Will Keiko Ever Be Free?
Marine Mammal Institute offers captives hope

The captivity of whales and dolphins for public display has long been a subject of great controversy. The public-display industry maintains that exhibiting live animals serves a valuable and necessary educational function. But the HSUS and others believe that no one can learn about how whales and dolphins fit into the marine ecosystem by watching these intelligent, far-ranging animals circle endlessly in tiny, chlorinated concrete tanks. The public-display industry says that captive whales and dolphins are saved from the uncertainties and dangers of life in the wild. Yet we know that the capture of these animals is cruel and traumatic, and that captivity is debilitating.

Captivity, then, contrary to all the benefits alleged by the public-display industry, only offers wild marine mammals “protection” from the one thing they really need: their natural environment.

Public opposition to captivity for whales and dolphins was galvanized when the movie Free Willy, the story of a captive orca, set free, premiered in July 1993. That opposition brought new momentum to The HSUS’s campaign to prohibit the capture of wild marine mammals for public display and to rehabilitate and return to the wild all suitable candidate whales and dolphins.

The focus of public awareness in the wake of Free Willy was “Keiko,” the orca who played “Willy” in the film. Keiko has not been in the best of health, living in a tank in Mexico City too small to accommodate him as he has grown. Not surprisingly, those who profit from displaying captive whales and dolphins have generally been opposed to their release. However, both the public-display industry and the U.S. government have stated that they would consider the release of captive marine mammals to be a viable option if depleted populations ever needed restoration following an environmental catastrophe, either natural or man-made. The institute will help them live up to that pledge. To further this effort, The HSUS will seek to include qualified scientists and officials from the public-display industry and government in the establishment and operation of our institute.

In making the sequel Free Willy 2, producers Lauren Shuler Donner and Richard Glatzer used animated models and computer animation juxtaposed with film footage of wild orcas in place of live-animal actors. We urge the public-display industry to employ this kind of technical wizardry, instead of captive live animals, in their displays and shows. The public could then be educated and entertained without removing marine mammals from their ocean homes.

We place a high priority on the establishment of the Marine Mammal Institute and we are committed to its success. Through its work and with your support, whales and dolphins can be forever free.
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The HSUS will be working closely with officials of the National Park Service (NPS) to prevent the needless killing of these popular wild crea­tures.

THE BEAUTY and charm of many engaging fellow who ap­
peared on the cover of the Spring 1995 HSUS News
(above)―the first animal to grace the cover of the News
in its forty-year history―prompted many readers to ask for more information about him. He is a red-eyed tree frog, a species that lives in the tropi­cal rain forests of Central America. Red-eyed tree frogs, who grow up to three inches in length, are insect eaters who live in trees and are active at night. Their coloration is striking: they have a leaf-like green back, blue sides with cream-colored stripes, thin legs that are green above and blue below, orange feet and toes, and bright red eyes. Frogs are crucial members of the food chain in ecosys­tems all around the world. Adults prey on a variety of in­sects, while tadpoles and eggs are important food sources to many animals. But over the last twenty to thirty years, am­phibian populations have been dwindling due to habitat de­struction, air and water pollu­tion, and human consumption. By protecting wetlands and re­ducing chemical pollution, we can help ensure a future for these important species.

THE HSUS WILDFLIFE Land Trust was the recipient of $50,000 raised by the HSUS Accessori­on Benefit Ball, held in New York City in May. The donation will support the establishment of permanent wildlife sanctuaries closed to re­creational hunting and com­mercial trapping. Since its in­ception, the HSUS, Wildlife Land Trust and Pro­Natura Brazil—an organization
that promotes sustainable economic uses of natural resources—to protect one hundred and seventy thousand acres in the heart of Brazil’s Amazon rain forest.

CAUSING CONCERN throughout the animal-protection community and the livestock industry are increasingly complicated and cruel methods of altering the physical appearance of animals entered in youth livestock shows. Motivated by the profits to be reaped from champion animals, competitors are pump-
ing steers with air or oil to fill out concave body areas, administering steroids and drugs illegal for use in food animals, removing the ribs of lambs to cause their bodies to long-er lambs to cause their bodies to

MARCH the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), in an agency of the Department of the Interior (DOI), announced the removal of three species of kangaroo from the ESA list of endangered and threatened species. For twenty years environmentalists have fought to keep these kangaroos on the list and to ban U.S. import of kanga-roo skins. At the same time the Australian government has lobbied to remove these species’ ESA protection, claiming that it was properly managing kangaroo populations. According to the FWS there are 14 million fewer kanga-roos today than in 1981. The number of kangaroos killed each year for the interna-tional trade in kangaroo skins has skyrocketed, from fewer than 1 million in 1975 to more than 5 million in 1992. The FWS’s decision marks the first time that species have been re-moved from the ESA list in the face of declining populations. The HSUS and other organizations have announced their intention to sue over the deci-sion.

ALMOST TEN years ago, the NPS asked HSUS consultant Jay Kirk-patrick, Ph.D., and his colleagues for help in controlling the growing wild-horse population at Maryland’s Assateague Island National Seashore without harming, handling, or removing the horses from the island. In the spring of 1995 the NPS began to manage the Assateague horses by treating the mares with the immuno-con-tra-cptive PZP (por-cine zona pelVu-cida). PZP has been more than 95 percent effective in blocking pregnancy in treated mares at Assateague.

THE BEAUTIFUL Choice”. HSUS lobbied for more than 1995 egg efforts or launch that it could help with our 1995 egg efforts or launch/eggs from uncaged hens, to their own egg effort, contact the HSUS’s Bioedics and Farm Animal Protection section.

ALICE MORGAN WRIGHT-EDITH GOODE FUND FUNDAMENTARY TRUST December 31, 1993
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1993 Income from Investments—Net $55,725
Disbursements

Grants of 1993 Income to Organizations Listed $85,725

Please send me a free copy of the 1995-96 publications catalog.

Name
Organization (if applicable)
City, State Zip
Mail to Publications Catalog, The HSUS, 2100 L St., NW, Washington, DC 20037.
WILDLIFE REHABILITATION TRAINING CENTER OPENS

Each year people throughout the country rescue thousands of displaced and injured mammals, birds, and reptiles, carefully preparing these animals for a return to their natural environments.

To address the educational needs of this growing community, the HSUS has opened the Wildlife Rehabilitation Training Center (WRTC), on Cape Cod, in Massachusetts.

The WRTC is a combination classroom and clinic dedicated to providing training in the rehabilitation and release of injured wildlife. In 1995 a comprehensive curriculum of classes, workshops, and seminars was offered to laypeople, interns, veterinary technicians, and veterinarians. Prominent professionals in the field of wildlife rehabilitation and members of the HSUS staff served as instructors. The WRTC season begins each year in the spring and ends in the fall. Its programs, which run from two to four days, address specialized subjects, such as animal capture and restraint, as well as offer introductions to techniques that can be used with diverse species. As the program develops, it will provide appropriate training for highly skilled rehabilitators, as well as for novice ones, and a means of unifying and codifying disparate approaches to rehabilitation issues.

The WRTC also provides veterinary care for injured wildlife in the Cape Cod area, continuing some of the community-oriented services offered for the past several years by the private rehabilitation organization Orenda Center. The Orenda Center’s staff has treated gulls, geese, geese, raptors, raccoons, foxes, squirrels, turtles, and many other animals. The WRTC is working closely with Wildlife Information Referral Services, a Cape Cod animal-issues hotline, to help local rehabilitators with a wide range of patients and problems.

The WRTC began to take shape in October 1994, when Barbara Birdsey of the Orenda Wildlife Land Trust generously donated the Orenda Center property to The HSUS. With support from the Dodge Foundation, the HSUS conducted a study to assess the feasibility of creating a training center on the site. The study unequivocally supported our plans for such a center. The buildings on the property were renovat-

ed for the new and unique role of the WRTC.

Next spring’s program will build on this year’s offerings with the guidance of an advisory board of rehabilitation professionals from around the nation. The WRTC is the first facility dedicated to training in wildlife rehabilitation skills. The HSUS is committed to the sharing of expertise within the rehabilitation community through this center—Richard H. Farinazzo, HSUS director, captive wildlife protection.
ANIMAL-RESEARCH ISSUES

Students’ Concerns Triumph

Alternatives to classroom dissection offered

When Barbara Sant, a student at Hillboro Community College in Largo, Florida, approached her biology instructor with ethical concerns about a planned frog dissection, she was told that no alternatives for the class would be considered. She also was advised to weigh seriously any thoughts about not performing the dissection, as knowledge of frog anatomy would be essential to passing the exam. Ms. Sant decided that she had to stand up for a position she believed was morally correct. She studied appropriate textbooks and obtained a plastic model of a frog that contained more than 170 labeled parts. When the instructor made a final effort, at the beginning of the dissection class, to talk Ms. Sant to the professor. The HSUS activists arranged to speak on campuses about the reform of animal use in higher education.

In November 1993 the student animal-rights group at Sarah Lawrence College in Bronxville, New York, invited an HSUS speaker to address interested students and faculty. In an impromptu discussion following our presentation, a number of students shared personal and grievances about animal dissections with two biology faculty members present. The faculty members responded by adopting the progressive “Choice Policy Regarding Dissection in Biology Courses.” It appeared in the college’s registration materials the following spring.

Laurec Machnowski, a biology student at James Madison University in Harrisonburg, Virginia, and a leader of the campus Animal Rights Coalition (ARC), arranged to act as host to our speaker in October 1994. We met with the head of the biology department and were featured on a campus radio show. In the next few months, through the combined efforts of ARC and the HSUS, the use of animals in the school’s vertebrate physiology class (a specific target of ARC) was made optional and a new class section added that does not use animals. A new course, Issues in Animal Welfare, is being offered during the fall 1995 semester and will examine issues of animal rights, animal welfare, and the biology of animal suffering.

