Ballots over Bullets
Wildlife-protection initiatives triumph in two states

The November election results are just one indicator of widespread public cynicism toward government officials at the local, state, and national levels. Many people have voiced the opinion that the government is not representing their interests or speaking to their concerns. Included in this group are many who believe that legislators and other government officials routinely and reflexively echo the positions of animal exploiters, rather than those of animal defenders.

Some such government officials are members of fish-and-game commissions, which are primarily responsible for setting wildlife policy at the state level. From Alabama to Alaska, from California to Maine, these commissions reflect a stunning degree of homogeneity. They are comprised almost entirely of hunters. Though they constitute only 7 percent of the American population, hunters occupy nearly 100 percent of fish-and-game-commission seats at the state level and jealously and zealously preside over wildlife policy with rod, gun, and trap.

Hunter-controlled commissions often deal a kill shot to even modest reforms. Reforms that are advanced in the state legislatures often wither and die in wildlife committees, which are also controlled by hunters.

Recognizing that elected and appointed officials have failed to institute popular reforms, animal advocates—led by The HSUS—are charting a new course. We are not relying upon the representatives of the people to institute change. We are relying upon the people themselves, through direct democracy and the ballot-initiative process.

Since 1990 concerned citizens have qualified five wildlife-protection initiatives for statewide ballots. (Under the initiative process a certain percentage of a state's registered voters must sign petitions calling for the initiative to be placed on the ballot in a general election.) Four of the five initiatives have prevailed, including both of two in 1994. The only failure was resoundingly reversed in 1994. Such wins not only signal better days for victimized wildlife, but also mark the resurrection of a process not long ago left for dead by seasoned animal advocates.

Influenced by massive advertising from the hunting and trapping lobby, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, voters turned against the animal-protection community. They rejected an anti-trapping initiative in Ohio in 1977. They rejected an anti-trapping initiative in Oregon and sanctioned a mourning-dove-hunting measure in South Dakota in 1980. They also refused to support a measure banning moose hunting in Maine in 1983.

Because these initiatives sapped enormous energy, the animal-protection community chose to curtail the use of the initiative. In 1990, however, the political atmosphere began to change. California voters approved a ballot measure to prohibit the trophy hunting of cougars. In 1992 citizens qualified two initiatives for state ballots. An Arizona measure to ban all lethal trapping on public lands failed after the National Rifle Association (NRA) and other hunting groups blitzed voters with a $1.7 million campaign based on scare tactics. In Colorado, however, voters overwhelmingly approved a measure—strongly backed by The HSUS—to ban black-bear hunting in the spring and black-bear hunting with bait or hounds at all times.

Nineteen ninety-four was a banner year for initiatives. In Arizona the voters reversed their 1992 decision and banned almost all trapping by the decisive margin of 58 percent to 42 percent. In Oregon, in a campaign led by Wayne Pacelle, HSUS vice president, Government Affairs and Media, Oregon voters approved Ballot Measure 18, which bans black-bear baiting and the use of hounds in the hunting of black bears and cougars (see page 9).

These wins represent not only stunning victories for The HSUS and other sponsors, but also stinging rebukes for the NRA and the Ohio-based Wildlife Legislative Fund of America. They are a testament to the voters of these states, who voted their heads and hearts over their fears.

Make no mistake: these were hard-fought, expensive wins. Initiative campaigns succeed through a combination of research and polling, extensive planning, coalition building, tireless signature gathering, and diligent fund-raising. Initiatives hastily undertaken are all but certain to fail.

Initiatives properly conceived can deliver major victories for animals, as the wins in California, Colorado, Arizona, and Oregon prove. Cougars, bears, coyotes, and raccoons are living emblems of the power of the people, who can and will choose to protect animals when that choice is clearly and persuasively presented.
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WHEN OCEAN WORLD, a marine park in Florida, announced in July that it was going out of business, its twelve captive dolphins faced an uncertain future. After failing to find a U.S. facility that would accept the dolphins—and absolutely refusing to consider rehabilitation and release for any of them—Ocean World sought government approval to export the animals to a marine park in Honduras. If approved, Ocean World's would be the first export since the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) was reauthorized with critical changes (see the Summer 1994 HSUS News).

Under the previous version of the MMPA, exports of captive marine mammals required a permit from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The permit process included a mandatory thirty-day public-comment period, and the agency could deny a permit on the basis of the medical condition of an animal. The new export provisions, however, explicitly state that exports no longer require a permit. The receiving facility must merely have standards that are "comparable" to those required by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)'s Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS). APHIS has yet to define "comparable" in this context or to issue regulations governing export; until it does so, APHIS has chosen to approve exports on a case-by-case basis. After evaluating information provided by Ocean World and the Honduran facility involved, APHIS approved the export plan.

Concerned, The HSUS met with USDA and APHIS officials in September in an attempt to delay the move at least until APHIS inspected the Honduran facility and held a two-week public-comment period. We were successful in convincing APHIS to conduct an inspection. Unfortunately, however, the agency did not rescind approval of the export, as we would have liked. The HSUS filed a lawsuit in Florida, seeking a temporary restraining order against Ocean World, but we were rebuffed. The dolphins were flown to Honduras on September 15. Two weeks later one of the twelve died of chronic liver disease. Because of the remoteness of its nesting area, no reliable population counts are available. However, bird watchers along the Atlantic coast have traced the course of the peregrine's recovery. In the early 1970s, an average of 100 peregrines were seen each year during fall migration on Assateague Island, Maryland; in the years 1990-93, that average rose to 564. Overall, the Arctic peregrine population is thought to be at least three times as large as it was in the early 1970s.

The American peregrine falcon, the peregrine species that nests in the lower forty-eight states, is also recovering but remains endangered under the ESA. Nevertheless, the de-listing of the Arctic peregrine is good news for animals.

One of Ocean World's captive dolphins performs for visitors before the marine park closed its doors.
evaluation before the move by APHIS or NMFS. On November 4, a second dolphin died after a two-week-long illness.

The HSUS continues to press the USDA, APHIS, and NMFS to establish a strict regulatory regime to govern marine-mammal exports. It makes no sense for the United States to establish rigorous marine-mammal-care standards at home, only to allow marine mammals to be exported, almost without restrictions, to countries that have weak protection laws—or none at all.

FOR THIRTY years the U.S. Navy has used captive dolphins for underwater object retrieval, harbor patrol, and sonar research. By 1993 the Navy had 105 bottlenose dolphins, many of them captured as recently as the late 1980s. With the end of the Cold War, however, it found itself with 25 dolphins too many for its various projects.

In April 1994 the Navy offered its “surplus” animals to licensed marine-mammal public-display facilities. Few facilities responded, probably because the marine-mammal public-display industry has a glut of bottlenose dolphins. The newly established Sugarloaf Dolphin Sanctuary in the Florida Keys, a private facility dedicated to the rehabilitation and release or retirement of long-term-captive dolphins, requested as many as 6 of the Navy dolphins. The Navy did not immediately respond to this request.

In June the television news magazine show The Crusaders broadcast a hard-hitting segment on the Navy’s dolphin program that featured an interview with HSUS marine mammal scientist Naomi Rose, Ph.D. The program caught the attention of Rep. Charles Wilson of Texas (left), who serves on the U.S. House Appropriations Defense Subcommittee. He assisted in negotiations among the Navy, the HSUS, and Sugarloaf. On July 13 the three parties met in San Diego at the Navy’s dolphin-holding facility and agreed to the transfer of 5 young, male bottlenose dolphins to the sanctuary.

With all paperwork completed, the dolphins were transferred to Sugarloaf on November 30 and reported to be adjusting well. We hope they will soon be ready to return to their homes in the Gulf of Mexico, pending approval by the NMFS. The HSUS thanks the Navy, in particular Rear Adm. Walter Cantrell, for its remarkable cooperation in negotiating the transfer of these animals. We also thank The Crusaders and Representative Wilson for their efforts to conclude this precedent-setting agreement. We thank, too, the Sugarloaf Dolphin Sanctuary for its commitment to the effort to rehabilitate and release suitable captive marine mammals.

MORE GOOD NEWS FOR HENS!

HSUS efforts to get eggs from uncaged hens into supermarkets continue to reap success. As the public becomes aware of the cruelty involved in confining laying hens in battery cages, consumers are seeking a more humane alternative product.

Publix, the largest chain of supermarkets in Florida, now carries eggs from uncaged hens in some stores. Every major supermarket chain in Sacramento, California, carries uncaged eggs. Price Choppers, the largest supermarket chain in the Kansas City metropolitan area, has followed suit.

Our egg campaign has now been successful in eight cities! This achievement is a direct result of HSUS members using their purchasing power to improve conditions for laying hens.

For information on how you can launch your own “egg effort,” contact the Farm Animals and Bioethics section of The HSUS.

FOR THE FIRST TIME, an immunocontraceptive vaccine has been used successfully to block pregnancies in free-ranging white-tailed deer.

In 1993 the HSUS-sponsored research team of Jay Kirkpatrick, Ph.D., and John Turner, Ph.D., administered the porcine zona pellucida (PZP) immunocontraceptive vaccine by dart to seventy-three female deer on the Fire Island National Seashore in New York State. A year later The HSUS was pleased to report a 70 percent reduction in fawning rates among treated does. Typically, 85–95 percent of Fire Island’s does produce fawns every year; in 1994 only 28 percent of the treated does fawned.
The human residents of the Fire Island study site noticed the difference. "In Brodkin Park, where we vaccinated thirteen does, we should have had twenty fawns [without the vaccine]. There are only three," says Marija Beqaj, the resident who is helping to coordinate the local deer-monitoring effort. "People are thrilled with the program." Both friends and foes of the deer endorsed the project, a sharp contrast to the response given to Fire Island's 1988 bow hunt. Then, residents watched stalking hunters from their back porches, wounded deer stumbled along the boardwalks, and angry protests split the island community.

Fire Island residents put in more than two years of volunteer work for the immunocontraception project, acting as "deer monitors." They learned to identify and track the movements of more than one hundred individual deer. These data enabled Drs. Kirkpatrick and Turner to deliver two injections to each doe over a three-to-four-week period and to find the does the following summer to learn whether they had fawned.

Earlier work on captive deer had demonstrated PZP to be 95 percent effective in blocking pregnancies. With some refinements in techniques, the research team is hoping to match those results. In September 1994 fifty of the Fire Island does vaccinated in 1993 received a booster shot, and ninety more does were treated for the first time. Additional studies are being planned for other sites.

The HSUS congratulates Drs. Kirkpatrick and Turner and the seashore residents who made this remarkable project possible.

THE HSUS EXPOSÉ OF canned hunts and their connections with zoos has stimulated a blizzard of media attention and public comment (see the Summer 1994 HSUS News). More than one hundred newspaper, television, and radio stories have focused on the issue since July. We continue to receive phone calls and letters daily from people shocked and angered by the hunting of animals in enclosures with no chance of escape.

