committee, it will then go to a vote by the entire House of Representatives, where additional amendments can be added before passage. Simultaneously we will work to find a Senate sponsor for the bill and begin the entire process again there. At all of these junctures, support from you, our members, will be needed.

Is the Effort Worth It?
The legislative process is complicated, and one that offers no guarantee of a perfect bill at its end. There will always be the temptation to take a non-negotiable position, to say to the legislature, “Take this bill in our form or not at all.” We believe you, our members, want us to get the most effective legislation possible so we can move on to promoting alternatives to live-animal research more widely and improving the desperate state of animals now in labs.

The 556 and 4406 Legacy

We are fighting to keep the heart of both of these early bills in the subcommittee’s version. We are anxious to see a coordination center for alternatives established; provide training in alternatives to researchers; fund the development of alternatives; disseminate information and end duplication in research; establish a strong animal-care committee within laboratories; and create a mechanism by which research projects can be evaluated in terms of the potential animal suffering involved before they are undertaken.

We know your commitment to this important work is there. The outpouring of letters in support of H.R. 556 and H.R. 4406 provided a great deal of the impetus behind Congress’s decision to hold the 1981 hearings. We shall continue to persevere and see the process through to what we hope will be ultimate success.

There will always be the temptation to take a non-negotiable position, to say to the legislature, “Take this bill in our form or not at all.”...
Great Lakes

The HSUS Cleans Up at the Dogfights

November 28, 1981, was a typical late-fall day in Freedom Township, Michigan, a rural community 15 miles outside of Ann Arbor. Cold, windy—a good day to catch a college football game or put up the storm windows. But for the 23 people who gathered at noon in the basement at 3944 Rentz Road to watch pit bull terriers maul one another, it turned out to be a bad day at the dogfights.

By four o’clock, 19 men, 3 women, and 1 teenage boy were in police custody. Six were charged with a felony—dogfighting—the other 17 with attending a dogfight, a misdemeanor.

The result of months of effort by Wisconsin, Ohio, and Michigan law enforcement offices and humane societies, the raid and related activities in those states yielded charges, and 14 felony indictments. In three states combined their efforts to make local dogfighters, so complacent that they thought nothing of staging matches in broad daylight, think twice about having their fun so close to home in the future. The HSUS’s Great Lakes Regional Office, The Humane Society of Huron Valley, and the Wisconsin Humane Society can share the credit for this very successful effort. Agents under contract to The Humane Society of Huron Valley infiltrated the closed, secretive world of dogfighters in Michigan, actually renting the house where the November 28 raid took place; agents working for Wisconsin Humane tracked down participants in the Milwaukee area; and Great Lakes Regional Director Sandy Rowland and Investigator Tim Greyhavens spearheaded the investigations in the Toledo area. Police in all three states were involved as well.

A few hours after the Michigan raid, search-and-seizure warrants issued for five Toledo houses yielded a gold mine of evidence. Police found treadmills, a dogfighting pit, 12 pit bull terriers, and other dogfighting paraphernalia at all locations. Despite felony laws on the books in Michigan and Ohio, dogfighters in the Great Lakes region previously had been little troubled by local prosecution. Humane societies, sharing information and coordinating their activities with law enforcement officers, are changing all that.

“Now, dogfighters realize that they have no safe place to go in the whole area,” said Greyhavens. “One of the greatest benefits of a raid such as this is the response of neighboring states,” added Frantz Dantzler, Director of Investigations for The HSUS, who was involved.

An HSUS agent holds one of the fighting dogs seized in the Great Lakes raid.

Local police officers search and handcuff participants in the Michigan dogfight.

Police got there too late to stop Pinto’s fight. The bloody dog was seized along with a number of other pit bull terriers.

Sportsmen in the Great Lakes region can’t seem to have any fun these days—hot on the heels of the dogfight raid reported on the facing page was a cockfight raid carried out in January by the Lenawee County (Michigan) Sheriff’s Department and the Great Lakes Regional Office. Thirty-three men and women were arrested right in the midst of a fight taking place about 15 miles outside of Adrian, Michigan. Seventeen dead and 20 live cocks were confiscated along with the usual fighting paraphernalia (including carrying cages for fowl, above, right). Since it is a felony under Michigan law not only to own or maintain animals and birds for fighting purposes but also to own, maintain, or rent the premises where fights take place, authorities dismantled the cockpit itself and surrounding concession stands to use as evidence. Twenty-five felony charges have been filed against participants.

The HSUS’s Frantz Dantzler, Sandy Rowland, and Tim Greyhavens took part in this unannounced visit to another of Michigan’s exclusive nightspots.