Providing support and guidance to students is clearly worthwhile, but there is also a need to bring this issue more directly to the schools. Meeting this need The HSUS and other animal-protection organizations, convinced the Austin Independent School District to draw up “Guidelines for the Use of Animals in the Classroom,” which state, in part: “Students who oppose using animals must be given meaningful educational alternatives, including computer programs, videotapes, physical models, etc. Students must not be penalized in any way for refusing to dissect an animal.”

Students who object to the harmful uses of animals are the grassroots of humane reform in education. The surest way, if not the only way, that such use will cease is by students demanding—politely but firmly—alternative learning experiences. The HSUS actively encourages students to put into action their sincerely held beliefs concerning animals. The numbers of students speaking out on this issue are increasing, and with them the number of schools with alternative learning materials and choice policies.

Jonathan Balcombe, Ph.D., assistant director of education, Animal Research Issues

Silver-blue mink are among the “commodities” subsidized by the USDA’s Market Promotion Program targeted

Legislation

House Cuts Mink Subsidy

Market Promotion Program targeted

The federal government annually allocates millions of taxpayer dollars to subsidize and support industries—well-heeled corporations or conglomerates, in many cases—that harm animals. It spends large sums each year to promote the trophy hunting in Africa of hundreds of species by wealthy Americans. It annually appropriates millions of dollars to the Animal Damage Control Program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), a program whose agents systematically kill predators on public lands to benefit the livestock industry.

Alternatives to dissection include the use of plastic models that can be disassembled and reassembled by a student of anatomy.
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The government also spends billions of dollars on a multiplicity of experiments involving animals. An outrageous giveaway is the annual $2 million subsidy (a total of $13.2 million since 1989) to the U.S. mink industry for fashion shows and other promotional activities that take place overseas. It’s all part of a USDA effort called the Market Promotion Program (MPP). The MPP is designed to boost the export of U.S. agricultural goods—mink pelts, alligator skins, beef, and dozens of other commodities. MPP expenditures exceed $100 million a year.

MPP defenders say the program boosts exports in a competitive and heavily subsidized world marketplace and thereby helps American small farmers sell their goods. But Congress’s own investigative arm, the General Accounting Office (GAO), has concluded that no evidence exists to demonstrate that the MPP enhances exports. What’s more, small farmers and small companies don’t benefit from the MPP: in 1993 the MPP doled out $6.6 million to Sunkist Growers, $4.9 million to Ernest & Julio Gallo Winery, $1.6 million to the Dole Food Company, $240,000 to Tyson Foods, and $500,000 to Campbell Soup Company.

The mink industry subsidy also primarily benefits large corporations. USDA documents reveal that four companies receive 90 percent of the federal funds. The two principal beneficiaries—North American Fur and the Seattle Fur Exchange—receive multi-million-dollar revenues. North American Fur took in $49 million in 1994 and is a subsidiary of the Canadian Hudson’s Bay Company, which employs fifty-three thousand people and has sales of nearly $4 billion. Rep. Peter Deutsch of Florida called the subsidy “corporate welfare at its absolute worst.”

Determined to eliminate the subsidy, the HSUS worked with Representative Deutsch and Rep. Christopher Shays of Connecticut on an amendment to H.R. 1766, the Agriculture Appropriations Bill, which would end the MPP. In May 1996, the House approved the amendment by a vote of 232 to 160. The delegations from Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina gave the amendment particularly strong support.

The Senate is expected to consider the issue this fall. The HSUS presumes that its members will contact their senators, urging the elimination of the mink subsidy. To learn how your representative voted or where the issue stands in the Senate, please call the HSUS Government Affairs department at (202) 452-1100 or E-mail waynepp@ix.netcom.com.
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The HSUS’s Wayne Pacelle listens to Sen. Rick Santorum discuss with the press a letter from members of Congress to the USDA urging action against puppy mills.

COMPANION ANIMALS

A Congressional Howl
Legislators urge USDA to act on puppy mills

In an unprecedented congressional effort, more than a hundred U.S. representatives and senators have co-signed a letter to U.S. agriculture secretary Dan Glickman urging the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to protect dogs in puppy mills. Initiated by Rep. Glenn Poshard of Illinois and Sen. Rick Santorum of Pennsylvania, the letter asks the USDA to strengthen existing regulations and increase enforcement of current laws. The USDA is responsible for enforcing the Animal Welfare Act, which covers, among other things, animals raised for the pet industry.

The HSUS has been combating the inhumane conditions found in puppy mills for more than twenty years. HSUS investigators have visited hundreds of puppy mills across the country and documented widespread conditions of neglect and abuse, such as inadequate shelter and veterinary care, incessant breeding, and unsanitary water and food supplies. We have successfully helped get state laws passed placing accountability on pet stores that sell unhealthy puppies and requiring pet stores in some states to post information about where their puppies were born. Awareness of puppy-mill problems has increased dramatically, thanks to segments on ABC-TV’s 20/20 and Good Morning America, and articles in national magazines such as Life, Time, and People. The HSUS provided information to the reporters about all of these stories. “Pet-loving consumers are finally realizing, after years of educational campaigns, that buying a puppy-mill dog at a pet store only supports an industry that treats dogs as nothing more than a cash crop,” says HSUS President Paul G. Irwin.

The success of the recent congressional effort on behalf of dogs bred and raised in puppy mills is due to many people. “We have seen support from both [political parties] with this issue,” observes Wayne Pacelle, HSUS vice president, Government Affairs and Media. “Congresspeople we had never worked with before came forward to help on this effort. They had heard from countless constituents who are sick and tired of the cruelty found in so many puppy mills.”

It is our hope that this recent effort, supported by the American Veterinary Medical Association, the American Humane Association, and the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, will send a message to the USDA that cannot be ignored. Although a high-ranking USDA official sympathetic to animal-protection issues recently left the agency, Congress remains optimistic about the impact of the congressional letter.

“As long as puppy mills continue to exist, we must do all we can to improve conditions for the thousands of dogs bred and raised in these facilities,” says Mr. Irwin. “At the same time,” he continues, “we must never stop working toward a day when every puppy in the country is born and raised in a loving, life-long, responsible home.”—Rachel A. Lamb, HSUS director, companion animal care
Earth Charter Moves Forward

Conferees consider draft of UN-bound document

In the last two decades, world leaders, religious, economic, and development specialists have urged the formulation of an earth ethic, a set of principles to guide people in their relationship with the other forms of life on Earth. Maurice Strong, former executive secretary general of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), hopes this new earth ethic will become a formal chart to ensure the viability of the planet as a hospitable home.

Earth Charter Moves Forward

The presentation of the Earth Charter has been a declared goal of the United Nations since the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (UNCED), held in 1972 in Stockholm, Sweden. The conference ended with an agreement by world leaders that the Earth Charter should be developed as a framework for action on environmental issues. The Charter is intended to provide a statement of principles for the protection and sustainable use of the environment.

In early 1994 Mr. Strong and Mr. Gorbachev agreed to join their organizations’ efforts to revive the Earth Charter project. The Hague conference was planned with the goal of producing a draft of the charter to present to the United Nations (UN) at its fiftieth anniversary celebrations in San Francisco in June 1995. A document incorporating more than 150 existing documents prepared by organizations and individuals around the world was presented for discussion at the conference in the Hague.

The document was a matrix composed of five parts: a statement of a world view, principles of actions, and guidelines for action to prevent environmental disaster—the death of nature.

Seventy people from thirty countries attended the conference sessions in the Peace Palace of the International Court of Justice in the Hague.

Mr. Hoyt told the assembled group, “It is my hope that the Earth Charter can be constructed to be a proclamation of the richness, beauty, and integrity of the Earth. Let it become an affirmation that will serve to unite the peoples of the world in protecting it from further destruction and degradation and enhancing its various ecosystems.”

The presentation of the matrix document in San Francisco was the public launching of the project and completed its first phase. In the second phase, The HSUS will take a leadership role, facilitating a massive information-gathering process. Non-governmental organizations all over the world will be polled for information on what people desire in their relationship with nature-and with each other.

A committee of journalists and poets from government and nongovernmental organizations will use that information to produce the final draft of the Earth Charter, which will be submitted to the UN as the UN General Assembly observes its fiftieth anniversary celebration in San Francisco in June 1995.
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**VICTORIES FOR GOOD BILLS, DEFEATS FOR BAD ONES**

In other victories legislatures passed the laws below:

- In New Mexico, Texas, and Maine, leg- islators banned the deliberate tripping of horses, a common event in Mexican-style rodeos, or charreadas. We had hoped to ban horse tripping in Illinois, as well, but that effort stalled as legis- lative sponsors instead consider the “regulation” of horse tripping. Horse tripping clearly causes pain and injury and is unnecessary. As such, it should be banned, not just regulated.

- Iowa's legislature repealed its law re- quiring animal shelters to release ani- mals for research purposes. This prac- tice, pound seizure, undermines the work of shelters and forces them to serve as supply houses for research in- stitutions. Only three states still mandate pound seizure: Minnesota, Utah, and Oklahoma.

- Greyhound racing was banned before it even began in Virginia and will not be allowed to return to Vermont. The HSUS opposes the greyhound industry because greyhound racing cannot be conducted in a way that eliminates ani- mal exploitation.

- Oregon and Connecticut enacted laws requiring bond to be posted to cover the costs of holding and caring for animals involved in cruelty cases. Note the fi- nancial burden to care for such animals prior to trial will rest with the animals' owners, not the local animal shelters, in what can be lengthy proceedings.

- Illinois passed a law to license and reg- ulate guard-dog companies. If ena- bled to be finalized this fall, guard dogs must be provided with shelter during freezing-cold winters, adequate water and protection during summer heat waves, and veterinary care year-round.

- Louisiana enacted a pet-theft law that factors in the emotional bond between pet and pet owner when setting a mone- tary penalty. This is a precedent-setting law, since it recognizes that an animal has intrinsic value much higher than the price tag affixed by the market.

- Texas and Virginia enacted laws to re- strict the hunting of wild animals con- fined in enclosures, an activity com- monly known as a caged hunt. Legisla- tors in several other states have intro- duced similar bills likely to be consid- ered in 1996.