Although zoos vehemently deny the possibility of any connection between them and any canned-hunt facility or supplier, a few have taken steps to implement more restrictive policies regarding the placement of their surplus animals. Even though our three-year-long investigation into canned hunts and their suppliers did not focus on zoos, it uncovered evidence of a number of zoos that conducted direct or indirect transactions with canned-hunt operations or suppliers. Such evidence makes it clear that humane placement of "surplus" zoo animals cannot adequately be addressed by stronger policies on the part of only a few zoos.

The HSUS canned-hunt exposé also reached the halls of Congress. In direct response to the HSUS article and investigation, Rep. George Brown of California introduced the Captive Exotic Animal Protection Act of 1994 into the U.S. House of Representatives. If enacted into law, the bill would stop the transport and possession of exotic animals for the purpose of killing them for entertainment or trophies. The HSUS will work hard to support the bill when it is reintroduced.

The HSUS remains willing to share the results of our investigation with the American Zoo and Aquarium Association and to work with it to urge all zoos to ensure lifelong humane treatment for wild animals in their care.

DOWNERS HAD THEIR day in Congress when the U.S. House Agriculture Livestock Subcommittee held a hearing September 28, 1994, on the Downed Animal Protection Act. Introduced by Sen. Daniel Akaka of Hawaii and Rep. Gary Ackerman of New York, the act would make it unlawful for any stockyard owner, market agency, or dealer to transfer or market Downed animals (cows, pigs, horses, and others who are unable to stand or walk unassisted because of sickness or injury). HSUS Investigator Eric Sakach, accompanied by Melanie Adcock, D.V.M.,...
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HSUS director of farm animals, testified before the committee on the widespread mistreatment of downers at stockyards. Mr. Sakach presented to the committee documentation of the numerous abuses uncovered during two large-scale HSUS investigations of livestock auctions and stockyards across the nation. We will work for passage of this crucial legislation in the new Congress.

**FUR SALES** traditionally stay strong through Valentine’s Day; one of the fur industry’s biggest days for marketing its product to consumers. In 1994 the USDA reported that the number of minks killed on U.S. fur farms dropped 12 percent, while the number of fur farms themselves dropped 13 percent. Although the fur industry announced in the fall that retail sales had risen, sales had not improved enough to prevent some furriers from going out of business.

The HSUS’s anti-fur billboards and bus-boards are on display in many communities this winter. If you haven’t seen them, contact the HSUS Wildlife and Habitat Protection section and we’ll let you know how you can help place them in your area. You can also write to us to receive a free poster.

**A NEW FEDERAL BILL** seeks to make research institutions, particularly military facilities, more responsive to the public’s concerns about the use of animals in biomedical laboratories. On August 16, 1994, Rep. Robert Torricelli of New Jersey (right) introduced the Animal Experimentation Right to Know Act (AERKA) in the U.S. House of Representatives. The AERKA can be regarded as a “Freedom of Information Act” to be applied to animal experiments.

The AERKA calls upon the USDA annually to provide the public information on the status of animal experimentation in this country. The data would include summary statistics on the numbers and kinds of animals involved, their sources, and the experiments’ purposes. The bill would also require the U.S. Department of Defense to provide in-depth annual profiles of its animal-experimentation programs and to adopt reform measures such as programs to replace current uses of animals with humane alternatives. The bill establishes a presidentially appointed commission to review the military’s animal research and make recommendations for improvements in all aspects of laboratory-animal use.

The HSUS has been advocating many of these reforms over the past several years through legal action, congressional testimony, and other means, so we are especially appreciative of Representative Torricelli’s efforts.

The AERKA recognizes that many members of the public, including even some who support the use of animals in research, are concerned about the suffering and death of the 20 million research animals used annually in this country.
The bill acknowledges both the public’s right to know about a practice funded largely by tax dollars and the need for the military (which conducts large-scale painful animal experiments) to be more responsive to the public.

The HSUS is committed to working with Representative Torricelli when he reintroduces his bill in the new congressional session.

FOR MORE THAN TWO years, The HSUS and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have worked as partners in the Green Lights program. Green Lights encourages the use of energy-efficient lighting. The program is proof that government and industry can work together to create a cost-efficient and environmentally aware America.

Green Lights participants, including corporations, environmental groups, electric utilities, and state and city governments, promote the widespread use of energy-efficient lighting systems that reduce pollution. By investing in these technologies, Green Lights participants are creating an average cost savings of 50 percent or more in their lighting bills. They are also reducing emissions of pollutants associated with global warming, acid rain, and smog.

The HSUS utilizes these lighting systems in our national operations center, located in Gaithersburg, Maryland, and in our Washington, D.C., headquarters building. As we reduce air pollution, we are freeing monies for our animal-protection programs.

THE SECOND National Farm Animals Awareness Week, established to promote an appreciation of the fascinating behaviors of farm-animal species, was observed during the third week of September. The week’s events included a national radio tour by The HSUS’s Michael W. Fox, D.Sc., Ph.D., B. Vet. Med., MRCVS. Schoolchildren and members of the media, led by HSUS New England Regional Director Arnold Baer and Farm Animals Associate David Kuemmerle, toured the Natick (Massachusetts) Community Farm to learn the difference between the lives of farm animals in intensive-confinement systems and those of animals free to engage in natural behaviors. The HSUS also participated in “The Dance of the Ripe Tomato,” held at the White Dog Cafe in Philadelphia to celebrate organic agriculture. We paid tribute to the White Dog’s owner, Judy Wicks, and her head chef for ensuring that the animal products they serve have come from animals raised in systems that are more humane and environmentally responsible than are intensive systems. The HSUS Mid-Atlantic Regional Office’s Barbara Dyer shared with “Dance” attendees interesting facts about the animal species raised for food. Participating local humane societies, animal shelters, educators, and activists received information packets, including handouts for children, to help them celebrate this annual event.
You are invited to participate in the HSUS Family Week at Meadow Creek, an environmental-education center in the Ozark Mountains of Fox, Arkansas. Your family will be able to join with others who care about animals and the Earth to learn about our animal companions in a beautiful wilderness setting.

The conference center and lodges at Meadow Creek embody humane, sustainable living: the food served is organic, humanely raised, and locally produced, and the center's energy system is solar based. Its fifteen hundred acres include mountains, creeks, ponds, and forests as well as a great variety of wildlife.

The seven-day program features daily sessions on animals, the Earth, and HSUS initiatives to protect our fellow creatures; evening campfires; and nature hikes and side tours to Blanchard Springs Caverns, the Buffalo River, and the Mountain View Ozark Folk Center.

Hosting and participating in the week will be John A. Hoyt, chief executive, HSUS, and his wife, Trudy Hoyt; Michael W. Fox, D.Vet., Ph.D., vice president, Farm Animals and Bioethics, HSUS; Rick Clugston, Ph.D., executive director of the Center for Respect of Life and Environment (CRLE); Jay McDaniel, Ph.D., author of numerous books on the spirituality of animals and nature; and the Meadow Creek staff.

Meals, lodging, and all activities for the week are $400 for one adult, $700 for a couple, $900 for a family of three, and $1,400 for a family of four. Each family/couple will share a separate room. Some scholarships and travel subsidies are available. Shuttle service is provided between the Little Rock International Airport and Meadow Creek. Registration is limited. The deadline for registration is April 15, 1995; allow ample time to receive your registration information. Please fill out the coupon below and mail it to CRLE, 2100 L St., NW, Washington, DC 20037.
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Victories in the West
Voters restrict hunting and trapping

On November 8 voters approved sweeping statewide ballot measures restricting bear and cougar hunting in Oregon and steel-jaw leghold trapping in Arizona. The election marked the first time ever that two animal-protection ballot measures had been approved by voters in the same year. The HSUS—dueling with the National Rifle Association (NRA) and other pro-hunting and pro-trapping organizations—was the primary national organization backing both measures.

In Oregon voters approved Ballot Measure 18, which bans the baiting of black bears by trophy hunters and the hunting with hounds of bears and cougars. The measure drew strong support in the Portland, Salem, and Eugene areas of the state.

Ballot Measure 18 was launched in late 1993, after the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission rejected calls from wildlife advocates to eliminate bear baiting and the hunting with hounds of bears and cougars. Bear baiters typically litter the woods with rotting meat, fruit, and other odorous foods and then shoot bears who come to eat the bait. Hound hunters release packs of dogs whose collars are fitted with radio transmitters, wait for the dogs to tree a bear or cougar, and then shoot the treed animal at close range.

Wayne Pacelle, HSUS vice president, Government Affairs and Media, who led the Oregon campaign, charged, “Baiting and hounding are the moral equivalent of shooting an animal in a cage at a zoo. There is no sport in shooting a feeding bear or a trapped cougar.”

The HSUS, working with other member organizations of the Oregon Bear and Cougar Coalition (OBCC), including the Oregon Humane Society, the Oregon Sierra Club, the Humane Society of the Willamette Valley, and The Fund for Animals, led an all-volunteer signature-gathering campaign that qualified the measure—met the requirements for the measure to be voted on in a general election—with 90,000 signatures of Oregon-registered voters.

Opponents attacked Ballot Measure 18 with fury. Realizing that voters would not sanction either method of hunting as sporting or humane, Measure 18 opponents argued that these practices were necessary to control burgeoning populations of bears and cougars, which would threaten not only livestock and timber interests, but also human safety. Led by the NRA and the Columbus, Ohio-based Wildlife Legislative Fund of America (WLFA), these opponents mounted a massive advertising campaign designed to frighten voters into rejecting Measure 18.

Measure 18 opponents received substantial help from the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), which took advantage of every opportunity to dis-
credit the initiative, even though the ODFW, as a state agency, is precluded by state law from taking a formal position on ballot measures.

In the end, voters rejected the scare tactics of opponents to Measure 18, despite the blitzkrieg of negative advertising. The passage of this measure builds upon two other recent tremendous wins: California’s 1990 ban on the trophy hunting of cougars and Colorado’s 1992 ban on both the hunting of black bears during the spring and the hunting of black bears with bait or hounds.

The 1994 elections also delivered a ban on trapping on public lands in Arizona, where ban proponents swept to a landslide victory only two years after a similar measure had been decisively defeated in that state. Help Abolish Leghold Traps (HALT)—with substantial financial and grass-roots support from The HSUS—qualified a measure to ban the use of all lethal traps on all public lands in Arizona—83 percent of the entire state.

In 1992 a like measure was defeated after the NRA and the WLFA led a $1.7-million campaign to defeat the initiative, falsely charging that the measure banned all hunting and fishing, as well as trapping, on public lands. But in 1994 anti-trapping forces, led by Phoenix activist Janet Evans, qualified the measure again—the only incidence of a virtually identical measure being qualified in successive elections.