Bunching Decision Upheld

On another day in what proved to be a banner autumn for the Great Lakes Regional Office, the Champaign (Ohio) County Common Pleas Court ruled that the pro-HSUS decision handed down against Kiser Lake Kennels last summer should stand (see Around the Region, Fall 1981 HSUS News). Kiser, found to be bunching collecting dogs or other animals at one location for sale to research facilities for experimentation) and using county pounds as sources, was in violation of the Ohio Revised Code. Section 955.16 prohibits the release of dogs from animal shelters or pounds for research unless they are released to Ohio nonprofit organizations or institutions that are certified by the Ohio Health Council as being engaged in teaching or research concerning the prevention and treatment of diseases of human beings or animals. Kiser Lake did not qualify under these restrictions.

Commented Great Lakes Regional Director Sandy Rowland, “This favorable ruling serves as notice to all county commissioners as well as to other officials that The HSUS is determined to use every means possible to see that animals are cared for according to the law. HSUS members can be proud that this decision will benefit thousands of animals in pounds in Ohio and elsewhere.”

The result of months of effort by Wisconsin, Ohio, and Michigan law enforcement officers and humane societies, the raid and related activities in those states yielded charges, and 14 felony indictments. In three states combined their efforts to make local dogfighters, so complacent that they thought nothing of staging matches in broad daylight, think twice about having their fun so close to home in the future. The HSUS’s Great Lakes Regional Office, The Humane Society of Huron Valley, and the Wisconsin Humane Society can share the credit for this very successful effort. Agents under contract to The Humane Society of Huron Valley infiltrated the closed, secretive world of dogfighters in Michigan, actually renting the house where the November 28 raid took place; agents working for Wisconsin Humane tracked down participants in the Milwaukee area; and Great Lakes Regional Director Sandy Rowland and Investigator Tim Greyhavens spearheaded the investigations in the Toledo area. Police in all three states were involved as well.
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In what has become a yearly tradi-
tion, protesters, including represen-
tatives of The HSUS, demonstrated
against the Great Swamp National
Wildlife Refuge deer hunt held in De-
cember in Morris County, New Jer-
sy. According to wildlife officials, ap-
proximately 250 of the refuge’s 500 to
600 deer had to die either through the
hunt or other means to thin out the
herd and avoid starvation among the
deer population. Regional Director
Nina Austenberg, rejecting this logic,
told a national television audience,
“The Fish and Wildlife Service is ma-
nipulating habitat to create a surplus.

The campaign, headed by the
New England Regional Director
John Dommers, HSUS, is gearing up for a major assault
on rodeo cruelty. Documenting all
facets of rodeo abuse, including animal
transport and transportation,
in larger and smaller, ‘bush
league’ events will be the goal.

John Dommers, HSUS, has been named
as the West Coast Regional ofﬁce
Director of the New England Re-

The two-day program
attracted an enthusiastic crowd.

Regional Calendar

West Coast

The Northwest Humane Educa-
tors will sponsor a NAHA/HSUS
Humane Education meeting at the
Airtel Hotel in Portland, Ore-
go, on May 14-15, 1982. Pre-
registration, including two lunch-
eons, is $30, $35 at the door. Space
is limited; reservations should be
made through the West Coast Re-

Regional Office, 1713 J Street, Suite
305, Sacramento, CA 95814.

New England

HSUS staff members Michael
Nex, Katy Breskvy, and John
Dommers will be among the speak-

ers at the New England Federa-
tion of Humane Societies annual
conference to be held May 21-22,
1982, at the Framingham Motor

Inn in Framingham, Massa-
husetts. Conference topics include
intensive livestock farming prac-
tices and the newly-published na-
tional curriculum guide prepared
by The HSUS. Contact the New
England Federation of Humane
Societies, P.O. Box 255, Boston,
MA 02117.

The New England Regional Of-

The Great Swamp deer hunt by ama-

The Great Swamp deer hunt by ama-

The Great Swamp deer hunt by ama-

Pound Seizure End

California State Senator David
Roberti, along with co-authors,
has introduced SB 1348 to prohib-

the Michigan Federation of
Humane Societies will sponsor a
workshop for humanitarians on
Guest participants include HSUS
President John Hoyt and staff
members Phyllis Wright, Sandy
Rowland, and Tim Greyhavens.
Topics will include Michigan’s anti-
cruelty laws, lobbying for animal
welfare legislation, shelter man-
agement, dogfghting, humane en-
ducation, and membership devel-
opment. Contact Margaret Sarnn,
1601 Caliper, Troy, MI 48064.