Bills that exploit animals continue to be considered by elected officials. We defeated many:

- Nine bills were introduced to under- mine Oregon's 1994 black-har- hound-baiting ban. Last November Oregonians voted to ban the unspor- ting and inhuman practices of hunting bears with bait and hunting bears and cougars with hounds in a statewide ballot initia- tive led by The HSUS. In spite of the decisive result on election day, the troy- hunters' lobby attacked the initia- tive in the legislature. Some legislators thumbed their noses at the people of Oregon by trying immediately to over- turn their election verdict. Fortunately, all nine bills went down to defeat—in- cluding a bill that would put the issue back on the ballot!

**LEGISLATION**

**State Legislatures Take Action**

Myriad bills address animal protection

State legislatures enacted a myriad of bills addressing animal protection this year, ranging from strengthened anticyr- le capac- ity statutes to bans on specific types of exploitation such as horse tripping and canned hunts. Several bills were enacted as a result of the intense public in- terest generated by some particularly gruesome cruelty cases. Others were the result of hard work by The HSUS and lo- cal activists to bring the issues to the at- tention of legislators.

The American criminal justice system has been slow to take seriously the crime of animal abuse. Our nation's laws are di- vided into two categories: criminal (when an existing statute is broken) and civil (when someone seeks a private right or remedy against another). Criminal viola- tions also fall into two categories, felonies and misdemeanors. Serious crimes such as murder, assault, and burglary are felonies, usually punishable by more than a year of prison confinement and a fine. Lesser crimes, such as vandalism and most traffic violations, are misdemeanors and are punishable by smaller fines and, possible, time in a local jail.

Even though all fifty states have laws against animal cruelty, such crimes have almost always been designated misde­ meanor offenses. The HSUS champions the enactment of laws to designate inten­ tional acts of cruelty as felony offenses. When cruelty is a misdemeanor, law-en­ forcement officials do not consider it a priority and sometimes will fail to pursue prosecution. If a case is prosecuted, the punishment for the offender may be shockingly light. Skinning an animal alive or deliberately setting a pet on fire should be punished no less severely than a felony offense such as burglary.

Oregon, Louisiana, and Pennsylvania enacted felony cruelty laws this year. Fif­ teen states have now done so, eight within the last three years. Maryland moved to broaden coverage of its anticyr- le law as well. There is a compelling reason for soci­ ety to prosecute abusers: the torturing correlation between animal abuse and vi- olence toward humans. Many notoriously violent people started out abusing ani­ mals. Ted Bundy, Jeffrey Dahmer, Albert de Salvo (known as the Boston Strangler), and David Berkowitz (known as the Son of Sam) have histories of abusing animals before turning their perversity toward hu­ mans. Richard Allen Davis, the alleged killer of Polly Klaas, the California child abducted from her home in 1993, is re- ported to have used animals as a teenager. Other, less notorious, killers in- clude the three young Arkansasmen who had practiced satanic rituals, including skinning dogs, before they coldly killed three young boys in 1993. Animal abusers who do not go to these extremes frequently are involved in arson, vandal­ ism, hate crimes, and other antisocial acts.

They are committed by young people. Anthropologist Margaret Mead observed, “One of the most dangerous things that can happen to a child is to kill or torture an animal and get away with it.” As legisl­ ators target criminal behavior, they show they are recognizing that animal cruelty is itself a serious crime and an indicator of deviant tendencies.

News articles citing HSUS research on the connection between animal abuse and violence against humans helped make it known as a serious crime and an indicator of deviant tendencies.

In New Mexico, Texas, and Maine, legis­ lators have enacted laws with minimal fines, as low as one or two hundred dollars. The law enacted in Oregon makes cruelty punishable by up to a $100,000 fine—the most severe penalty in the coun­ try. Several states still have anticyr­ le laws with minimal fines, as low as one or two hundred dollars.

In Pennsylvania the torture death of “Duke the Dalmatian” caused citizens across the country to react with shock and disbelief. The Pennsylvania legislature re- sponded, enacting a law making the torturing correlation of dogs and cats a felony offense.
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LEARNING TO BUILD A MORE HUMANE AND CARING FUTURE

Teaching children involves much more than the three Rs. Young people must learn to respect one another, the Earth, and its animals. Each month of the school year, KIND News brings children articles and activities designed to instill compassion and respect. You can give a classroom KIND News by adopting a teacher—one you know or one on our waiting list—for the HSUS Adopt-A-Teacher Program. The cost is $20—a small price to pay to help build a more humane future.

BUILD A BETTER TOMORROW—ADOPT A TEACHER TODAY!

HSUS Adopt-A-Teacher Program, P.O. Box 362, East Haddam, CT 06423-0362

INVESTIGATIONS

New Chapter in Iditarod Saga
Two dogs die in 1995’s long-distance race

Since 1991 the HSUS has focused attention on Alaska’s Iditarod sled dog race, the world’s premiere competition in long-distance mushing, or traveling over snow with a sled drawn by dogs. The popularity of long-distance mushing competitions is growing internationally, according to the International Federation of Sled Dog Sports’ 1993 survey, long-distance mushing competitions were held not only in the United States and Canada, but also in Italy, Austria, France, Spain, and Sweden. Countless events are more grueling even than the Iditarod: dogs are literally running for their lives to keep up with this fast-growing “sport.”

The ongoing HSUS investigation has played a critical role in the cancellation of Iditarod sponsorship by the Timberland Company and the farms Company, implementation of a number of protective procedures, and what seemed to be an agreement from the mushing community to make the welfare of sled dogs a top priority. In the 1995 running of the Iditarod in March, when Iditarod organizers were under more public pressure than ever, their promises of a humane race rang hollow. Once again dogs died during the race. An attempt to cover up the fatalities underscored problems inherent in the event. One of Minnesota musher Robert Somers’s dogs died on March 10, a warm, sunny day, on the way into the town of Iditarod, the half-way point to the race’s finish line in Nome. One week later, a second dog, “Payday,” who belonged to musher Keizo Funatsu, died. Although race officials knew of the March 10 death, Payday’s death was widely reported on March 18 as the first of the race.

Why was the first death unreported?

Iditarod Trail Committee (ITC) executive director Stan Hooley explained to the Fairbanks, Alaska, paper Daily News-Miner that the ITC this year adopted a new policy not to volunteer news of dog deaths unless specifically asked. Reporters argued that they had asked about fatalities many times, even before any deaths had been reported.

Karim Schmidt, D.V.M., chief veterinarian for the 1995 Iditarod, told Anchorage Daily News reporters, “In hindsight I think we have to tell the media [whenever dogs die during a race].” According to Dr. Schmidt, the ITC inaction in this case was caused partly by events beyond the ITC’s control: for example, the veterinarians who tended to Mr. Somers’s dog wanted time to complete the preliminary necropsy before releasing information. According to Dr. Schmidt, by the time the necropsy had been completed, the death no longer seemed so important.

In a statement to the Anchorage Daily News, ITC president Matt Desalernos said 1995 was the Iditarod’s greatest year in terms of steps taken to improve the handling of the dogs. He brushed off the ITC’s failure to report the Somers dog’s death as “one mistake [that was] ballooned out of proportion.”

Consistent with this view, the dog’s death was big news in Alaska only because it was not disclosed. Dogs have died every year since the race’s inception in 1973, but their deaths are reported as routinely as are race statistics and weather conditions.

The Iditarod has proven year after year to be inherently injurious and deadly to dogs. It is difficult to assess the dangers of the lesser-known races as they do not receive nearly as much scrutiny as does the Iditarod. Is it enough for the races to be reformed or should they be abolished?

The HSUS announced our opposition to the Iditarod and other long-distance race events in 1994. Although we shall continue to monitor mushing competitions closely, it is the responsibility of the mushing community to make the treatment of dogs its top priority. Even one death is unacceptable. Each dog’s life must be valued—Leslie Isom, associate for companion animal care
It can be easily trained. ... "It bonds to its owner more than a dog." ... "It eats cat food." ... "It can be quickly taught to use a litter box." Which animal is so perfect a pet?

Surprisingly, these claims are made about a number of extremely unusual animals—wild or exotic, nondomesticated and/or nonnative—such as hedgehogs, pot-bellied pigs, sugar gliders, prairie dogs, monkeys, and wild cats.

There is nothing new about keeping wild animals as pets in our society. Aristocrats have long kept private menageries of wild animals who were mere playthings—entertainment for lavish parties. Now, however, animals as diverse as prairie dogs and primates are becoming mainstream pets. Widely accessible and affordable, these animals are pushed on the unsuspecting public as the newest and hottest trend. Own a wild animal and you'll be admired and envied by your friends; breed wild animals and you'll make quick money. Behind this seductive message, however, is a living, feeling animal. Whether the animal is a reptile, a bird, or a mammal, the rise and fall of its popularity as a pet is predictable.

What is at the root of this fad-pet trend? The answer is simple: money. Selling animals is big business. Profit, not the welfare of the animal, is the number-one priority. Although there are well-meaning pet-store operators, breeders, and wholesalers who care about the animals they sell, their motivation is nonetheless monetary. All it takes is one person, hoping to make a profit, to introduce a new species to the market. Suddenly a species rarely seen in the United States becomes the newest pet craze.

In the first stage of a fad-pet trend, individual animals can be sold for thousands of dollars. Few people have the animals, so prices are high. In the mid-1980s, when the Vietnamese pot-bellied pig was first introduced in this country as a pet, the few people who had the animals made big money. One fertile female pig was sold for $35,000.

In this early stage, the fad species seems perfect for profit and even companionship. People are eager to own an animal that no one else owns. At the same time, the species is marketed as the perfect pet.