This time, with the supporters clearly indicating that the ballot measure banned only trapping and not hunting or fishing, voters offered a decisive verdict. Proposition 201 was approved by a margin of 60 percent to 40 percent. Voters and editorial boards throughout the state judged trapping to be the cruel and indiscriminate practice that it is.

Proposition 201 marks the first-ever successful passage of a statewide anti-trapping measure. Prior to the 1992 defeat in Arizona, similar measures had been defeated in Ohio in 1977 and in Oregon in 1980.

“The passage of ballot measures in Arizona and Oregon sends a clear and unmistakable signal to state fish-and-game agencies that they can no longer pander to the wishes of trophy hunters and commercial trappers, but must pick up on the wishes of nonhunters who want the states to implement more humane wildlife policies,” declared Mr. Pacelle. “These agencies must be service agencies for wildlife, not service agents for those who wish to exploit wildlife.”

Reflect for a moment . . . how can I help animals even when I no longer share their world . . . ?

Through your bequest for animal protection to The Humane Society of the United States, your will can provide for animals after you’re gone.

Naming The HSUS demonstrates your lasting commitment to animal protection and strengthens the society for this task. We will be happy to send information about our animal programs and material that will assist in planning a will.
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Name

Address
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A musher and dog team race in the Iditarod. The HSUS has been committed to discovering the clinical reasons why so many dogs have died during the race over the years.

INVESTIGATIONS

Iditarod and "Sudden Death"
Exertional myopathy cited in dog's death

In March 1994 the annual Iditarod sled-dog race from Anchorage to Nome, Alaska, claimed the life of a dog belonging to four-time Iditarod champion Susan Butcher. "HC," a female husky, appeared to collapse and expire in a manner consistent with "sudden-death syndrome," the label used since the late 1980s to explain the deaths of a number of dogs who died without obvious cause in previous Iditarods.

The HSUS has long been suspicious of the term "sudden-death syndrome" because it provides no real information about the cause of death. When John Blake, D.V.M., a veterinary pathologist, performed the necropsy on HC, The HSUS's suspicions seemed justified. The fatal condition was consistent with a diagnosis of exertional myopathy. High levels of calcium and myoglobin were found in the dog's body. Myoglobin, which causes acute kidney failure, and calcium, which causes heart failure, are released by muscle tissue when it breaks down, usually as a result of excessive physical exertion or, in an unconditioned animal, after hard exercise. The necropsy report revealed that HC, although well conditioned, extremely well nourished, and a seasoned, enthusiastic runner, showed signs consistent with complete physical and psychological exhaustion.

The very nature of dog mushing, or racing, may disguise early symptoms of exertional myopathy (which may not reach its fatal point until days into the race). With from ten to fifteen dogs pulling together in harness, the affected dog will be carried by the team during the onset of the condition, making it virtually impossible for anyone to detect warning signs. Every minute or less, the amount of time it takes normally for blood to make its way through the circulatory system, more calcium and myoglobin are produced until the dog drops in harness. The dog is dead before the musher can remove the dog from the harness and get him/her into the sled. Such a death is not a sudden death at all, but a painful deterioration, undetectable by even the most discerning human until the animal collapses.

If affected individuals were human marathon runners, he/she could pull up or voice distress, because his/her brain would not allow him/her to continue. A sled dog, pulling with so many others, is unable to communicate distress or comprehend that his/her heart is thumping and his/her kidneys are shutting down. The dog literally runs to death.

The HSUS had Dr. Blake's tissue slides and report sent to Scott Schelling, D.V.M., of Tufts University, for a second evaluation. In his report Dr. Schelling wrote, "I concur with Dr. Blake's opinion that this dog died from the untoward metabolic/physiologic consequences of exertional myopathy."

The HSUS suspects that the majority of the dogs who have died in past races of "sudden-death syndrome" were victims of exertional myopathy. When a dog died during the 1992 race, the death was attributed to "sudden-death syndrome." No full clinical necropsy was performed. Prior to the 1993 race, The HSUS had pushed for the
performance of a full clinical necropsy on any dog who died from “sudden-death syndrome.” Six dogs expired, two from obvious trauma and the others from “sudden-death syndrome.” Before the Iditarod animal-care committee’s required necropsies could be performed, however, the bodies had been allowed to freeze, rendering any attempt to determine causes of death meaningless.

This debacle gave The HSUS the ammunition to convince Iditarod sponsors to ensure that all of our procedural recommendations, including necropsies, were adopted for the 1994 race.

The 1994 race was extremely forgiving: the quality of the snow made for easy running, and the condition of the snow coverage at Anchorage required officials to move the starting point of the race to Willow. This shift provided the competing dogs with an additional twenty-four-hour rest period that decreased their early stress and trauma.

Even before the findings of the necropsy on HC, The HSUS had expressed grave concern over the inordinate stress and trauma experienced by dogs who were pulled from competition during each annual race. In our view these “dropped dogs” were indicative of serious problems. Out of approximately fourteen-hundred dogs, four hundred to seven hundred are “dropped” each year at various checkpoints in the race. They are suffering from torn Achilles tendons, musculoskeletal trauma, severe diarrhea, dehydration requiring the administration of intravenous fluids, and other ailments.

The HSUS has spent a great deal of time exploring the issue of competitive long-distance mushing (see the Summer 1991, Fall 1991, and Summer 1992 HSUS News). The activity has gained amazing popularity and has drawn increased financial support from a number of corporate sponsors. Prior to our involvement, there was little or no public scrutiny of the dogs who died or were dropped from long-distance races.

The HSUS is convinced that thousands of sled dogs have received better care and more humane treatment, and that the public’s tolerance of dog deaths during the race has dropped, as a direct result of our involvement with mushing.

Nonetheless, in April The HSUS announced on the television show Good Morning America our opposition to the Iditarod and other such long-distance events in their current form.

The HSUS, based on our exhaustive findings and investigations, has concluded that long-distance competitive mushing entails an unacceptable probability of risk of death and/or injury to the dogs involved.

It is our belief that, without the involvement of The HSUS, the cause of the condition hitherto known as “sudden-death syndrome” would have remained a mystery for years. The HSUS attempted to avoid any polarization on the issue based on philosophy or cultural bias. Our investigation convinced us that the scientific findings of the necropsy on HC, combined with the problems some dropped dogs experience and the subsequent fate of many animals traumatized during the race, left us with no choice but to vigorously oppose long-distance competitive mushing events such as the Iditarod.

To those in the mushing community who say that this was what The HSUS had set out to do from the start, we can respond only that we sincerely struggled with this issue and that both the scientific evidence and our personal observations offer strong and accurate data to support our position.

To those of our friends in the animal-protection community who will say, “What took you so long—we knew all along” that mushing was inhumane, we reply that belief without fact is mere opinion. There were, and are, too many dogs whose care and existence have been, and will continue to be, at stake for us to allow the debate to rage simply as one opinion versus another.

In September The Timberland Company, the primary sponsor of past races (and a company whose sponsorship would have approached $1 million), announced it will not sponsor the 1995 running of the Iditarod. The Iams Company has stated publicly that it will not renew its contractual agreement with the race once it expires at the end of the 1995 running.

Will the Iditarod and other events cease to exist? No one knows. Clearly, public and corporate interests will watch more closely to see if these races continue to kill and harm the canine participants.

There is probably nothing wrong with dogs pulling a sled for fun and exercise. There is clearly something wrong with a competitive event that has as a guaranteed feature the death and/or injury of even one dog.—David K. Wills, HSUS vice president, Investigations
Go Expo in March

Come to Animal Care Expo '95, the premiere trade show and educational conference in animal care! Animal Care Expo '94 was the largest gathering of animal-care, -control, and -sheltering professionals ever held. Expo '95, March 30–April 2 at the Hyatt Orlando in Orlando, Florida, promises to be an even bigger and better show.

Register for Expo '95 today and receive the special early-registration rate of only $18! For this low fee, you can enter our exhibit hall, with more than one hundred exhibitors, and attend your choice of more than twenty-five workshops, special lectures and presentations, and social events.

Send in the registration form below or call 1-800-248-EXPO for more information.

---

**Registration Form**

(please check one of these registration boxes.)

- **Early Registration** (postmarked by February 1, 1995)
- **Registration** (postmarked after February 1, 1995)
- **Day-Long Certificate Courses** (Sunday, April 2, 1995—please choose one):
  - Cats: Issues and Topics
  - Preventing and Coping with Animal-Behavior Problems
  - Shelter Design and Planning
  - Fund-Raising for Animal Shelters

Cost Per Person Total
$18 $18
$30 $30
$60 $60

Name Title
Address
City State Zip
Organization Phone Number Fax Number

Make checks or money orders payable to HSUS Animal Care Expo '95. Return this form, with payment, to Expo '95, The Humane Society of the United States, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.

All hotel reservations should be made directly with the Hyatt Orlando at 1-800-233-1234. The special Expo rate is $79/night (single or double occupancy).
This arresting image accompanies the message "Holding on to Your Best Friend Is Just the Right Medicine" in the new HSUS poster.
Karen is four months pregnant. She has heard that cleaning a cat’s litter box could be dangerous to her baby. Although she dearly loves her cat, “Samantha,” she believes she is doing the right thing as she tearfully surrenders Samantha to a local animal shelter.

Richard is thirty-four and has been HIV-positive for six months. He has cared for his dog, “Dusty,” since the dog was a puppy but has decided to give him away through an advertisement in the newspaper because his doctor told him Dusty could be a risk to his health. When Dusty is taken by a couple who answers the advertisement, Richard feels as if he has just lost his best friend.

Evelyn, aged eighty-three, has recently become a widow after fifty-seven years of marriage. Now that she is alone, her two cats, “Pumpkin” and “Shadow,” mean more to her than ever. Because Evelyn’s health has become frail, however, her nurse is worried that if she is scratched by one of the cats, she might contract some sort of infection. After her nurse suggests that she find Pumpkin and Shadow a new home, Evelyn gives them to a friend. As soon as they are gone, Evelyn becomes severely depressed.

For each of these individuals, dealing with a fragile immune system means separating from a beloved pet. Both the owner and the animal undoubtedly suffer from the separation.

Many pet owners with immunocompromised conditions have been led to believe that they should give up their pets. Is this type of separation really necessary? Fortunately, the answer is almost always “no.”

Because so many illnesses and conditions attack the immune system in some way, the chances are good that you or someone you know has a compromised immune system. When a pet is part of the family, at least two lives are affected.

(continued on page 43)

BY RACHEL LAMB AND SALLY FEKETY
Newfangled “Fun” Is Old-Fashioned Cruelty

Grunting, a wild hog waits inside a wooden chute adjacent to a specially built pen. Suddenly the chute’s gate opens, and a painful shock from an electric prod propels the hog into the 100 ft. by 100 ft. fenced enclosure—straight into the path of two snarling dogs. The hog runs frantically to the far end as the dogs give chase. He runs back and forth, seeking a way out. In his panic, he jumps into the air and smashes his face into the fence. The dogs attack the hog from both sides, tearing at his ears, legs, and testicles. Screaming in pain and terror, the hog tries desperately to escape back through the chute, but the gate is closed. As he stands there, he is an easier target for the dogs, who clamp onto him with their powerful jaws, ripping off one of his ears. The undetermined type of animal cruelty.