The HSUS and the Humane So-
ciety of Huron Valley will sponsor a
session of The HSUS’s Animal
Control Training at the University
of Michigan in Ann Ar-
bor on May 10-21, 1982. Contact
Phyllis Wrights, HSUS, 2100 L
St., NW, Washington, DC 20037.

Medical Association oppose SB
1438.

In 1980, California research in-
institutions received over 297 mil-

It is particularly disturbing," said HSUS field
investigator Eric Sakach, "that so many of those participating in the
carnage take obvious delight in such a brutal act, even allowing children to participate.

The "bunny bops" aroused and
angered citizens and humane groups from coast to coast, HSUS President John A. Hoyt called up-
on Idaho Governor John V. Evans to intercede. "I hope HSUs will come to us
and urge them to pass this much
needed legislation. Any organiza-
tion may join the coalition by con-
tacting the West Coast Regional
Office.
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Appearances can be deceiving. No where does this aphorism hold more truth than in the attitude of state fish and wildlife agencies toward the Endangered Species Act (ESA), one of this country’s most important and influential wildlife-protection laws.

State fish and wildlife agencies are those organizations in individual states charged with the responsibility of protecting, preserving, and managing wildlife and wildlife habitat. Because they have been funded, in most states, from hunting and trapping licenses and fees and not from general tax revenues, these agencies have received little attention from governors and other elected officials. The agencies have tended to act a little like independent fiefdoms, taking political actions and positions of which elected state officials and citizens (whom state governments are supposed to serve) are unaware. These actions have often been influenced by the pro-hunting, pro-exploitation attitudes of the state fish and wildlife professionals themselves and not by the opinions of citizens state-wide.

This tendency is made more pronounced at times by the existence of the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. The International Association is a loose association of the fish and wildlife agencies of individual states in the U.S. and similar agencies in Canadian provinces and Mexican territories. It is also the group which normally and nominally represents individual state fish and game agencies in lobbying efforts before the Congress.

The positions taken by this group, presumably on behalf of individual citizens in the fifty states, are very likely to be dictated by those same pro-hunting, pro-exploitation attitudes of the state fish and wildlife officials who make up its membership. These positions carry a fair amount of weight in the halls of Congress and with the administration and are taken, in many cases, without the knowledge of the governors and citizens wildlife officials represent.

A timely example is the question of bobcat protection and this nation’s international commitments under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna, known as CITES. The United States fulfills its commitments under CITES through the ESA. The American bobcat receives protection under CITES, thus, it receives certain protections under the ESA. During the past few years, lawsuits have been filed in U.S. courts on behalf of bobcat protection under the CITES/ESA agreements. These lawsuits have resulted in the courts sharply restricting exports of bobcat pelts to fur markets in Europe. This restriction was not some arbitrary judicial ruling; rather, it was the consequence of the complete failure of the federal government and most state fish and wildlife agencies to prove unlimited mass export of bobcat skins permitted by most states would not be detrimental to the very survival of bobcats in this country. The courts further ruled that, in allowing export, "any doubt whether the killing of a particular number of bobcats will adversely affect the survival of the species must be resolved in favor of protecting the animals and not in favor of approving the export of their pelts." Obviously, the court imposed reasonable requirements to protect a beautiful native American cat which has been extirpated from a number of states already and has been subjected to virtually unlimited destruction for its skin.

Enter the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. The International Association has as its major goal during the ESA-reauthorization process (taking place this year) the addition of language that would, in effect, overturn previous court decisions made under CITES, so that unlimited killing and export of bobcats may once again occur!

The state fish and wildlife agency (through the International Association) supports the positions of the fish and wildlife agency (through the International Association) supports the positions of the fish and wildlife agency (through the International Association) supports the positions of the fish and wildlife agency (through the International Association) supports exactly the opposite position! If you want your state’s position (and that of your fish and wildlife agency) on the ESA changed, you will have to write, call, or mailgram the governor. (Sadly, the governor probably does not realize his state fish and wildlife agency has taken such a position!)

Your letter should:

• Tell the governor the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies which purports to represent state fish and wildlife agency is taking a position that would weaken bobcat protection under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna and would weaken U.S. implementation of CITES.

• Ask him/her to direct the state wildlife officials to go on record supporting (1) a stronger Endangered Species Act and (2) the CITES agreements as interpreted by the courts, and (3) bobcat protection under CITES.