In the second stage, momentum grows quickly. People hear that the fad species is bringing extremely high prices and want to be part of the money-making scheme. The pet industry pushes the new pet to its magazines. Pet stores are pressured to sell it or be left behind their competitors. Articles published in pet-store-operator magazines on how to care for the fad species make it sound as though it is tailor-made for any household.
The fad species may be promoted through publications such as the Animal Finders’ Guide, a catalog of animals for sale or trade. Lists, tigers, bears, hedgehogs, wallabies, snakes, ostriches—all are available for a price. During the rise in popularity of fad species, such publications may either start the current trend or go along for the ride.

In the third stage, the species’ availability to the general public widens. Pet stores begin to stock it, and the mainstream media begin to report on this trendiest of pets. (With the recent emergence of the hedgehog as a fad species have come favorable articles in newspapers and magazines across the country. Self magazine, in its “What’s Hot Now” column, recently pushed hedgehog ownership as “a little creature comfort without the hassles of having to feed or dangle catnip. Maybe you should think hedgehog—everybody else is.”) Celebrity and gossip magazines profile celebrities who own and love their fad pets, which piques the interest of new breeders, supply meets demand. Prices begin to drop and the fad animal becomes affordable to the general public. Owners’ clubs begin to form, as do newsletters that tout the joys of ownership. With an increase in ownership comes legislative efforts to make ownership easier. While these efforts are under way, it is common to see the fad species paraded in front of community councils. Opposition to the ownership of such a “cute” and “friendly” animal is challenged.

In stage four of the trend, breeders, promoters, pet stores, and pet owners all believe they have found the perfect pet. The honeymoon may last a few years, depending on the number of available animals, the rate at which the market becomes saturated. The status of local and state laws regarding the ownership of exotic animals, and the ease with which the species can be exploited.

The small and inoffensive hedgehog, for example, is quite easily captured and culled in a cell based on the age of 10 weeks. In captivity, the hedgehog is confined in an aquarium at pet stores and exotic-animal markets. Pigs, and foxes, a little hedgehog may bite, but it won’t snarl, smell, or wreck the living room: its unobtrusiveness is a place in our culture. Do exotic and wild species have a place in our culture? The cuddly baby suddenly becomes an aggressive biter or turns destructive and temperamental, for no reason apparent to the perplexed owner.

Reptile popularity has increased dramatically of late, but iguanas (opposite) have been linked to outbreaks of salmonella-related illnesses. A hedgehog’s unobtrusiveness makes it more marketable—but a captive-born hedgehog will die if “re-turned” to the wild.

As consumers realize the problems of fad-pet ownership, prices begin to plummet. The Animal Finders’ Guide stops listing the animals altogether or only at extremely discounted prices. One recent ad from a newspaper read, “trade pot-bellied pig for working as-conditioning unit.”

Such an animal is genetically programmed to behave as a wild animal and will do so. Many of the misconceptions surrounding wild animals being kept as pets develop from misunderstanding the process of hand-feeding a baby animal. A bond is created between infant and substitute mother in that process, and hand-raised babies are easily sold. They appear tame and manageable at first. As they mature, however, especially sexually, their need for a mother—natural or surrogate—ends. The instinctual behaviors of the adult replace the endearing behaviors of the dependent baby or juvenile.
ANIMAL PROTECTION AND THE MEDICAL COMMUNITY


ALTHOUGH THE LANCET IS ONE OF MEDICINE'S MOST PRESTIGIOUS JOURNALS, IT MIGHT SEEM STRANGE THAT THREE AMERICAN ACADEMIC PHYSICIANS WOULD PUBLISH SUCH A PAPER IN GREAT BRITAIN. THE REASON THEY DID SO PROVIDES SOME REVEALING INSIGHTS INTO THE PRESENT DEBATE WITHIN THE MEDICAL COMMUNITY OVER THE USE OF ANIMALS IN BIOMEDICAL SCIENCE.

OVER THE PAST CENTURY, NUMEROUS PAPERS DEFENDING ANIMAL RESEARCH HAVE APPEARED IN MEDICAL LITERATURE, BUT THE PAST FIFTEEN YEARS HAVE SEEN AN INCREASE IN THE NUMBERS OF SUCH PAPERS CONTAINING MUCH STRONGER CONDEMNATION OF PEOPLE INVOLVED IN ANIMAL ADVOCACY. AUTHORS PUBLISHED IN MAJOR MEDICAL JOURNALS HAVE CALLED UPON PHYSICIANS TO "DEFEND MEDICAL SCIENCE" AND TO JOIN IN DENOUNCING ATTEMPTS BY ANIMAL-PROTECTION ADVOCATES TO CHANGE THE STATUS QUO. DEFENDERS OF ANIMAL RESEARCH HAVE TRIED TO SILENCE THE VOICES OF PHYSICIANS WHO MIGHT SPEAK IN SUPPORT OF ANIMAL PROTECTION BY DENIGRATING THEIR EFFORTS AND CHARACTERIZING THE PHYSICIANS THEMSELVES AS DANGEROUS TO MEDICAL SCIENCE.

SADLY, VIRTUALLY NONE OF THESE DEFENDERS OF RESEARCH OPENLY ADVOCATES ANY CHANGES, EVEN MINOR ONES, TO ADVANCE ANIMAL PROTECTION IN BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND TESTING. INSTEAD THEY WARN AGAINST ATTEMPTS TO CHANGE THE STATUS QUO—RAISING THE SPECTRE OF SACRIFICING HUMAN LIVES FOR ANIMAL LIVES, OF SLOWING DOWN OR HALTING MEDICAL EXPLORATION, AND EVEN OF THE DOMINATION OF SOCIETY BY ANIMAL ACTIVISTS WHO SEEK TO DISCONTINUE THE USE OF ANIMALS FOR FOOD, SPORT HUNTING, FUR, AND ENTERTAINMENT. SOME AUTHORS HAVE SPECIFICALLY CALLED ATTENTION TO THE "INFILTRATION" OF GROUPS LIKE THE HSUS BY "RADICAL ELEMENTS," CLAIMING THAT A BROAD SPECTRUM OF ANIMAL-PROTECTION GROUPS ARE ASSAULTING BIOMEDICAL SCIENCE.

DAVID O. WIEBERS, M.D., JENNIFER LEANING, M.D., S.M.H., AND ROGER D. WHITE, M.D., MEMBERS OF THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY COUNCIL OF THE HSUS AND AUTHORS OF THE LANCET PAPER, HAVE BEEN FRUSTRATED BY AND CONCERNED ABOUT THE PUBLISHED COMMENTS OF AVID ANIMAL-RESEARCH ADVOCATES THAT HAVE GONE UNCHALLENGED IN THE MEDICAL LITERATURE, EXCEPT FOR SOME BRIEF LETTERS TO THE EDITOR BY PHYSICIANS WITH ALTERNATIVE VIEWPOINTS.
It took almost two years and an inordinate amount of diligence to get the Lancet paper, “Animal Protection and Medical Science,” published. Nearly all of the time was spent trying to convince each of three prominent U.S. medical journals to publish the paper. The authors worked for more than a year with one of these journals alone, through four major revisions and seemingly endless negotiations. The journal ultimately concluded that the paper was too critical of animal-research advocates and their positions and that the subject matter did not have a high enough editorial priority to merit publication (the journal had previously devoted a significant amount of space to the topic, but all of it was devoted to pro-animal-research perspectives). This view seemed odd and discouraging to the authors: more than twenty million animals per year in the United States alone are used for research, testing, and education and the journal’s editorial board knew the authors’ point of view had never been explored at any length in any earlier issues.

“At that point it would have been easy to give up and to conclude that our efforts to create some balance within the medical literature were hopeless,” recalls Dr. Wiebers. However, all of the authors believed that their message was reasonable and that it was too important to abandon. They felt that the unwillingness of medical journals to publish more than one point of view was contrary to the spirit of scientific critique and that this unwillingness itself ultimately would be far more damaging to medical science than would be any lack of disclosure, refinement, and replacement of the use of animals in biomedical research.

To the authors’ amazement, when the “final” version of “Animal Protection and Medical Science”—the one rejected in the United States as too controversial—was submitted sequentially to two of the most prominent British medical journals, the Lancet and British Medical Journal, the responses from both indicated that they found the paper important, but not appropriate for the paper and nothing of substance with which to disagree. In fact they were not interested in publishing the paper as it was written because it was too controversial and too bland. One editor was so “anxious” he even went so far as to write the authors expressing his regret and “professional wariness”.

The authors submitted a shorter, more focused version to the Lancet. This version was rejected, and sent to press within days, and published within a month. As expected, the release of this article sparked some rather heated criticism and defensiveness on the part of avid animal-research advocates. However, as Dr. Wiebers relates, “The beautiful and perhaps less expected component to the response was that the vast majority of physicians who contacted the authors expressed strongly positive support for the message we put forth in this paper.”

Three months after publication, a full-length editorial in support of the Lancet paper appeared in the journal Ophthalmic Surgery. Written by the editor in chief, the editorial began: “Wiebers, Lennox, and White, in the April 9, 1994, issue of the Lancet, have published a lovely ‘viewpoint’ on the use of animals in medical research. They move the debate between proponents and opponents of animal research to a new level. Perhaps we may realize on occasion sought to frighten the public with statements to the effect that medical science will be severely damaged or halted or millions of human lives will be lost in response to suggested humane modifications in research policies. In reality, neither science nor the world will come to a tragic end by attempting to refine, reduce, and replace part of all the use of animals in biomedical research, education, and testing. It would be lamentable if being a physician or scientist meant that one could not care deeply about the welfare of sentient beings other than human beings. To those in the animal-protection community, a deep caring implies more than lip service. It implies placing high priorities on securing humane conditions for animals even in the face of substantial extra cost and looking carefully and critically at projects and areas in which animal research is highly unlikely to benefit health, or is grossly inhumane, and a commitment to call for the cessation of those projects. It implies placing high priority on the development of alternatives to animal research, including the creation of in vitro and in silico models and the expenditure of greater time and resources. For the medical community to respond with reflexive, parochial attacks, based in part on untenable positions, is not in the long-term interests of science. Such attacks enable the medical community to deny the existence of any problems with the status quo. Society will be better off when the biomedical community recognizes the animal-protection community as an extension of itself—allowing the alleviation of unnecessary suffering and death to extend beyond other animals. Perhaps then we may realize the day when scientific investigators are moved to direct more of their efforts towards developing innovative and effective alternatives to animal use rather than innovative and effective ways of avoiding the status quo.”