Officials with the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission and a few hog hunters questioned about the activity depicted in the photographs were baffled. Efforts to gain additional information from the person who brought the film to be developed were futile. The facts behind the images in the photographs remained a mystery.

Several months later an HSUS investigator discovered that the photographs had been taken at a hog/dog field trial near Athens, Georgia. It was not an isolated occurrence. Our subsequent investigation revealed that hog/dog field trials are an organized activity, involving thousands of people, that takes place virtually every weekend in Georgia, South Carolina, Arkansas, and the states bordering the Gulf of Mexico.

Hog/dog field trials consist of several events, including the “one-dog bay,” “two-dog bay,” and “two-dog bay-and-catch.” Some field trials are sanctioned by an organization known as the United Bay Pens Association. Contestants pay a $20–$80 entrance fee for each event. Spectators pay $5–$10 to watch. The pen where the trials take place is usually no larger than one-half-acre square. The dogs in the typical trial vary in type. Pit bull terrier and hound mixes are the most prevalent. Depending on the number of...
Hog/dog field trials...take...place...every weekend in Georgia, South Carolina, Arkansas, and states bordering the Gulf of Mexico.

From left to right: A chained dog waits for a turn in the hog pen; two dogs face a hog in a two-dog bay; a hog chased by dogs is lassoed by a participant in a bay-and-catch event. The HSUS is confident that hog/dog trials can be stopped before they gain wide popularity.

entries, field trials may last as long as ten hours or as little as two hours. Some attract crowds of more than two hundred people. The majority of the events take place in rural communities.

Typically, half the money gathered during each event (perhaps several hundred dollars) is given to the owner of the winning dog(s). The trial promoter keeps the other half. Revenue is also generated through the sale of concessions, equipment, and promotional merchandise, including hats and shirts. Gambling among spectators is common.

Feral boars, captured from the wild, serve as the bait animals. In an attempt to prevent serious injury to dogs and people, most boars have had their tusks removed. The most common—and most painful—method of detusking is placing a steel pipe over the tusk and snapping it off. Sometimes jagged partial tusks are left behind.

The winner(s) of each event are determined by judges selected prior to the trial. Bay dogs are required to hold the hog motionless (or “at bay”) for two minutes without biting or touching the hog for more than five seconds. When the time is up, a timekeeper signals by blowing a whistle and the dog is removed from the pen. Often dogs do not leave the hog when their owners give the command, and it may take several minutes to capture the dog. As the owner and others attempt to corner the dog, still others chase the hog back into the chute, where he is allowed to rest briefly before he is forced into the pen for another “run.”

Bay dogs who catch hogs are supposed to be disqualified. (A catch is defined by field-trial proponents as a dog’s biting and holding on to a hog for more than five seconds.) HSUS investigators found that hogs caught even for a few seconds were often seriously wounded. The dogs bite at any body part within reach, and investigators saw hogs who had suffered ripped ears, bitten testicles, and ruptured scrotums.

The dogs often suffer injuries as well. On one occasion our investigators witnessed a boar with tusks pick up a dog with his tusks and slam him repeatedly against a wooden fence. During another field trial, a dog was gored by a boar with a partial tusk; the dog was left to bleed to death in the back of a pickup truck.

To justify their actions, field-trial participants compare hog/dog trials to hunting hogs in the wild. In fact, hog/dog field trials bear very little resemblance to hunting.

What You Can Do

Hog/dog field trials are held in Georgia, South Carolina, Arkansas, and states bordering the Gulf of Mexico. Contact the lawmakers and game and fish departments of these states and demand that they take action to prohibit hog/dog field trials. If you know the location of such a trial, contact The HSUS and your local media.
HSUS investigators found that hogs caught even for a few seconds were often seriously wounded....The dogs often suffer injuries as well.

Hogs hunted in the wild have some opportunity to escape and/or defend themselves, but the hogs used in field trials have no possibility of escape and no way to defend themselves. They must take part in trial after trial. The HSUS has found that many in the hunting community (The HSUS is strongly opposed to hunting in general) oppose hog/dog trials as we do. They see the activity as the repeated torment of a captive animal that could never remotely resemble anything close to a sport.

Though The HSUS believes animal cruelty is inherent in hog/dog field trials, these trials’ legal status remains a question in some states. From the beginning of our investigation, The HSUS believed Florida’s laws prohibiting animal cruelty and animal baiting applied to hog/dog field trials. Trial participants argued that the practice is legal because of its correlation with hunting. To our astonishment, some law-enforcement officials in the state agreed.

The HSUS provided Florida Attorney General Bob Butterworth and several state legislators with documentation from our field-trial investigations. We requested that Mr. Butterworth render an opinion regarding the legal status of the contests. Just three days after our official request, he concurred with our interpretation of the law in an opinion that clearly stated that hog/dog field trials are illegal in Florida.

The next day a Florida hog/dog field-trial promoter who had been advised of the attorney general’s opinion concluded it would be legal to go ahead with a field trial as long as the dogs did not catch a hog.

In the presence of HSUS investigators and deputies from the Glades County Sheriff’s Office, the promoter tried to decrease the likelihood of a catch. He stationed more people than usual inside the bay pen to capture any dog attempting to catch a hog.

In the first event, several dogs bit and caught hogs despite genuine efforts to prevent them from doing so.

After the first event, the promoter canceled the rest of the trial. Many hogs showed signs of injury. Convinced that the abuses witnessed during the one-dog bay clearly violated state animal-cruelty laws, The HSUS submitted video footage and testimony regarding hog/dog trials to the local state’s attorney. In exchange for protection from the likelihood of criminal prosecution, the promoter signed a statement indicating that he would not conduct any more field trials.

The HSUS worked with People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals and the law firm of Holland and Knight to block another field trial that was scheduled to be held in Branford, Florida. After holding a hearing on the matter, Circuit Judge Roy Bean issued a temporary restraining order against the event’s promoter. We hope Judge Bean will issue a permanent injunction.

In Texas we found hog/dog trial partici-
The dairy cow is a part of American culture. She is the subject of childhood songs and nursery rhymes; for centuries she peacefully grazed the countryside; and she is the source of our first ice-cream cone. She has inspired paintings, poetry, and songs and is featured in the mythology of early civilizations. Anthropologists cite her as the key to the human species' transition from hunters to pastoralists, the basis of a "cattle culture" in early history that many later cultures have identified as the beginning of civilization.

The dairy cow, with her wobbly legged calf gazing wide-eyed

By Melanie Adcock, D.V.M., and Mary Finelli
The dairy cow, dubbed humankind’s “foster mother” by the dairy industry, increasingly is being moved from the pasture to confinement housing and dry lot.
by her side, has touched our hearts. Whether as a symbol of motherhood or as a representative of the traditional family farm, she has the respect and affection of many Americans.

But despite our fondness for her, most of us know little about the modern dairy cow or the increasingly intensified methods of production to which she is subjected. Perhaps public attention to her plight will allow caring consumers to help her find her way back to the proverbial greener pastures.

**COMPLEX AND SOCIAL**

Dairy cows, like all animals commonly used for food, are complex, sensitive, and highly social animals. Each cow has her own personality and preferences. Although somewhat timid, cows are quite inquisitive and will closely investigate anything new in their environment. Cows are very responsive to the treatment they receive and are able to remember a bad experience for years afterward.

Cows have varied tastes in music. Playing music to cows during milking can have a positive effect on their milk production; in one study cows gave an amazing 35 percent more milk when listening to the music of Elvis Presley than to the music of other artists. Some herds prefer country-western or opera, while others like rock and roll.

Cows can act heroically. "Carletta" the cow rescued an elderly Italian farmer, Bruno Cipriani, from being gored to death by a wild boar. She mooed loudly and attacked the animal with her horns, saving the farmer's life. Mr. Cipriani said of his companion of ten years, "We just have a great affection for each other."

"Julieann," a pregnant Brahman heifer, was apparently homesick for the farm from which she had been moved. She walked more than thirty miles, crossing barbed-wire fences, a river, and several highways, despite driving rain. In twenty hours she was "home."

All modern breeds of cattle are descended from the now-extinct aurochs, wild cattle of Europe and the Near East who had been domesticated by 6500 B.C. The first cows were brought to North America in 1611 A.D.

As herd animals, cows have a cooperative nature. The movement and assembly of the group are accomplished through various means of communication, with a greater reliance on cooperation than on domination. Although a hierarchy is established within each herd, dominant cows usually are not herd leaders. Instead, the leader at any particular time can be any one of a pool of animals.

Cows have a nine-month pregnancy. A cow will separate herself from the herd shortly before her baby is born. After birth, she begins licking the newborn. Some cows will "talk" to their calves, encouraging them to stand and begin suckling. They are caring mothers and will bravely protect their young.

Mothers will share "baby-sitting" duties, with one or two cows remaining with all of the calves while the rest graze. One amused farmer reports finding his large bull, "Sandy," watching over the babies while the cows were grazing a short distance away.

Dairy cows form strong bonds, especially among mothers and young and among peers. If they are allowed to stay together, the bond between a cow and her calf remains even after weaning. As calves grow up together and, as young cows, give birth, their calves may also associate with each other. Cows demonstrate preferences in their associates: certain cows simply choose to avoid one another.

By nature, calves spend a great deal of time interacting and playing—leaping, running, frolicking, and butting heads. Their mothers are frequently the object of much of this play behavior.

Cows can perceive higher and fainter noises than can humans and can detect odors from more than six miles' distance. They are visual animals, preferring to keep herd mates in sight and becoming dis-
tressed when separated from them.

The dairy cow is a ruminant and as such is suited to a diet of grasses and other roughage. Her four-chambered stomach allows her to digest plants that other animals cannot utilize. When a cow ruminates she chews partially digested plants (the cud) prior to full digestion. The average cow spends six hours a day eating and eight hours ruminating.

THE MODERN MILK MACHINE

A dairy cow must have a calf to produce milk, after which she can be milked for ten months. In order to have a continuous cycle of milk production, she must produce one calf and complete one lactation every year.

Today’s dairy cow has been bred to be a milk machine, producing an average of 15,557 pounds of milk a year, almost 40 percent more than her counterpart of just sixteen years ago. While the undomesticated cow produced enough milk to feed her one or two calves, a dairy cow in a modern dairy farm produces about twenty times more milk than her calf needs.

Excessive production demands, coupled with the trend toward confining cows indoors or in densely populated drylots (enclosures devoid of grass), have resulted in serious welfare and disease problems for the dairy cow.