The state fish and wildlife agencies, and the governor, are supposed to represent you and your desires. The only way for the governor to know what you think is for you to tell him or her, as specifically as you can, what your position on CITES and the ESA is and what you want done about it. Remember, the Endangered Species Act must be reauthorized this year. Time’s awasting.

by John W. Grandy

John W. Grandy is Vice President of the Humane Society for Wildlife and the Environment for The HSUS.
Tax Deductions and Non-Itemizers

The Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 makes deductions for charitable contributions available to individuals who do not itemize deductions on their tax returns. They can now directly deduct a percentage of their charitable contribution in calculating their taxable income. In 1982, the non-itemizer can deduct 25 percent of his contributions up to $250. For example, if a taxpayer contributes $800 to a charitable organization, he can deduct $200 on his return, even though he does not itemize other deductions. The new law does provide for a yearly increase in the percentage of the contribution deducted, until 1987. Then, a taxpayer will be able to deduct the full amount of the contribution within the limit of 50 percent of his adjusted gross income. At every stage, however, the taxpayer must be able to document the contributions for which he is claiming a deduction.

The IRS provides receipts for all contributions over $10.00.

Watt and BLM Sued

On February 26, 1982, The HSUS and the American Horse Protection Association (AHPA) filed a lawsuit against the Secretary of the Interior James Watt and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to stop the illegal policy, adopted by the BLM in January, 1982, of killing excess wild horses and burros removed from the public lands in 45 days without being adopted. The BLM is further granted authority to destroy humanely, any society operating a veterinary clinic by a humane society. The BLM opposes the use it makes of the profits from the tax-exempt income.

HSUS Opposes USDA Move

The Winter issue of The HSUS News reported on the lawsuit The HSUS brought against the United States Department of Agriculture for its failure to enforce the humane care requirements of the Animal Welfare Act at the Institute for Behavioral Research (IBR) and at other research labs across the country. The USDA has moved to dismiss the suit, arguing The HSUS is merely a “concerned bystander” which has sustained only “abstract injury” because of the USDA’s actions at IBR.

The HSUS is opposing USDA’s dismissal motion, arguing the efforts of HSUS members and employees and its expenditures in providing for the IBR monkeys and in supporting the prosecution of IBR scientists give The HSUS a direct stake in the outcome of the suit. The HSUS also argues it suffered an “organizational injury” its efforts are directed to protecting animals the USDA has a statutory obligation to protect and away from other animal-welfare matters not covered by a federal program. The HSUS contends its suit is brought on behalf of the IBR monkeys, which have a statutory right to humane care under the Animal Welfare Act but cannot sue in their own behalf. The HSUS is attempting to persuade the Court its status as an animal-welfare organization gives it an “advocacy relationship” with animals that should allow it to represent and promote animal rights in the courts.

Danvers (Boston) Massachusetts November 3-6, 1982

1982 HSUS ANNUAL CONFERENCE

“Protecting Animals in Today’s World”

The events of the past several months have confirmed that the challenge to animal welfarists is greater than ever before. The abuse and suffering being inflicted on animals in almost every segment of society is unparalleled in modern history. Both locally, and nationally, the protection of animals in today’s world demands an informed, dedicated, and concerted response. We invite you to join with fellow HSUS members, directors, and staff to explore these issues in depth and formulate ways in which to ensure the protection of animals more effectively.

Program moderator for the conference will be Roger Caras, noted author, lecturer, and television commentator. The keynote address will be presented by Dr. Amy Freeman Lee, artist, educator, and preeminent animal-welfare activist.

Special conference events will be two “dilemma” forums discussing laboratory animal and intensive farming issues: a mock trial; and an optional trip to historic Boston and the New England Aquarium. The annual awards banquet on Saturday evening will conclude the conference events.

Workshops will be presented on a wide variety of topics of interest to animal-welfare activists, including sessions for persons working in specialized areas.

Make plans now to visit beautiful New England and attend this year’s stimulating and informative conference on November 3-6, 1982.

Compiled by Murdaugh Stuart Maden, HSUS General Counsel, and Roger Kindler, Associate Counsel.
As a child you learned it from the important people in your life—your parents, grandparents, aunts, uncles, brothers, sisters, teachers, clergy...

These people provided humane examples for you to follow. They helped mold your value system. They made you what you are today—a humane person!

Now it's your turn....

And Kind magazine is here to help you. Kind can be a wholesome extension of all the big and little things you do to pass your values on to the young people in your life. That's why we publish Kind. It's a unique investment for a humane future.

Subscribe for a young person today. Kind is only $6 a year for six issues. You'll feel good and the young person will be overjoyed.

Kind includes career features, puzzles, fiction, cartoon, projects, pull-out posters and more....

Use the envelope bound into this issue of The HSUS News to let us know who is to receive your Kind gift. Give us the child's name and address and indicate if you would like us to send a gift card.

Kind is the only truly humane national children's magazine! And we're proud of it. You will be, too.

Kind
The Humane Society of the United States
2100 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037