TROPHY OF DEATH

At my shot, the lion roars, drops and flops around. . . . It suddenly collapses when van Aswegen [the "professional hunter"] shoots while I am reloading. . . . My bullet has smashed its shoulder, blowing away the top part of its heart and destroying a lung. van Aswegen’s bullet has broken the spine. . . . I put two more bullets through its backbone and into the lungs from behind and above. . . . Its boiled-out skull should rank very high in the SCI [Safari Club International] Record Book of Trophy Animals. –Bill Quimby, SCI director of publications, in Safari magazine, January/February 1995

Endangered or threatened species, including the elephant, are among those killed by American trophy hunters. Above: Skulls of waterbuck, buffalo, impala, and zebra are on display at a hunting lodge in Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe.

AN HSUS REPORT REVEALS A STARTLING INCREASE IN TROPHY HUNTING: ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES ARE AMONG THE VICTIMS

Americans, aided by a lucrative and growing trophy hunting industry, kill animals for fun and competition a hundred times a day in countries around the world.

In a new HSUS report on American “big game” hunting (“Big Game, Big Bucks: The Alarming Growth of the American Trophy Hunting Industry”), the HSUS reveals that the number of animals killed by Americans hunting in other countries is skyrocketing and that endangered and threatened species are among those killed.

The number of animals imported to the United States as trophies increased from 27,205 in 1990 to 46,582 in 1993, a 71 percent increase (1994 data are incomplete). More than 1,300 of those imported as trophies in 1993 were endangered or threatened according to standards set by the Endangered Species Act (ESA). This was an 84 percent increase over 1990 figures. Trophies from more than 250 species, more than 40 of which were endangered or threatened, were imported during the same four-year period. Most were killed in the African nations of Zimbabwe, South Africa, Tanzania, Botswana, Zambia, and Namibia, but black bears killed in Canada rank high in number among the trophies imported to the United States.

Why are the numbers of American trophies rising? There are several reasons. The U.S. government increasingly accepts trophy hunting and trophy imports. Trophy hunting advocacy organizations aggressively promote trophy hunting to cash-poor African nations eager to sell trophy permits. Several trophy hunting advocates have ascended to positions of power in Congress.

The Clinton administration’s position on trophy hunting was revealed in November 1992, when U.S. secretary of the interior Bruce Babbitt remarked at the conference of the parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) that trophy hunting in Africa provides a valuable source of income to African nations and instills a sense of conservation awareness in the communities where it takes place. Three months later Secretary Babbitt supported the auctioning of two permits to import trophies of threatened Argali sheep from Kyrgyzstan and Mongolia. The permits had been granted to the pro-safari-hunting organization Safari Club International (SCI).

BY TERESA M. TELECKY, PH.D., AND DORIS LIN
The number of elephants killed and imported to the United States as trophies grew from 62 in 1990 to 416 in 1993. Early in the decade, trophy-hunted elephants could be imported from only two countries; now they can be imported from six, and that number may increase. Botswana has decided to allow trophy hunting of elephants to resume after more than a decade of safety for those animals. Kenya, which has invested heavily in ecotourism, is considering allowing trophy hunting of elephants and other animals, which would bring that country’s twenty-year ban on such hunting to an end.

Trophy hunting is on the rise, due in part to trophy hunting advocacy organizations like SCI. Founded in 1971 and based in Tucson, Arizona, SCI has a small but wealthy membership of twenty-two thousand. Through its lobbying efforts here and abroad, SCI has successfully promulgated the idea that trophy hunting is a good way for developing nations to make money. Trophy hunters can spend $35,000 to $50,000 on a hunt. Most of this money goes to hunting outfitters (the organizers and guides who run the hunts and are based in the United States or in other developed nations), not to the people who live in the region of the hunt itself or to their government.

In a few cases, trophy hunting income has trickled down to the community where the hunting takes place. As a result, the community has preserved the natural habitat of its wildlife rather than convert it to agricultural land. This bucks the current trend, driven by economic necessity, that wipes out wildlife or, at the very least, forces it to relocate. However, a huge and expensive infrastructure has been developed to support the symbiotic relationship between the trophy hunters and the communities that benefit from the hunting. The two programs most commonly cited as examples are CAMPFIRE (Communal Ar eas Management Program for Indigenous Resources) in Zimbabwe and ADMADE (Administrative Management Design for Game Management Areas) in Zambia. The management infrastructure for these programs is not funded by trophy hunting income but by American taxpayers through a U.S. agency (This is an outrageous use of tax money that HSUS/HSI is trying to stop.) Funding for CAMPFIRE has come from a six-year grant of $7.6 million (1989-1994) from the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). USAID is funding the six-year ADMADE project for $4.8 million (1990-1995).

By far the most valuable service SCI has performed for the trophy hunting industry has been conducting elite trophy competitions. The competitions provide those who can afford trophy hunting with a playing field on which to “compete” to kill the most animals of a particular type (for example, all the bear species of the world, or the biggest animals of each species). The competitions increase the demand for hunts as hunters seek to advance to the next level.

To win all of SCI’s competitions at the highest level, a hunter would have to kill at least 322 animals and spend a great deal of money on trophy hunting safaris. A trophy hunting safari in Zambia for the “grand slam” of the “Africa Big Five” (elephant, rhino, lion, leopard, and buffalo) would cost at least $85,000. A similar competition hunting sheep on three continents would cost at least $185,000. SCI competitions have caused the trophy hunting industry to boom.

One arguable consequence of these programs is that they may drive some people to commit illegal or unethical activities just to win. (This is not to say that SCI intends for its competitions to have that consequence or that SCI is responsible for the illegal acts of its members.) The larger hunting community acknowledges that SCI’s competitions have this effect: an article in the February 1995 issue of Sports Afield states that SCI competitions “have spurred some members to stretch the boundaries of ethical hunting behavior.”

In an all-too-common scenario, lions and leopards are lured to bait set by hunters, who shoot the cats from a blind at night. Such baiting often takes place just outside the boundaries of national parks; it is often park animals who are drawn to the bait. Leopards and lions wounded in night hunts crawl off into the dark, so hunters can’t follow to finish the kill. In Botswana an estimated 25 percent of all animals who are shot and wounded are not caught. Elephants are also hunted on the periphery of national parks. Outfitters make clients kill elephants before killing any other animals in the area, because at the sound of gunfire, elephants run back to the protection of the park.

Animals are often shot by trophy hunters who never leave their vehicles. Even though this activity is illegal in many countries, hunt outfitters have been known to make exceptions for clients in poor health.

Far from Africa, trophy hunters pursue polar bears with sled dogs that, having
When male lions are killed, their lionesses lose their territory and cubs starve. Even if some males survive, the stability of the pride breaks down and breeding stops. Above: The stuffed head of an elephant decorates the wall of a park lodge in Zimbabwe.

Drinking Water, Fisheries, and Wildlife held a special hearing on the ESA that focused on the importation of foreign endangered and threatened species. The House Subcommittee on Trophy Hunting, which I appeared before, demonstrated to the subcommittee that even the current ESA allows too many foreign endangered and threatened species to be imported, and that if anything, the ESA needs to be strengthened in this area. Trophy hunting has already caused the decline and near extinction of a number of animal species, including the spectacled bear and the tiger, jaguar, and sable antelope, and continues to threaten countless others. We hope our report will convince Congress not to return to the days of unregulated American trophy hunting.

Teresa M. Telecky, Ph.D., is HSUS director, Wildlife Trade Program. Doris Lin was a summer 1993 HSUS intern.
GOOD LAWS DOOMED?

During most of last year's debates over modifications to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), attention was focused on broad issues such as the importance of free trade to an expanding world economy. But GATT, which Congress ratified in November 1994, may have serious implications, most of them bad, for animal protection in this country and around the world.

The World Trade Organization (WTO), created this year by the GATT contracting parties, is now in a position to coerce the United States either to pay trade penalties or to amend or repeal the law that seeks to ensure that fishermen do not kill dolphins while trying to reach the tuna that frequently swim beneath them.

The WTO could try to invalidate a long list of U.S. animal-protection laws, including the Humane Slaughter Act, the Wild Bird Conservation Act, and the Sea Turtles Act (see sidebar, page 33). Previously disputes were decided by a three-member panel, and nations that rejected the panel's decision could block its implementation. Under the new rules, decisions of the dispute panel are automatically adopted sixty days after they are handed down, unless there is a consensus among WTO members to reject the ruling.

The WTO could have sweeping implications for animal protection. While the early GATT rounds focused almost exclusively on reducing tariffs on certain products, more recent negotiations focused on what trade experts refer to as "non-trade issues"—trade barriers to the environment. In effect, nations no longer could be allowed to express their citizens' wishes if those wishes conflicted with free trade. Under GATT, countries may regulate product-related production or process methods, which alter the final product, without unfairly burdening trade. An example of a product-related method is a regulation by the European Union (EU) requiring that imported wood be heat treated to inhibit the spread of parasites.

Non-product-related production or process methods, such as whether a tuna was caught in a dolphin-safe manner, have not been allowed by past GATT panels.

Recent GATT rulings regarding the U.S. Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) provide a chilling illustration of this principle. The MMPA, among other provisions, prohibits the importation of tuna caught in ways that kill significant numbers of dolphins. Fishermen in pursuit of yellowfin tuna, particularly in the Pacific, have long used so-called purse-seine nets, which they set on dolphins in order to capture the tuna swimming underneath. Dolphins, however, often become entangled in the nets, which makes it impossible for them to come to the surface to breathe; they drown, as a human would if caught in a similar manner. The MMPA also prohibits the importation of tuna from countries that have not certified that dolphins-kill rates associated with their tuna catches fall below a specified amount.