To meet these extraordinary milk-production demands, cows are fed a diet geared toward high production. This diet, which is heavy in grain, is fed to species whose digestive tract is suited to roughages. High-production diets create myriad health problems, including severe metabolic disorders and painful lameness, which are compounded by confinement.

At any given time, half of U.S. dairy cattle have mastitis (a painful udder inflammation, usually caused by infection). Losses to the dairy industry from mastitis are estimated to exceed $2 billion a year. Mastitis is typically treated with antibiotics. The incidence of this disease would be even higher if not for the antibiotics given routinely to cows between lactations.

Today’s cow is typically burned out (unable to keep up production) and sent to slaughter, for human consumption and other uses, at an average age of four years. Her natural life span would be from twenty to twenty-five years. (The world’s oldest cow to date lived to be forty-nine!)

A recent analysis by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration found that meat from dairy cows and their calves was the source of 60 percent of those drug and other chemical residues found in edible meats in amounts that violated allowable limits. (Dairy cows are the source for the majority of processed beef and 26 percent of hamburger in the United States.) The government’s ability to ensure a safe milk supply has also come into question.

Despite a dairy-product surplus and with cows already pushed to their limits, recombinant Bovine Growth Hormone (rBGH), a genetically engineered drug injected into dairy cows to increase milk production, has been approved for use by American dairy farmers (see the Spring 1994 HSUS News). Embryo transfer, cloning, the creation of transgenic cows, and the engineering of cows to secrete pharmaceuticals and other substances in their milk are also under way.

Another practice growing in popularity is tail docking, the removal of about two-thirds of an adult dairy cow’s tail—without use of an anesthetic. This procedure, the rationale for which is that it keeps cows cleaner, is completely unnecessary. It also deprives the cow of her natural means of swatting flies.

Newborn dairy calves are typically taken from their mothers at birth or shortly thereafter. Some female calves are kept as replacements for individuals in the dairy herd. The other calves are sent to slaughter as babies, to veal farms, or to be raised for beef. Many are sent to stockyards when only one or two days old, even before they can walk.

It is increasingly common for baby calves who will be leaving the farm not to receive colostrum, the antibody-rich milk produced by their mothers. Colostrum helps protect calves from disease and increases their chance of survival. It is critically important because calves in the sale/slaughter pipeline are often transported long distances, subjected to rough handling, and exposed to numerous diseases and weather extremes. They may be given no opportunity to rest or eat.

Calves destined to be slaughtered at sixteen weeks of age for “milk-fed” veal spend their lives in crates so narrow that they are unable even to turn around. Denied water and solid food, they are fed a diet consisting solely of an intentionally iron-deficient milk replacement, often containing antibiotics, which they typically lap
Dairy cows are complex, sensitive, and highly social animals. Cows have their own personalities and preferences; they can form strong bonds with their peers or, alternatively, choose to avoid one another altogether.

from a bucket twice a day. Veal is a byproduct of the dairy industry that owes its existence to the surplus calves delivered by ten million dairy cows every year.

Another by-product of the dairy industry is the downed animal—an animal who is too weak, ill, or injured to stand or walk without assistance. Burned-out dairy cows move on their own. They are often left to push their cows past their natural limits; both downed calves and cows are often dragged or thrown and are trampled by other animals. Downed dairy cows are painfully dragged off trucks and across stockyards by chains or ropes tied around one leg. Both downed calves and cows are shocked with electric prods, kicked, and beaten during the transport and auction process in futile attempts to get them to move on their own. They are often left without food, water, or veterinary care, sometimes for days at a time, until they either die or are loaded onto trucks yet again for a trip to slaughter.

As many as 90 percent of downed animals could be prevented by simple improvements in management, handling, and transportation practices, including keeping newborn calves on the farm of their birth for a minimum of five days before sending them to market.

CONSUMERS HOLD THE KEY

Both dairy cows and dairy farmers are victims of the trend toward large-scale industrialization of dairying and the obsession with ever-higher levels of milk production. Dairy farmers are often caught in economic tides that will either push them into bankruptcy or force them to act as though bigger is better. Since the 1950s, the number of farms with milk cows has decreased by 90 percent. In less than ten years, the number of dairy cows kept in herds of more than five hundred has increased 166 percent, paralleling the arrival of large drylot dairies, of over one thousand cows, in Florida, California, and states in the Southwest.

As consumers, we must help shift the odds in favor of the dairy cows themselves and those dairy farmers who care about their animals. We must support farmers who want to farm without having to push their cows past their natural limits; who provide consumers with high-quality foods produced with respect for the environment; and whose presence on the land nurtures rural communities and the family farms that Americans cherish.

Consumer efforts toward these goals are already meeting with success. Veal consumption has decreased from its peak of 3.5 pounds per capita in 1993, owing in large part to the public's refusal to purchase inhumane produced products such as milk-fed veal.

Public pressure on federal legislators was a primary impetus for hearings on "no downer" legislation before the U.S. House Agriculture Subcommittee on Livestock. Decision makers must continue to hear that the public will not tolerate abuse of downed animals.

Consumers are fighting for package labeling that allows them to choose dairy products from cows who have not been injected with rBGH. More than 2 percent of the milk sold in this country is now either labeled organic or rBGH-free. Federal labeling legislation has been introduced in Congress, and several states have passed legislation allowing an "rBGH-free" label.

How we spend our money on food directly influences how food is produced and how animals are treated. Even the smallest of efforts is important. Consumer power can create a better future for farm animals, for humane farmers and ranchers, and for ourselves.

Melanie Adcock, D.V.M., is HSUS director of farm animals; Mary Finelli is a research associate in the HSUS Farm Animals and Bioethics section.

HOW YOU CAN HELP

- Don't purchase milk-fed veal.
- Ask your supermarket manager to stock milk and dairy products that are rBGH-free, and ask your local school board to request rBGH-free products from dairy suppliers.
- Write The HSUS for a list of producers and distributors who have pledged to reject dairy products that come from cows who have been injected with rBGH.
- Shop at natural-food stores, food co-ops, and farmers' markets where you are likely to find food choices that are the products of more humane, sustainable agricultural practices.
- Remember the 3Rs when you shop or eat out:
  - Refine your diet by purchasing only organic or rBGH-free dairy products and other animal products obtained in more humane and sustainable ways. (The Human Consumer and Producer Guide can help you locate such products.)
  - Reduce your consumption of dairy products.
  - Replace the dairy products in your diet with nonanimal foods.
- Write to us for information on legislation The HSUS supports to protect downed animals and to require the rBGH labeling of dairy products.
- Send for and distribute reprints of this article to help educate others.
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HSI was recently called upon to assist in a unique mission, one of the most demanding oil-bird rescues ever undertaken. Late last June a storm packing torrential rains and gale-force winds tore through the waters off the southern tip of Africa, sinking the ore carrier Apollo Sea. More than 2,400 tons of heavy fuel leaked out of the ship, bubbling to the surface of the Atlantic Ocean about twenty-seven miles west of Cape Town, in the Cape of Good Hope province of South Africa. The spill took a devastating toll on seabirds, marine mammals, and other sea life. There may not be a less opportune location for a spill than the seas southwest of the Cape of Good Hope, particularly in June, winter in the Southern Hemisphere, when petrels, shearwaters, albatross, and other seabirds migrate to the region from their breeding areas in southern oceans.

The welfare of the Jackass Penguin (Spheniscus demersus) caused the greatest anxiety among conservationists. Named for its “braying” call, the Jackass Penguin is endemic to southern Africa—the only member of the eighteen species of penguins in the world found on the African continent. It is estimated that the number of these birds in the wild has declined 90 percent over the past sixty years. Although more than 1.2 million penguins once inhabited the region, by 1994 the total adult population numbered only 170,000.

The sinking of the Apollo Sea resulted in the worst spill in South Africa’s history. It jeopardized the lives of an estimated 40,000 Jackass Penguins on Dassen and Robben Islands; these small islands off the coast of Cape Town are home to two of the world’s largest remaining colonies of the species. Conservationists speculated that up to two-thirds of the region’s birds died or disappeared in the days after the first oil slicks began to form. Certain death awaited the surviving oiled birds unless they could be caught, cleaned, and rehabilitated.

During a week-long roundup involving military helicopters and personnel and conservation officers, 7,000 penguins were captured on Dassen and Robben Islands and ferried to the mainland. So many penguins were affected by the spill that rescuers had to concentrate their efforts on this imperiled group. Other spill victims were left to fend for themselves. Unsold penguins were left on the islands. Since the after-effects of the spill continued through the early days of the breeding season, chicks had to be dug from nestling burrows and taken into captivity.

On the mainland, wildlife rehabilitators and volunteers worked around the clock tending to the oiled birds. About 2,300 birds died from stress, cold, and the elements.
and oil contamination. The main treatment facility was located at the South African National Foundation for the Conservation of Coastal Birds (SANCCOB) north of Cape Town. Once that facility had been inundated with penguins, birds were moved to auxiliary rescue centers established at two military bases and to a private residence, where 600 chicks and juveniles were quartered. SANCCOB was accustomed to working with small numbers of oiled penguins—an October 1993 oil spill had affected 116 of the birds. Now, as many as twice that number were crowded into each of SANCCOB's chain-link-fenced pens.

Two response-team members from California’s International Bird Rescue Research Center (IBRRC), which specializes in oiled-wildlife rehabilitation, arrived in Cape Town only to discover that a lack of experienced volunteers, confusion over treatment protocols, and difficulties in obtaining supplies and equipment had contributed to a chaotic situation. Care of the birds was being entrusted to a volunteer labor force primarily comprised of schoolchildren on vacation.

IBRRC’s executive director called HSI. The two organizations have collaborated on several oil-spill responses, conducted joint training classes, and cooperated in the publication of treatment manuals. In 1991 and 1994, IBRRC and HSI had teamed up to aid Magellanic penguins harmed by oil pollution in Argentina.

HSI dispatched Guy Hodge, HSI director of data and information services, to South Africa. Mr. Hodge has eighteen years of experience with oil spills and is a pioneer in the capture and treatment of oiled wildlife.

At SANCCOB a management team was put together to supervise the care of oiled penguins. Working closely with SANCCOB officials, five rehabilitators from HSI and IBRRC streamlined the treatment process and accelerated the rehabilitation of oiled birds. Overseeing the penguins’ feeding regimen fell to Mr. Hodge. Unlike other species of seabirds, penguins will only consume dead fish if fed by hand. Each of 3,000 birds had to be hand-fed twice a day, a process that lasted from dawn to dusk.

Feeding aside, the rehabilitation of oiled birds is a technical process that must be conducted to exacting specifications. At SANCCOB each penguin was washed in a series of detergent baths formulated to the precise concentration and temperature required to remove oil from the bird’s plumage. The limitations of the center’s hot-water system allowed IBRRC personnel to wash only 30–45 birds per day. Washed birds were then allowed to swim regularly in pools to remove any residue of oil or detergent from their feathers.