By most measures the MMPA has been a substantial success—dolphin kills from tuna fishing have dropped by 97 percent. In 1991 and 1994, two GATT panels ruled that the law violated free trade because it sought to regulate not the product (tuna), but rather how the product was produced. In essence, the panel ruled that a can of tuna is a can of tuna, regardless of the impact on dolphins or the means by which the tuna was obtained, and that the United States could not discriminate between physically identical tuna products. While the United States could have banned all tuna sales in the country with running afoul of GATT, it could not discriminate on the basis of how the tuna was caught.

Many of the United States' most important animal-protection laws incorporate trade barrier because such regulation makes it more difficult for foreign companies to compete in the Canadian market. Groups that advocate protection of animals and the environment fear that the WTO will put trade above the desires—reflected in laws and regulations—of certain countries to protect animals and the environment. In effect, nations no longer would be allowed to express their citizens' wishes if those wishes conflicted with free trade. Under GATT, countries may regulate product-related production or process methods, which alter the final product, without unfairly burdening trade. An example of a product-related method is a regulation by the European Union (EU) requiring that imported wood be heat treated to inhibit the spread of parasites.

Non-product-related production or process methods, such as whether a tuna was caught in a dolphin-safe manner, have not been allowed by past GATT panels.

Recent GATT rulings regarding the U.S. Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) provide a chilling illustration of this principle. The MMPA, among other provisions, prohibits the importation of tuna caught in ways that kill significant numbers of dolphins. Fishermen in pursuit of yellowfin tuna, particularly in the Pacific, have long used so-called purse-seine nets, which they set on dolphins in order to capture the tuna swimming underneath. Dolphins, however, often become entangled in the nets, which makes it impossible for them to come to the surface to breathe; they drown, as a human would if caught in a similar manner. The MMPA also prohibits the importation of tuna from countries that have not certified that dolphins-kill rates associated with their tuna catches fall below a specified amount.

By most measures the MMPA has been a substantial success—dolphin kills from tuna fishing have dropped by 97 percent. In 1991 and 1994, two GATT panels ruled that the law violated free trade because it sought to regulate not the product (tuna), but rather how the product was produced. In essence, the panel ruled that a can of tuna is a can of tuna, regardless of the impact on dolphins or the means by which the tuna was obtained, and that the United States could not discriminate between physically identical tuna products. While the United States could have banned all tuna sales in the country with running afoul of GATT, it could not discriminate on the basis of how the tuna was caught.

Many of the United States' most important animal-protection laws incorporate
WHAT LAWS ARE AT RISK?

GATT’s failure to protect so-called “non-product-related production or process standards” could cause many of our animal-protection laws to be found in violation of fair-trade standards. Among those in peril are:

• The Marine Mammal Protection Act. This law prohibits the importation of fish or fish products that have been caught with purse seines (nets) and that result in dolphin deaths. Scraping methods have proven fatal to hundreds of thousands of dolphins in the past twenty years. At the time of the recent challenge, the law set quotas on dolphin captures in leghold traps. This is particularly galling, because if the leghold trap regulation is found to violate GATT, it would be for the same reasons that the MMPA was considered a restraint on trade. Thus, the U.S. government would be undermining its rationale for protecting the MMPA from attack under GATT.

• The Marine Fish Depletion Act. This law prohibits the importation of endangered or threatened exotic bird species. It also permits the United States to set quotas on the importation of certain bird species and to ban the importation of all birds—both wild-caught and domestic-bred—from countries that do not implement a management program that provides for conservation of the species and its habitat.

• The High Seas Driftnet Fisheries Enforcement Act of 1992. This law prohibits the importation of endangered or threatened exotic bird species. It also permits the United States to set quotas on the importation of certain bird species and to ban the importation of all birds—both wild-caught and domestic-bred—from countries that do not implement a management program that provides for conservation of the species and its habitat.

• The Sea Turtles Act. This law prohibits the importation of shrimp and shrimp products from countries that do not have an adequate sea-turtle conservation program and that do not require the use of turtle-excluder devices on their shrimp vessels.

• The African Elephant Conservation Act. This law prohibits the importation of raw or worked ivory from any producing country that does not have an adequate elephant conservation program in place. On June 9, 1989, the act placed an import ban on all African elephant ivory.

• The Federal Humane Slaughter Act. This law prohibits the importation of meat from countries that do not use methods of slaughter recognized as humane by the United States.

In 1993 the United States threatened to challenge a Canadian regulation that would have prohibited the importation of U.S. “puppy-mill” dogs into Canada. As a result of the threat, Canada never implemented its law. Trapping interests in the United States have promised our government to join with Canada to protest the U.S. steel-jaw leghold trap restrictions. The office of the U.S. trade representative has told several members of Congress that it will file a GATT challenge to the EU regulation if the regulation is not modified to allow the importation of U.S. pelts caught in leghold traps. This is particularly galling, because if the leghold trap regulation is found to violate GATT, it would be for the same reasons that the MMPA was considered a restraint on trade. Thus, the U.S. government would be undermining its rationale for protecting the MMPA from attack under GATT.

These problems could only worsen under the auspices of the WTO. Unlike international organizations such as the United Nations (UN), the WTO’s proceedings will not necessarily be conducted openly. It is not yet clear what sort of access humane, environmental, and other non-governmental organizations (NGOs) will be granted to WTO deliberations and decisions. Currently the three-member dispute panels must be comprised of trade experts, with no provision for submission of friend-of-the-court briefs or other input from animal-protection or environmental experts. This closed-door policy has particularly dire implications for matters of animal protection, where only public opinion can successfully battle private business interests.

The HSUS has lobbied domestically and internationally to allow NGOs to observe and participate in WTO processes, to obtain and have input into the creation of working documents, and to join dispute-resolution panels whenever an environmental, consumer-, or animal-protection law is challenged. Although HSUS action in concert with other U.S. NGOs had inspired the office of the U.S. trade representative to push for increased openness in Geneva, it is unclear how open or “transparent” the WTO actually will be.

The United States is also pressing environmental concerns through a new trade and environment committee. It is up to the world community that has batted so hard for laws to protect animals and the environment to see that its work is not sacrificed on the altar of global economics.—Patricia A. Forkan, senior policy advisor, Contributed to this article.
2000, as many as two-thirds of the world's six billion people could live in these coastal zones. HSIS (Canada) has publicly reaffirmed its support of the Canadian government's position and said it will continue its ef-

forts to urge a peaceful resolution to the overfishing dispute. We support the de-
velopement of a global oceans strategy that would attempt to address these seri-
ous issues. The single greatest underlying cause of

the harm we inflict upon the life-giving waters of our planet is the long tradition of free and open access to the sea. It is a tradition we can no longer afford. –Michael O'Sullivan, director, HSIS (Canada)

CRACKDOWN IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

Wildlife authorities in British Columbia announced in July a major crackdown on individu-
als suspected of illegally trading in wildlife. They seized 191 animal prod-
ucts—bear gallbladders, elephant hides, tiger parts, and musk-deer glands—with an estimated value of several hundred thousand dollars. Forensic tests are being conducted to confirm the identification of the items seized and several people have been charged under the province's wildlife act.

A specially trained dog—believed to be the only one of its kind—was used to
detect the bear gallbladders. The wildlife bust was facilitated in part by an earlier undercover operation mounted by investigators from HSUS/ HSI and the Investigative Network (IN) —a Washington, D.C.-based group that investigates violations of U.S. and inter-
national environmental and animal-protection laws—that had revealed thir-
teen out of twenty traditional Chinese pharmacies in the city of Vancouver were offering bear gallbladders for sale. One admitted to obtaining bear gallbladders directly from poachers. In 1992 British Columbia banned possession of bear gallbladders, paws, and other parts in light of growing evidence of poaching conducted specifically to fuel this trade.

Just one week prior to the raid, British Columbia doubled the penalties for poaching and trading in bear parts and other illegal hunting practices. First-time offenders now can be fined up to $10,000 and those convicted of subse-
quent offenses can be fined up to $20,000. Some provinces, such as the North-
west Territories, Quebec, and Nova Sco-
tia, still allow trade in bear gallbladders, despite evidence that the legal trade is used to launder illegally taken gallblad-
ers from other provinces. In Ontario legal loopholes remain, the law virtually un-
enforceable.

There is a price on the head of every living bear. The trade is already causing the extinction of wild bears in Asia. Asian nations will only work with us to protect the world's bears if we send them a clear and unequivocal message: Cana-
dian bears are not for sale. This illegal trade reinforces the need for the speedy passage of a Canadian Endangered Species Act, proposed by Deputy Prime Minister and Environment Minister Sheila Copps, which is currently under dis-
cussion by government officials.

The Bear Protection Act was recently introduced in the U.S. Congress, the Sen-
ate version (S. 968) by Sen. Mitch Mc-
Connell Jr. of Kentucky and the House version (H.R. 2240) by Rep. John Porter of Illinois (see the Summer 1995 HSUS News). The bills would stop the import, export, sale, purchase, and possession with intent to sell in interstate commerce bear viscerum or products that contain—or claim to contain—bear viscera. The bills would also call on the U.S. Fish and Wild-
service to initiate international efforts to protect bears. This is important legislation—that deserves full support—Michael O'Sullivan, director, HSIS (Canada), and Teresa M. Telegky, Ph.D., HSUS director, Wildlife Trade Program.

PLATYPUSES STAY HOME

HSI (Australia) has been at the forefront of a success-
ful national campaign to stop the exploitation of one of the world's most amaz-
ing animals, the platypus. About half the size of a household cat, the platypus is famous for its duck-like bill, a flexible and sensitive structure that assists the animal in its search for food. The platypus is found in the wild only in Australia.

Australia has long banned the com-
mercial export of live animals. A govern-
ment proposal to ship three or four live platypuses to Japan for the World City Exposition in October 1996 would have precipitated the first live platypus export since the passage of the Wildlife Protec-
tion Act in 1982. In 1993 former Aus-
tralian premier John Fahey promised the
governor of Tokyo live platypuses for the
Japanese expo. That promise set a terrible precedent for Australia's animals.

Tom Grant, Ph.D., Australia's leading expert on the conservation of the platy-
pus, stated that "there is a high probability that the [housed] animals will die as a re-
result of the two-way transfer between [Australia's] Taronga [Park Zoo] and [Japan's] Ueno Zoo," and that "around 70 percent of animals brought into zoos from
the wild die within their first year in cap-
vity." Worst of all, while Taronga Park Zoo claimed to want to export these ani-
imals for conservation reasons, the prima-
ry motive appeared to be public display to raise money—a fund to handle the moises coming from Japan was set up by the Syd-
ney and Tokyo governments, and the expo was described as an opportunity to raise funds from the international community.

The Australian Nature Conservation Agency was the first to announce in the national press a call for public comment on the proposal to export the platypuses. HSIS (Australia) mounted a national cam-
paign to oppose the proposal, sending ac-
tion alerts to all animal-protection and
conservation groups in Australia and un-
dertaking a significant press campaign. The response to our efforts was over-
whelmingly positive.

The campaign brought us into direct conflict with the Taronga Park Zoo, con-
sidered by many to be Australia's best. The besieged zoo defended its decision to export the platypuses despite all the oppo-
sition marshaled through the media.

Eventually HSIS (Australia) received promises to delay approval for export both from officials in government and from those contending for power in an upcom-
ing election. We made it clear that if ap-
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the wild die within their first year in cap-
vity." Worst of all, while Taronga Park Zoo claimed to want to export these ani-
imals for conservation reasons, the prima-
ry motive appeared to be public display to raise money—a fund to handle the moises coming from Japan was set up by the Syd-
ney and Tokyo governments, and the expo was described as an opportunity to raise funds from the international community.

The Australian Nature Conservation Agency was the first to announce in the national press a call for public comment on the proposal to export the platypuses. HSIS (Australia) mounted a national cam-
paign to oppose the proposal, sending ac-
tion alerts to all animal-protection and
conservation groups in Australia and un-
dertaking a significant press campaign. The response to our efforts was over-
whelmingly positive.

The campaign brought us into direct conflict with the Taronga Park Zoo, con-
sidered by many to be Australia's best. The besieged zoo defended its decision to export the platypuses despite all the oppo-
sition marshaled through the media.

Eventually HSIS (Australia) received promises to delay approval for export both from officials in government and from those contending for power in an upcom-
ing election. We made it clear that if ap-
proval for export was granted we would take legal action in the federal courts. Meanwhile we maintained our vigorous national—and regional—press campaign against the transfer.

On April 19, 1995, the new state min-
ister for the environment, Pam Allen, an-
ounced the cancellation of plans to ex-
port the platypuses to Japan.

Although she said she would enter into loan arrangements with zoos around the world for other species, she said that "the government will always place the welfare of the animals as the paramount consider-
ation." HSIS (Australia) has asked Ms. Allen to make it state policy to prohibit the export of platypuses and koalas to for-
eign zoos.—Michael Kennedy, director, HSIS (Australia)

The campaign brought us into direct conflict with the Taronga Park Zoo, con-
sidered by many to be Australia's best. The besieged zoo defended its decision to export the platypuses despite all the oppo-
sition marshaled through the media.

Eventually HSIS (Australia) received promises to delay approval for export both from officials in government and from those contending for power in an upcom-
ing election. We made it clear that if ap-
proval for export was granted we would take legal action in the federal courts. Meanwhile we maintained our vigorous national—and regional—press campaign against the transfer.

On April 19, 1995, the new state min-
ister for the environment, Pam Allen, an-
ounced the cancellation of plans to ex-
port the platypuses to Japan.

Although she said she would enter into loan arrangements with zoos around the world for other species, she said that "the government will always place the welfare of the animals as the paramount consider-
ation." HSIS (Australia) has asked Ms. Allen to make it state policy to prohibit the export of platypuses and koalas to for-
eign zoos.—Michael Kennedy, director, HSIS (Australia)

PORTAL: A water-lov-
ing platypus is one of only three species of egg-laying mammals in the world. A na-
tional campaign has assurred that, for the
time being, the platyp-
pus will not be export-
for public display.
SAVING WHAT WE VISIT

How do we make sure that tourism, the biggest industry in the world, is sustainable, so that tourists do not degrade or kill the things that attract them in the first place? This is the question—posed by Wendell Rockefeller, spokesman for sustainable tourism, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, and the great-grandson of Theodore Rockefeller—that policy makers worldwide must answer if the great natural places of the Earth are to survive. Like other industries such as energy, agriculture, and forestry, tourism must be managed sustainably so that it is kept from destroying the natural world and the habitats of the animals tourists come to see. The need to make tourism sustainable has only recently attracted the attention of policy makers and become a high priority.

Belize, a neighbor of Guatemala in Central America, is a country that has begun to build the practical and philosophical framework of community-based sustainable tourism. Under the enlightened leadership of Prime Minister Manuel Esquivel, the government of Belize is working with nongovernmental organizations, including EarthKind, to ensure that tourism does not negatively affect the animals, the people, and the natural surroundings, but instead benefits them. “Clearly, countries must continue to develop, but it must be done in an environmentally sensitive manner so that future generations are not undermined,” the prime minister points out. His commitment to the preservation of Belizean biological, ecological, and cultural diversity is impressive. His vision of eco-cultural tourism has made Belize a global leader in shaping the future of the largest and fastest growing industry in the world.

Uniquely, Belize has placed tourism and the environment under the supervision of one government minister, the Honorable Henry Young. Minister Young has emphasized that sustainable tourism must involve local communities.

The largest coral reef in the Western Hemisphere lies off the coast of Belize. Preserving this unique ecosystem is profoundly important in its own right and also represents an important economic opportunity for Belize. Mims Wright, who owns the Victoria House, a hotel on the Belizean island Ambergris Caye, observes, “Nature-based tourism will be an increasingly important revenue center for Belize if [the Belizean] maintain the reef in all its purity and beauty.”

The Belizean rain forest also depends on respect for animals and their environment for its survival. A birdwatcher’s paradise stretching from the coast to the Maya Mountains, Belize’s rain forest (above) supports five hundred species of birds, including harpy eagles, scarlet macaws, tanagers, banana birds, and hummingbirds. Birdwatching and other kinds of expeditions into the rain forest provide revenues for the country and its business.

EARTHKind IN ACTION

EYES OF THE EARTH FOCUS LOCAL EFFORTS

EarthKind welcomes the participation of the U.S. Information Agency (USAID) in the Eyes of the Earth Program, which distributes EarthKind video cameras to groups engaged in the struggle to protect endangered ecosystems (see the Spring 1995 and Summer 1995 issues of the HSUS News for other articles on the Eyes of the Earth Program). Launched in 1995, the Earth Summit by EarthKind and the legendary rock and roll band, the Beach Boys, which has supported it financially, the Eyes of the Earth Program is helping to create a global network that works regionally to preserve the biological diversity of the planet.

“EarthKind’s ‘Eye of the Earth’ is arriving at the perfect time,” declared José Manuel Mateo, director of the Dominican National Parks Service’s Department of Environment. “My department is discussing videotaping the parks and their activities [and using the tapes] in classrooms for environmental education.”

“This is a great idea,” says Judith Buttermore, Ph.D., public affairs officer of the U.S. Embassy in Kampala, Uganda. “Uganda’s national parks organization is active, having an innovative program involving communities bordering the parks. A video camera is just what they could use to further the goal of environmental education. Uganda’s.” Ms. Buttermore continues, “is increasingly getting involved in programs and public awareness campaigns to protect the environment.”

In India the Aligarh Muslim University is conducting a study of Indian orchids, endangered species, and subtropical grasslands. The EarthKind video camera is an effective tool in this endeavor.

In western Poland the Lubistan Nature Reserve, supported by EarthKind, has 2,000 members. The reserve has a program to restore the natural environment, including the establishment of new protected areas, and to record natural events such as bird migration patterns.

“If we want to save the animals and their habitats,” notes Marcelo Nadra, president of Brazil’s Pre-Nature, an international organization promoting sustainable economic use of natural resources, “we must build the local capacity of environmental organizations to better advance their agenda. EarthKind is making a real contribution to the global environmental movement through its Eyes of the Earth Program, and organizations such as Pre-Nature are proud to join forces to promote compassion towards all creatures and a caring attitude towards Creation.”

The Eyes of the Earth Program is an example of EarthKind’s efforts to build the capabilities of regional organizations that share our concern for the integrity of the natural beauty, and diversity of the natural world.—John A. Hoyt, president, EarthKind (USA)
SUSTAINABLE ENERGY

Often our destiny is decided by our choices. Consider the choice between a traditional, inefficient incandescent lightbulb and an environmentally friendly compact fluorescent lightbulb. Just as an energy-efficient car is less polluting than a gas guzzler, so too are a variety of environmentally friendly household products less polluting than traditional products such as incandescent lighting.

Lighting accounts for 20 to 25 percent of the electricity used annually in the United States. Lighting for industries, stores, offices, and warehouses represents 80 to 90 percent of all of the electricity used for lighting purposes.

If energy-efficient lighting were used everywhere it was profitable, the electricity required for lighting would be cut by 50 percent and U.S. demand for electricity would be reduced by 10 percent.

Such a reduction would in turn reduce annual carbon-dioxide emissions by 232 million tons (4 percent of the national total)—the equivalent of 42 million cars—and save $13.6 billion from energy bills. It would also reduce sulfur-dioxide emissions by 1.7 million tons (7 percent of the national total) and nitrogen-oxide emissions by 900,000 tons (4 percent of the national total). Other forms of pollution—boiler ash, scrubber waste, acidic drainage—would also be reduced.

EarthKind and the Sustainable Development Initiative of Columbia University have co-sponsored and help to organize two national conferences dealing with the need for a new sustainable-energy strategy. Its cornerstones are energy-efficiency technologies and renewable energy sources such as the sun and the wind.