Prior to release, each penguin was subjected to a rigorous evaluation, including a blood test, weight check, physical examination, and swimming trial (to make certain that his/her plumage was once again waterproof). Each bird was then ringed with an individually numbered metal tag before being released.

The continued flow of oil from the ocean floor delayed the return of the rehabilitated penguins to the wild. The first release of 488 birds did not take place until thirty days after the sinking of the Apollo Sea. Chicks were ferried to Robben Island once they were self-sufficient; adult birds were released on a coastal beach about twenty-five miles north of Cape Town. Jackass Penguins are thought to mate for life and return each breeding season to the nesting burrow they originally made together. Within days of the first release, ringed birds were observed reuniting with their mates, returning to nests, swimming, and feeding on schools of anchovies and sardines. During Mr. Hodge’s three weeks in South Africa, 2,500 penguins were rehabilitated and returned to the wild. Oiled birds continued to arrive at SANCCOB through August, and it was not until mid-September that the rescue operation ended.

The number of birds handled during this spill—more than 6,000—may be without precedent. The 1989 Exxon Valdez spill in Alaska involved the rescue of only one quarter as many birds as were handled in South Africa. “Wildlife rehabilitators have never before had such an immediate or significant impact on the fate of a wildlife species,” observed Mr. Hodge.

While the rescue operation helped to assure the survival of the Jackass Penguin, the species remains in peril. The wreck of a Spanish super tanker, which sank in 1983 with its cargo of oil, sits on the ocean floor just a few miles from Robben and Dassen Islands, a potential threat to the penguins. HSI is petitioning for the Jackass Penguin to be formally designated an endangered species. We will also be offering our expertise and support to South Africans in developing an oil-spill contingency plan and training materials.

Wildlife rehabilitators feed some of the rescued penguins after the Apollo Sea spill. Each of 3,000 birds had to be fed by hand twice a day.
Jackass Penguins off South Africa's coast are members of a dwindling wild population. Inset, above: A penguin is washed in a detergent bath. Inset, below: Guy R. Hodge (blue jacket) is part of a penguin-release team.
CITES: A MIXED BAG

In November more than eight hundred people, including delegates from 124 nations, met in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, to discuss the fate of one hundred of the world's most threatened species of animals and plants.

Such species are considered by some to be valuable commodities in the international marketplace. The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), the subject of the Florida meeting, is an international treaty that establishes rules for trade in threatened species (see the Fall 1994 HSUS News). During 1994's biennial meeting of the parties to CITES, the treaty itself was under attack from pro-trade governments and wildlife traders who are tired of CITES's protection of species from trade. They want to cripple CITES, the only obstacle to the killing or capturing of endangered and threatened species for profit. These interests would have the world believe that animals, even endangered or threatened ones, must have economic value if they are to survive. Those species are virtually deprived of their economic value from trade because they are listed on Appendix I and commercial trade in the animals or their parts is illegal.

At the CITES meeting, The HSUS attacked this "use them or lose them" philosophy, sometimes called "sustainable use of wildlife." John A. Hoyt, president of HSI, introduced his recent book, Animals in Peril: How "Sustainable Use" Is Wiping Out the World's Wildlife. In his remarkable expose, Mr. Hoyt describes the way in which wildlife use is claimed to be "sustainable"—able to occur at a rate that will not cause the species either to decline in number or to change in population structure. While such use is theoretically possible, it virtually never works in a real world dominated by economic interest and greed. "Sustainable use" has become a catchphrase for business as usual and is, in reality, commercial exploitation cloaked as conservation. Under the guise of "sustainable use," species are being exploited to the point of depletion. Mr. Hoyt challenged the CITES delegates to rethink their attitudes towards the exploitation of the world's wildlife before the destruction is complete.

HSUS board member and renowned primatologist Jane Goodall, Ph.D., was also a visible presence at CITES. She addressed the CITES delegates on the importance of retaining the CITES treaty's emphasis on protection. When the biological status of a species is uncertain, the species should be given the benefit of the doubt and protected from international trade long before it becomes threatened, said Dr. Goodall. She was instrumental in demonstrating to the CITES delegates the folly of requiring that species fall below specific numerical standards of population size, geographic-range size, or rate of decline in order to qualify for maximum protection under the treaty.

HSUS/HSI took the lead among conservation and animal-welfare non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in organizing and preparing for the CITES conference. John W. Grandy, Ph.D., vice president, Wildlife and Habitat Protection, led the HSUS/HSI delegation, with the outstanding support of Teresa M. Telecky, Ph.D., associate director. Dr. Telecky worked for more than two years on behalf of HSUS/HSI to develop and coordinate a new coalition of organizations, the Species Survival Network (SSN). Each of the almost sixty SSN member organizations from around the world is dedicated to making CITES work as intended. The SSN was a powerful force at the Novem-
Some white rhinos lost Appendix I protection at CITES. Inset, left: Joining Jane Goodall, Ph.D., (center) at CITES are (from left) HSI’s John W. Grandy, Ph.D., Teresa M. Telecky, Ph.D., Patricia Forkan, and John A. Hoyt. Inset, below left: CITES delegates meet in Florida. Inset, below: The Body Shop’s display at the SSN reception attracts attention.
ber meeting, helping to raise funds to bring NGOs from developing nations to Florida, holding a reception for CITES delegates, presenting awards of excellence to ten wildlife-law-enforcement agents, and preparing and distributing a vast array of technical documents in several languages calling for delegates to vote in favor of protecting animals and plants from international trade.

The HSUS prepared several technical publications for consideration by the CITES delegates, including an expose of bear farming and trade in China and Taiwan, a preliminary report on the international pet trade in turtles, and a report on how international-development banks are encouraging nations and individuals to use more wildlife. We have also prepared special video presentations on the trade in elephants, rhinoceros, American box turtles, and sea turtles. These videos were shown to CITES delegates at an HSUS booth on the site.

Animal species given new or increased levels of CITES protection include two species of fruit bats (hunted for human consumption); the hippopotamus (hunted for the species' valuable "ivory" tooth); the giant muntjac and Vu Quang ox (two newly discovered rare species from Vietnam threatened by the zoo trade and trophy hunters); the siaga antelope (threatened by the trade in its horn for medicine and by trophy hunting); the red panda; the American box turtle; and all species of tarantula (threatened by the pet and zoo trades). Both the African elephant and minke whale retained CITES' highest level of protection from international trade.

Rhinoceroses were the biggest losers at the CITES meeting. Despite the startling decline in rhino populations over the past ten years (the result of poaching for their horns), the parties to CITES reversed their previous stance opposing any trade in rhino horn. In years past the parties have called for the destruction of government-held rhino-horn stockpiles, the elimination of international and domestic trade in horn, and the use of political, diplomatic, and economic pressure to stop such trade. However, in November the parties decided to contemplate opening up the legal trade in rhino horn (with proceeds from such trade to offset the costs of protecting rhinos). To make matters worse, South Africa's southern white rhinos lost CITES Appendix I protection; now, live rhinos and rhino trophies may enter international commercial trade. It seems that the parties to CITES are on the verge of approving the legal trade in rhino horn despite the increasingly threatened status of the five rhino species.

CITES parties also approved two measures that, in theory, may make it easier for trophy hunters to import dead cheetahs and leopards. Although this may cause increased pressure worldwide, the U.S. government has assured us that it will continue to scrutinize all such imports and refuse them entry if they will have a negative impact on the survival of the species.

Important new procedures were established for treatment of live animals confiscated in international trade, including the evaluation of the potential for their reintroduction to the wild. And while new criteria for listing species on the CITES Appendices were approved, the criteria should not prove harmful to endangered and threatened species. The parties agreed to undertake a study of the trade in the parts and products of sharks, which is believed to be affecting severely shark populations worldwide. The trade will be examined at the next CITES meeting. The parties also acknowledged the significance of the problem of illegal trade in the meat of endangered species of whales, such as the humpback, and urged CITES to work with the International Whaling Commission to address this problem.

At the SSN reception, children deliver petitions against trade in endangered species to Dr. Goodall and U.S. Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt. Three million signatures were collected worldwide by The Body Shop.
Perhaps it was inevitable that HSI should find itself expanding into Australia. When HSI President John A. Hoyt formalized his vision of a worldwide expansion of The HSUS in 1991, The HSUS had already been extremely active in southern Africa and Latin America. Australia, which is in many ways culturally similar to the United States, also seems a natural point of focus. Australia shares many of the same problems of human/animal interaction, such as human-population growth, loss of wildlife habitat, conflicts between the interests of livestock ranching and those of native wildlife, and surplus companion animals.

Australia is a major economic and socio-political power in the South Pacific. Opening an HSI (Australia) office made sense both philosophically and strategically. Nonetheless, every office and every program of HSI succeeds or fails on the basis of the strengths and leadership of those individuals who guide and implement the HSI mission.

The appointments of Executive Director Michael Kennedy and Marketing Director Verna Simpson guarantee that the HSI expansion into Australia will provide greatly needed protection for the animals of that area of the world. Mr. Kennedy has a long and distinguished record in the conservation community. The senior policy adviser for the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) (Australia) since 1990, Mr. Kennedy brings fifteen years of experience to his new role. He is the former national coordinator for the National Threatened Species Network, under the auspices of WWF (Australia); environmental consultant for WWF (Australia), the federal Department of the Environment, and the Wilderness Society; and personal environmental-policy adviser/private secretary to the Honorable Barry Cohen, MP, federal minister for the environment.

Ms. Simpson is an accomplished fundraiser with a strong commitment to and love for animals. While managing direc-
HSI (Australia) will also be tackling key animal-welfare issues at the state and Commonwealth level, specializing in policy and legislative-development programs.... HSI (Australia) has already been successful in urging the Commonwealth minister for the environment to place a number of important conditions upon the Northern Territory's approval to seek the unqualified listing of the saltwater crocodile, _Crocodylus porosus_, on Appendix II of CITES. HSI will pursue this program with intense scrutiny. 

Mr. Kennedy is proposing new program initiatives for HSI (Australia): investigations into aspects of the wildlife trade, general wildlife conservation, threatened-species conservation, CITES issues and implementation (in conjunction with The HSUS), and humane treatment of animals controlled by government agencies for the purposes of nature conservation.

"With the rise in the 'use it or lose it' ethic in this country, and the concurrent abandonment of wildlife conservation and related animal-protection matters by the major [international conservation] groups, the argument for a new and effective national organization to enter the fray has never been more compelling," concluded Mr. Kennedy, previously a consultant to Australia's Parks and Wildlife Service. 

One of the many programs on HSI (Australia)'s agenda is the conservation of wildlife, including unique species such as the koala bear.

A kangaroo at a leaf-strewn water hole is one of the many animals to be appreciated "in and of themselves" in the HSI worldview.
Researchers studying the life spans of several species of captive cetaceans, such as killer whales, concluded that most captives live shorter lives than do their wild counterparts.

WAGES OF CAPTIVITY

Surrounded by a symphony of sights and sounds far beyond the range of human senses, a family pod of killer whales moves effortlessly in the cool ocean depths. Breaching, they are breathtaking in their majesty. Their reverie is shattered by the sudden appearance of “catcher” boats moving relentlessly at top speed toward them. The noise of the churning propeller screws and the shadows cast by the speeding boats add to the whales’ terror as one of their number is cut off and wrenched from their family—to be turned into an unwilling performer in a marine circus for the rest of his/her unnatural life.

HSUS/HSI has long maintained that the quality of life of captive animals is greatly diminished from that of animals in the wild. Now a study sponsored in part by The HSUS, HSI, and HSI (Canada) provides new evidence that these animals also may be sentenced to a shortened life span when held in captivity.

A Canadian team of researchers with the International Marine Mammal Association, Inc., which included Thomas H. Woodley, Janice L. Hannah, and David Lavigne, Ph.D., of the University of Guelph, investigated the overall survival rates of captive and free-ranging bottlenose dolphins, killer whales, and beluga whales. The basis of this research was data on captive populations in the United States and Canada for the years 1960–1992, provided by U.S. and Canadian government agencies; information on free-ranging populations in the United States and Canada, supplied by U.S. and Canadian cetacean biologists; and computer models, prepared by the researchers themselves.

The researchers found that, for the calves of all three species, annual survival rates were significantly lower in captivity than in the wild. For adult animals the annual survival rates of killer whales and dolphins were lower in captivity. Such was indicated to be the case for adult beluga whales as well. Calculations taken from the study showed that on average the expected life span of a bottlenose dolphin in captivity could be as little as fourteen years, while in the wild the dolphin could live twenty to twenty-nine years. A killer whale would live on average only fifteen years in captivity but as long as twenty-nine to fifty-eight years in the wild. The Canadian team found that other species of cetaceans, such as the narwhal and short-finned pilot whale, have even lower annual survival rates in captivity than do dolphins, killer whales, and beluga whales.

When comparing estimates of survival rates for captive and wild cetaceans, the researchers suggested that such estimates might not be compatible because the causes of death in confinement and in the wild are different. However, their findings seem to suggest that because cetaceans die of natural causes in the wild, through
The researchers will continue to gather data from around the world. While we intend to use this study to convince other nations to follow the lead of Brazil and Finland in banning the further capture and confinement of cetaceans, we believe that, with this new information in hand, we may be able to persuade consumers to stop supporting an industry that captures and confines such intelligent, social animals.—Michael O’Sullivan, executive director, HSI (Canada)

HUMANE-TRAP STANDARDS A SHAM

Each year millions of wild animals are trapped using the steel-jaw leghold trap—a cruel, nonselective device that has remained largely unchanged for three hundred years.

Faced with a worldwide decline in fur sales and mounting international criticism that eventually led to the passage of a European Union (EU) directive scheduled to ban the import of furs from thirteen species caught using steel-jaw leghold traps as of January 1995, in 1984 the fur industry began lobbying for international “humane” trap standards through the International Standards Organization (see the Spring 1994 HSUS News). The campaign has been spearheaded and funded in large measure by Canada, the world’s third-largest producer of furs.

An investigation by HSI (Canada) has revealed that the development of these “humane” trap standards is simply a public-relations exercise by the fur trade. Confidential government documents obtained by HSI (Canada) show a familiar pattern of government behavior intended to keep animal-protection organizations from learning the long-term plan of the fur trade, which is to perpetuate the use of the steel-jaw leghold trap.

Based on questionable science and trap-testing data derived from procedures that violate Canadian guidelines for the treatment of animals used in research, the international fur trade’s definition of a “humane” trap is so broad that it includes a leghold trap that its own research reveals is both cruel and nonselective!

The HSI (Canada) investigation revealed that the Canadian government, demonstrating a marked lack of faith in its own program to develop a “humane” trap, is trying to use free-trade laws to eliminate protection for wildlife. In May Canadian government officials initiated a consultation on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) with the EU. Because the EU directive to ban the import of furs had not been set aside, Canada was taking the first steps to file a challenge before GATT. An international agreement to reduce trade barriers, GATT has been widely criticized for its failure to protect human rights, animals, and the environment.

Despite repeated federal surveys that show that eight out of ten Canadians support the protection of wildlife, the Canadian government spends millions of tax dollars annually to support self-promoting strategies of the fur industry. HSI (Canada) has also learned that a relatively small group of individuals and companies has been given lucrative contracts to implement these strategies. We have asked the Office of the Auditor General to investigate the procedures used to award these contracts. HSI (Canada) is preparing a legal brief that we intend to file before a federal court to force it to release additional confidential documents relevant to the government’s role in supporting the fur industry. We intend to ask Canadians and other caring individuals from around the world to stop such government initiatives in their tracks.—Michael O’Sullivan, executive director, HSI (Canada)

Millions of wild animals, including countless arctic foxes, are trapped each year through the use of the steel-jaw leghold trap.
Boston's reputation as "The Hub of the Universe" seemed well earned in October when more than five hundred people made their way to the venerable harbor city to attend the HSUS National Conference. They were rewarded with four lively, information-filled days moderated by HSUS President Paul G. Irwin.

The preconference "Good for You!" forum attracted an attentive audience for keynote speakers Frances Moore Lappé and Paul Martin Du Bois, Ph.D. Despite the day's serious theme—"Choosing a Humane Diet"—forum attendees enjoyed a beautifully presented vegan luncheon and the unique catables served during a special exhibit at day's end.

The conference itself featured the Honorable Anita Pollack, who spoke from her unique perspective as outgoing chairwoman of the European Parliament's Intergroup on Animal Welfare (see page 44). In an address on Friday, HSUS Chief Executive John A. Hoyt challenged his audience with a stirring call to action entitled "A Bit Less Body—A Heap More Spirit." On Thursday evening a dessert reception honoring both Maine's Baxter State Park and the inauguration of the HSUS Wildlife Land Trust attracted attendees from across New England.

At Saturday's banquet, activist Henry Spira offered an inspirational message on grass-roots action in his acceptance of the Joseph Wood Krutch Medal. His remarks were followed by those no less eloquent of K. William Wiseman, outgoing chairman of the HSUS Board of Directors and the recipient of a Special Krutch Medal for his many years of service to The HSUS.
John A. Hoyt provides conference attendees with a stirring call to action in his Friday address.

The Massachusetts SPCA's Martha Armstrong (right) and The HSUS's Ann Church and Wayne Pacelle field questions after their workshop on lobbying basics.

Wednesday's vegan luncheon buffet offers "Good for You!" forum attendees an array of tempting salads, breads, and entrees from which to choose.

The HSUS's Jonathan Balcombe, Ph.D., makes a point during his humane-education workshop.
The Honorable Anita Pollack gives the keynote address.
Surrounded by HSUS colleagues, departing South Central Regional Director Jim Tedford receives a farewell gift—a print by artist Woody Jackson (kneeling, left).

HSUS Vice President Michael W. Fox, D.Sc., Ph.D., B. Vet. Med., MRCVS, enjoys meeting a conference attendee.

Messrs. Wiseman (left) and Irwin (right) present Maine’s Baxter State Park director Irvin C. Caverly, Jr., with a plaque honoring the park.

Exhibitors at Wednesday’s forum hand out free literature and food samples.
STEEL HOUSES MAKE SENSE

If we are going to save the great forests of the world and the wondrous diversity of plants and animals that inhabit them, we must ask not only what forested regions should be protected and which techniques should be used in harvesting, but also how we can reduce the pressure exerted on the forests themselves. So long as there is a nearly insatiable demand for forest products, there will be companies seeking to meet that demand wherever large stands of old trees remain. Any comprehensive approach to saving the last stands of pr-mordial forests, whether they are in the United States, Canada, Siberia, Brazil, Malaysia, or Zaire, must address the demand side of the forest-preservation equation, not just the supply side.

Although wood products will always play a significant role in our economic system, there has been a virtual revolution in the steel industry that allows an environmentalist to advocate the construction of steel houses over wooden (or stick-built) houses. Although other construction materials are even more environmentally friendly than steel, steel is competitively priced (compared to wood) and has a chance to alter significantly the immedi-

Framed with steel, this house is one of thousands built recently that use significantly less wood in their construction than do stick-built houses.
Market demand for lumber places enormous pressure on old-growth forests.

Clearcuts in Washington State’s Wenatchee National Forest show the consequences of lumber mills’ need for timber (inset).

Oxide emissions by 198,000 tons annually, a decrease of 95 percent. These decreases have the potential to reduce drastically the acid rain that so damages forests. More progress must be made, but improvements in pollution-prevention technology can continue to cut steel-mill emissions.

The U.S. steel industry leads all of America’s industries in recycling: two-thirds of the steel produced in the United States is recycled, and all new steel products contain recycled steel. Unlike wood, steel can be reused forever.

Using steel to build houses would also help ease our country’s landfill crisis. Nationally, 25 percent of the waste in landfills is construction debris, of which wood is the largest component. Steel comprises only a small fraction of landfill waste.

There is enough steel in six scrapped cars to make studs for a typical 2,000-square-foot house. The same size wood-framed house requires forty to fifty trees. (Old-growth forests supply the dimensionally stable wood—found in large logs—that is in the most demand for building construction.)

The use of steel for home construction minimizes chemical pollution. Steel studs are not affected by insects, dry or wet rot, or fungi, so the need to use insecticides or other chemical treatment in steel dwellings is minimized.

Though steel is a conductor and
transmits heat, with proper insulating between the studs and in the attic, steel-framed houses compare favorably with wood-framed in terms of their thermal efficiency.

Virtually any type of house can be built with steel, from a small Cape Cod to a large contemporary. Given such a wide variety of architectural designs and prices that are stable when compared to those for stick-built houses, it is not surprising that approximately ten thousand houses with steel framing were built in the United States in 1993. Between fifty thousand and seventy-five thousand steel houses were projected for completion in 1994. The American Iron and Steel Institute predicts that 25 percent of all new houses built in the United States by 1997 will be made with some steel.

We cannot live without forests, yet trees are a shrinking global resource. Controlled forest harvesting and improved forest management may, with time, lead to an increased supply of framed lumber (that which is ready for use in building construction), but right now, in many cases, forests are being cut at unsustainable rates. The loss of forests leads all too often to desertification, erosion, and the siltation of surface water. When forests are cut faster than they can regenerate, animals often lose their homes. The specter of extinction caused by forest loss then haunts the land. Given the irreversibility of extinction, preserving biodiversity should count heavily whenever an environmentally conscientious person is deciding between buying a stick-built house and a steel-built one.

Increasingly, people are appreciating the link between their consumer choices and the environmental impact of those choices. Now they can make an environmental statement when they build a home. For a free information kit on steel houses, call 1-800-79-STEEL.—Jan A. Hartke, Esq., executive director, EarthKind

LIFEBOAT FOR WILDLIFE

On June 13, 1994, London's Tower Bridge was raised for the passage of Ocean Defender, Great Britain's first "lifeboat" for marine wildlife and the latest project of EarthKind (UK), originator of the EarthKind concept.