EarthKind has found a visionary ally in Hazel O’Leary, who is fast becoming the best secretary of the Department of Energy in U.S. history. Secretary O’Leary has been a leader among advocates of sustainable energy policy, here and abroad. She has made recommendations that would encourage energy efficiency in all sectors of the U.S. economy, including a revenue-neutral tax shift to promote efficiency and environmental initiatives in industry; an effort to fund cost-effective, demand-side management during the electric industry’s restructuring phase; and tax incentives to encourage early retirement of inefficient, polluting power plants.

O’Leary’s ideas are urging the use of energy-efficient technologies in lighting, heating, and air-conditioning as a way to stem the growth of expensive new power plant construction while maintaining energy-driven services so necessary for economic development. Leaders like Secretary O’Leary and nongovernmental organizations like EarthKind are beginning to shift the focus of major international lending institutions, such as the World Bank and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, from large-scale projects to projects incorporating environmentally friendly technologies.

Such a shift in national and international policy holds enormous significance for people and animals. Through a sustainable-energy policy, we can reduce the risk of global warming and its projected catastrophic impact on human and animal (coastal inundation, super hurricanes, droughts) in the interior of continents, and the complete submergence of many island countries without reducing our standard of living. As John A. Hoyt, president of EarthKind™ (USA), has said, "It is clearly wrong for a person to roll up the windows of his car on a hot day and leave his cat or dog inside to suffocate. It is just as wrong for the hand of humanity to turn up the world’s thermostat—and risk a climate change that will cause millions of animals to suffer and die—by overdependence on fossil fuels."
A. ANIMALS: IT'S THEIR WORLD TOO T-SHIRT
If you're looking for a way to show your love of animals, this 100% cotton crewneck T-shirt will suit you to a tee! Green. Made in the USA. S (34-36); M (38-40); L (42-44); XL (46-48)
4A-619 $12.50 (Members $11.00)

B. FRIENDS T-SHIRT
Be up front about your love for companion animals with this 100% cotton crew-neck T-shirt. White with multi-colored artwork by Mimi Vang Olsen. Pre-shrunk. Made in the USA. S (34-36); M (38-40); L (42-44); XL (46-48)
4A-628 $13.35 (Members $12.00)

C. DOLPHIN PLUSH
You'll flip for this playful plush dolphin. Cute and cuddly ... and oceans off the m! An adorable playmate for kids of all ages. 12". Also available to purchase.
4M-317 $15.95 (Members $14.00)

D. HSUS BABY ANIMALS WALL CALENDAR
12 full-color images of some of the most lovable baby animals you've ever seen make this 1996 12-month calendar irresistible. 12" x 12". SD-508 $9.99 (Members $8.95)

E. HSUS YEAR-IN-A-BOX CALENDARS
These 1996 daily calendars feature color photos of a full year's worth of canines or felines. Includes helpful pet care tips and interesting facts. 6" x 4.5"
$9.99 (Members $8.99)

Cats SB-500
Dogs SB-570

F. CAT LOVERS T-SHIRT
Show your love of cats by wearing this perfectly designed shirt for The HSUS. Made in the USA of 100% cotton. Printed on back: "Animals... It's Their World Too." White. M (38-40); L (42-44); XL (46-48)
5R-628 $19.95 (Members $17.95)

G. DOG LOVERS T-SHIRT
A delightful tribute to our canine friends, this exclusive tee is sure to have everyone barking with approval. Made in the USA of 100% cotton. Printed on back: "Animals... It's Their World Too." Natural. M (38-40); L (42-44); XL (46-48)
5R-638 $19.95 (Members $17.95)

H. J. K. HSUS WALL CALENDARS
Whether you want dogs, cats or horses, you are sure to find a calendar you'll enjoy looking at for all of 1996. Each 16-month calendar is printed on 100% recycled paper and features 13 captivating full color images. Made in the USA. 12" x 11". $16.99 (Members $15.99)

Cats SB-500
Dogs SB-520
Horses SB-510

I. CAT LOVERS T-SHIRT
Show your love of cats by wearing this perfectly designed shirt for The HSUS. Made in the USA of 100% cotton. Printed on back: "Animals... It's Their World Too." Natural. M (38-40); L (42-44); XL (46-48)
5R-628 $19.95 (Members $17.95)

J. DOG LOVERS T-SHIRT
A delightful tribute to our canine friends, this exclusive tee is sure to have everyone barking with approval. Made in the USA of 100% cotton. Printed on back: "Animals... It's Their World Too." Natural. M (38-40); L (42-44); XL (46-48)
5R-638 $19.95 (Members $17.95)

K. HSUS BABY ANIMALS WALL CALENDAR
12 full-color images of some of the most lovable baby animals you've ever seen make this 1996 12-month calendar irresistible. 12" x 12". SD-508 $9.99 (Members $8.95)

L. HEWI VINTAGE NOTE CARDS
Enjoy the third edition of 20 assorted blank note cards and envelopes. Perfect for any occasion, this set contains a mix of contemporary and archival black and white photography featuring the close bond between people and animals. 5" x 7".
5E-542 $18.95 (Members $16.95)

M. DOG MONTAGE UMBRELLA
The next time it rains cats and dogs, you'll be ready with this generously sized umbrella. With its fanciful multi-dog pattern, it is truly a breed apart! 48" open. Wood shaft. Burgundy.
4S-006 $25.95
(Members $22.95)
Also available: 15" folding automatic umbrella. 43" open. Black plastic frame.
4S-016 $22.95
(Members $19.95)

N. COFFEE MUG
Show your support of the animal protection efforts of The HSUS with this 11-ounce ceramic mug featuring real, dog, cat, and cow faces. Makes a great gift! White with 4-color images.
4E-111 Mug $9.95
(Members $8.95)
4E-114 Set of Four $35.95
(Members $33.95)

CALL TOLL FREE 1-800-486-2630
Mon.-Sat., 9am-midnight, Sun. 9am-10pm, EST

ORDER ANY 3 CALENDARS, GET ONE MORE FREE!

FREE with $50 Purchase
C. DOLPHIN PLUSH
You'll flip for this plushy plush dolphin. Cute and cuddly... and oceans of fun! An adorable playmate for kids of all ages. 12". Also available to purchase.
4M-317 $15.95 (Members $14.00)

FREE with $50 Purchase
N. COFFEE MUG
Help Us Free Willy!

P. "Keiko," the orca who captured our hearts as the star of Free Willy, will soon be on his way to freedom, thanks to the Free Willy Foundation. You can help by "adopting" Keiko. Adoption kit includes a movie poster, quarterly newsletter, bumper sticker, adoption certificate and much more! All proceeds will go to the Free Willy Foundation.

S. Horse Lovers T-Shirt
You won't hear any "nays" when you wear this exclusively designed tee for The HSUS. Made in the USA of 100% cotton. Printed on back:

"Animals... It's Their World Too." Natural. M (48-50), L (42-44), XL (46-48)
$19.95 (Members $17.95)

Q. Holiday Cards
Our exclusive holiday cards feature magnificent wildlife photographs and are printed on recycled paper using soy-based inks. Velvety photographs and are printed on recycled paper using soy-based inks. 15 cards and 30 envelopes per box.

5E-500 $22.95 (Members $22.95)
4E-510 $22.95 (Members $22.95)
5E-520 $25.95 (Members $25.95)
4E-541 $22.95 (Members $22.95)

R. Wolves in Yellowstone
Youngsters will be enchanted by the true adventures of wolves who are reintroduced to Yellowstone National Park. The set includes a 32-page hardcover picture book, a 10-minute audiocassette narrated by Tom Chapin and a plush wolf toy.

Item 5F-318
Set $39.95 (Members $35.95)

U. Umbrella
You're sure to stay dry under our newest creation. Four colorful canopies are pictured with their personalities shining through. 41" open. Automatic. Black plastic handle. Hol. 5S-005 $25.95 (Members $22.95)

T. Hope
The true story of a factory farm pig who is rescued by The Farm Sanctuary and given a new chance at life. The set includes a 32-page hardcover picture book, a 10-minute audiocassette narrated by Tom Chapin and a plush toy of Hope.

SF-321 Set $35.95 (Members $35.95)

You Save Lives.
HSUS Checks help protect wildlife and companion animals worldwide. Each order contributes to The Humane Society of the United States' efforts to speak for animals since they cannot speak for themselves.

Each check depicts an endearing creature with a message to encourage humane behavior each time you write a check. HSUS Checks are printed on recycled paper with vegetable-based soy ink to help preserve our environment. They meet national standards for quality and are guaranteed to work at your financial institution. When you choose HSUS Checks there's nothing to lose — and a whole world to gain.

How to Order HSUS Checks:
Complete the attached order form.
Include a deposit ticket for your purchase. (Make checks payable to Affinity Products.)
Enclose all the above items in an envelope and mail to: HSUS Checks, 5016 S. Wabash Ave., Chicago, IL 60616.

Satisfaction Guaranteed
If you're not satisfied, simply return the items you purchased within 30 days for a full refund.
Met~od
[Image 0x0 to 1197x769]

Method of Payment: [ ] Check [ ] Visa [ ] MasterCard

Account # ________________________ Exp. Date: ____________

Signature: ________________________

Name: ____________________________ Tel. #: ____________

Address: __________________________

City: ___________________ Zip: ____________

All orders must be prepaid; checks payable to The HSUS/FWF. Allow 4-6 weeks for delivery. Mail to:
Free Willy Foundation, c/o The HSUS, 2100 L St., NW, Washington, DC 20037

Yes! I want to "adopt" Keiko. Please send me my adoption kit(s). $12.95 each (plus $4.00 each for shipping and handling). I enclosed $_________ I am enclosing an additional contribution of $_________.

I understand that this contribution is tax deductible to the extent allowed by law. Free Willy Foundation is a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization.

Free Willy Foundation is a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization.

Free Willy Foundation is a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization.

Free Willy Foundation is a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization.

Free Willy Foundation is a 501(c)(3) tax-exempt organization.