The 1993 oil-spill disaster involving the oil tanker Braer off Scotland's Shetland Islands underscored the need for a base from which wildlife could be rescued by small boats and for the emergency rehabilitation of wildlife survivors.
Alan Knight, of British Divers Marine Life Rescue (BDMLR) and an EarthKind (UK) council member who has considerable experience in the rescue of sea life, brought the idea of a base ship to EarthKind (UK), which later made the concept a reality.

Mr. Knight located Ocean Defender in late 1993. The ship began life in Oslo, Norway, in 1912, when she joined the Norwegian southern whaling fleet hunting and harpooning whales. She was refitted by a team of hardworking volunteers and is now operated by a full-time crew. Ocean Defender fulfills her life-saving mission in several ways. She is constantly on “full alert” status in case an environmental disaster occurs. She serves in such a situation as a rescue “mother ship,” providing a critically needed base for BDMLR divers as well as other rescue workers and scientists.

Disaster relief will always be Ocean Defender’s priority, but for the greater part of any year it is envisioned that the ship will be involved in education and conservation awareness.

During her 1994 voyage circumnavigating Great Britain, Ocean Defender made a valuable contribution to the work of regional conservation groups and scientists working on behalf of sea life.

EarthKind (UK) is seeking funding to create a special wildlife-treatment unit on Ocean Defender, for what would be Britain’s first floating marine-wildlife hospital.

Prof. James E. Lovelock, president of EarthKind (UK), sees Ocean Defender as an important project. “We should be truly glad that our sturdy ship...is there to focus our thoughts on the sea, to make us aware that our ocean planet is not for us alone but for all earthkind."

Overfishing, pollution, sewage, the indiscriminate killing of sea creatures, and more than six hundred oil spills a year threaten the very life of the sea. The activities of Ocean Defender are highlighting the need for concern and action.—Margaret Cooper, chairwoman, EarthKind (UK)
THE BEST MEDICINE
(continued from page 15)

Medical experts, led by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), are reexamining the roles pets play in human health and the risks they present for people with compromised immune systems. Medical professionals now say that, although some immunocompromised individuals may be more susceptible than uncompromised people to some infections from some animals, giving up a companion animal isn’t necessarily the answer to the problem.

Increasing numbers of physicians are now echoing what many of us have known—and studies have confirmed—for years: pets are good for what ails you. This is no more true than for those people with illnesses and conditions that affect the immune system’s resistance. Such people include (but are not limited to) those with HIV, AIDS, cancer, or certain kidney or liver diseases, those who are aged or pregnant, those who have had a bone-marrow transplant, or those who are taking immunosuppressive drugs.

“Pets are good for everyone, and they are particularly beneficial for someone who is faced with illness,” says Kenneth White, HSUS vice president, Companion Animals and Field Services, who points to studies that show pet owners have stronger heartbeats than do non-pet owners and that the survival rate for patients with chronic diseases is highest for those who own pets. “Because of the strong attachment people have to their animal companions and the health-affirming nature of such relationships, these individuals must have access to accurate information to keep themselves and their pets together and happy.”

For pet owners with immunocompromised conditions, a pet can literally mean the difference between hope and despair. Many such people suffer from the loss of companions, family, friends, and good health in a painfully short period of time. “Pets can and do create a reason for hope,” says Mr. White. “Given what we now know about the risks of infection from pets, the human-animal bond should be encouraged in immunocompromised individuals, not discouraged. We shouldn’t forget that pets, too, bond strongly with their owners and that a separation is extremely traumatic for them.”

The key to saving the human-animal relationship, physicians and veterinarians say, is managing the risks. Chip Wells, D.V.M., founder of PETS-DC, a group in Washington, D.C., that provides support to pet owners with HIV or AIDS, says, “All across this country, pet owners with serious medical conditions and compromised immune systems are discovering that they can keep their beloved pets by taking simple precautions.” This is good news for millions of immunocompromised pet owners and their companion animals.

“The precautions that immunocompromised pet owners should take are relatively simple,” echoes the CDC’s Frederick Angulo, D.V.M., Ph.D. These include (but are not limited to) washing hands frequently, especially before eating or smoking and after changing a litter box or cleaning up after a pet; avoiding contact with a litter box or wearing rubber gloves when changing the box; and providing preventative veterinary care to the pet to keep him/her in good health. “By following the [precautions] regularly and consistently, the potential risks have been shown to be minimal.” In an effort to educate patients, doctors, and veterinarians on safe pet-care guidelines and methods of preventing the transmission of zoonotic diseases (those that can be transmitted from animals to humans), both animal- and health-care professionals are taking a more active role.

The American Veterinary Medical Association participated in these efforts with a feature article addressing immunocompromised pet ownership in the December 15, 1994, issue of the Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association (JAVMA). The article outlines the latest information on zoonotic diseases, their transmission, and the special needs of affected individuals.

Without asking probing questions about a client’s own health, how will a veterinarian learn if a pet owner needs this information? The HSUS has produced a full-color poster, “Holding on to Your Best Friend Is Just the Right Medicine,” as an attachment to the JAVMA article. The poster, available to animal shelters, veterinarians, doctors, health-care clinics, social-service agencies, schools, and libraries, can provide an opportunity for discussion between an immunocompromised pet owner and his/her veterinarian.

The HSUS is proud to be part of a nationwide effort involving several animal-and human-related organizations working to support and encourage the bond between immunocompromised pet owners and their beloved companions. Pets can and do create a reason for hope. Sometimes, love is the best medicine of all.

For a copy of the safe pet-care guidelines formulated by a San Francisco support group, contact Pets Are Wonderful Support, PO Box 460489, San Francisco, CA 94146-0489. For a listing of support groups for immunocompromised pet owners, contact The HSUS. For a free copy of our “Holding on to Your Best Friend Is Just the Right Medicine” poster, please send $3.00 (shipping and handling) to The HSUS, Dept. PA, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC.

Rachel Lamb is HSUS director of companion animal care; Sally Fekety is HSUS associate, animal care and sheltering.
Issues have a great resonance across borders,” said the Honorable Anita Pollack, a British member of the European Parliament (MEP) and the keynote speaker at the HSUS annual conference held in Boston in October. “And, politicians do listen to their mailbags.”

Ms. Pollack, immediate past president of the EP Intergroup on Animal Welfare, has an avid interest in such animal issues as protecting whales and reforming or eliminating such agricultural methods as the use of battery cages for hens and ofveal crates for calves. She believes that the lack of agricultural reforms “was [the EP’s] biggest failure” but that such reforms will be the “sleeper issues” in the new Parliament, which convened in July. (EP members are elected by voters from the twelve European Union—or EU—nations.)

“The culture has changed. People are now much less ready to eat battery-farmed [intensively produced] food. They’re much more unhappy about what goes on in producing the food they eat.... The time is now ripe for another bash at the battery-food issue,” said Ms. Pollack.

The Intergroup on Animal Welfare is a cross-party grouping of MEPS interested in animal welfare. It is also the EP’s most effective caucus. According to Ms. Pollack, an MEP since 1989, the Intergroup works behind the scenes with the European Commission (the EU’s bureaucracy in Brussels, Belgium) to draft regulations to protect animals. “Without a doubt, the most successful thing the [EP] has done has been the [baby-seal fur] ban,” said Ms. Pollack. The winning formula was “a combination of scientific evidence, massive public pressure, and a lot of dynamic political activity to get it through. It took a lot of pushing, a lot of shaking, a lot of jumping up and down and shouting,” she added. But it was worthwhile. “You don’t really get anywhere without having to push quite hard. There are too many vested interests. There’s a lot of money to be made out of animal suffering.”

Politics comes naturally to her: her grandfather was in the Australian Parliament. She began her career as a book editor but soon gravitated to politics. She served for eight years in the EP as assistant to the Rt. Hon. Baroness Castle, formerly Barbara Castle, a British MEP who was a strong animal-protection advocate. “I guess I caught the bug,” said Ms. Pollack, who was reelected in 1994.

Ms. Pollack’s leadership resulted in the funding of the European Centre for the Validation of Alternative Methods (ECVAM). ECVAM’s work—developing validated alternatives to testing on animals—is particularly critical, since EU legislation designed as an outright ban of cosmetic testing on animals has been diluted and postponed by EU bureaucrats.

Success spawns imitators, and now there are EP intergroups on bullfighting, hunting, and conservation and sustainable development. According to Ms. Pollack, “They are... vested-interest lobbies. The people behind these groups are always those who are actually the enemies of animal welfare. Fortunately... their numbers are small and their message is pretty muted. So I think we can contain them.”

As of January 1, 1995, Ms. Pollack and her colleagues were working in an expanded European Parliament: Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Austria have been invited to join the EU. “I think that Austria and Sweden are going to be very progressive and a great help on all of these kinds of [animal-protection and environmental] issues,” she said.

Ms. Pollack is proud that Great Britain “has a great head of steam behind animal-welfare issues,” but she is disturbed by “contradictions” within her own country. “There are all kinds of illegal practices that go on in Britain,” she said. And “there is, of course, fox hunting... It seems to me [that] in Britain we still have to put quite a lot of our own house in order.”

The HSUS conference marked the MEP’s first trip to the United States. She was “struck that people were interested in absolutely the same issues [as are Europeans]. It looks as if we’re all on the same wavelength.

“We’ve discovered that there are many organizations, in particular HSI, working on the issues that... organizations at home are working on. It is necessary that these organizations lobby in all parliamentary arenas. It is actually very nice that it is all coming together. It is very much a world family,” she laughs.—Betsy Dribben, Esq., director, European Office, HSI
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Orders will be shipped to address printed on check unless otherwise specified. Allow 3-4 weeks for delivery. For your protection, we will accept written orders only. We reserve the right not to process incomplete orders. For more information on how to order HSUS Checks, call our customer service representatives toll-free at 1-800-438-9451 8:30am to 5:00pm Eastern Standard Time. Ask for your HSUS Specialist.

**COMPLETE ORDER FORM BELOW.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
<th>Day phone</th>
<th>Start my checks with</th>
<th>Select an Elegant Lettering style:</th>
<th>Make check payable to HSUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>❑ Old English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>❑ Quill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>❑ Professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>❑ Script</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>❑ Brachetoke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>❑ Graphic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-part checks</th>
<th>Duplicate checks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 ($14.95) 1 box</td>
<td>150 ($16.95) 1 box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 ($29.90) 2 boxes</td>
<td>300 ($33.90) 2 boxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 ($44.85) 3 boxes</td>
<td>450 ($50.85) 3 boxes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Sales Tax $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third Class Shipping (add $3.50 per box) $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Optional First Class Delivery (add $15.95 per box) $*

**Grand Total $**