World Congress for the Protection of Animals

In May of 1984, citizens of the United States will have the unique opportunity of attending an international gathering of animal-welfare professionals being convened in this country for the first time. Sponsored and arranged by the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA), this congress is expected to attract delegates and participants from numerous countries throughout the world who will discuss many critical issues affecting animals and seek to develop effective programs to ensure their protection from abuse and suffering.

Papers will be presented in general sessions in these subject areas: Transportation of Animals: Animal Husbandry—Intensive Systems; Animals in Research; Early Childhood Abuse of Animals and Later Criminal Behavior; Animals in the Motion Picture Industry; Animal Spectacles—Rabies—A Worldwide Problem; Sealing; and The Fur Controversy. All papers and subsequent discussions will be presented with simultaneous translations. Written proceedings will be available in Spanish, French, German, and English.

Because such an international gathering will likely not be held in the United States again during the 1980s, you are urged to take advantage of this rare opportunity. The congress will be held from May 27 to June 1 at the Boston Park Plaza Hotel. Registration for the entire congress, including banquet, is $50.00 for WSPA members; $60.00 for non-members. Hotel reservations should be made directly with the Boston Park Plaza Hotel, 50 Park Plaza, Boston, MA 02117. Specify that you are attending the WSPA-sponsored World Congress. Rates are single $85.00 (plus tax); double $72.00 (plus tax) per night.

Whether or not you plan to attend this world congress, you are invited to become a member of the World Society for the Protection of Animals for just ten dollars per year. Through your membership in this outstanding international animal-welfare organization, you will be assisting in protecting animals worldwide.

Send your membership dues to WSPA, P.O. Box 190, 29 Perkins Street, Boston, MA 02130. Also, if you desire to attend the world congress, write to the same address for a registration form and further congress information.
Sea World Wins Its Way

In November, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) issued a permit to Sea World to capture ten orcas (killer whales) over the next four years for display and breeding purposes (see the Fall 1983 HSUS News). As many as ninety animals can be caught and held briefly to be measured, blood-sampled, photographed, and, possibly, marcelled. Although the NMFS did not reduce the large number of animals originally requested by Sea World as we had hoped, we were pleased to see that the final permit issued in much more restrictive than that which Sea World sought. It has taken into account our opposition to painful procedures such as liver biopsies, tooth extractions, and stomach samplings being performed on the animals. If Sea World wants to undertake these procedures, it will have to prove they do not unduly stress the animals and that they are truly beneficial research. And, if any whale dies during capture, it will count toward the quota of ten and all activity will have to be suspended and reviewed.

Before Sea World can even begin to remove the two animals for display in 1984, it must conduct a population survey and present it to the NMFS for approval. There are a number of points during the procedure at which the HSUS, along with others, has requested a chance for input and review. Now that the permit has been granted, the public must scrutinize every aspect of the capture to ensure that the whales are handled as humanely as possible.

The larger question, however, is whether these animals should be used in captivity at all. Federal legislation has been introduced by Rep. Rod Chandler of Washington State “to prohibit the taking and importation of killer whales for public display purposes.” The granting of the permit is only the first step down a long road for Sea World. Much could happen before ten orcas are ensconced in the attraction’s multi-million-dollar new facilities being built in Florida and California.

Trap Seeks Foot-hold

Woodstream Corporation of Lititz, Pennsylvania, the largest trap manufacturer in the world, is introducing a modified version of the steel-jawed, leghold trap to the Connecticut legislature (see “Around the Regions”). The manufacturer states that this new model, which is equipped with padded jaws, has been tested by his company and causes none of the cuts and broken bones which result from the steel-jawed, leg­hold variety. But The HSUS believes this trap is neither new nor humane. In the past several years, different modifications of the cruel steel-jawed trap have been developed; some used various materials wrapped around their jaws as padding, while others had an offset ground into the jaws which left a gap when the trap was closed, lessening the pressure on the trapped limb. But none of the modifications proved popular with the trappers. HSUS staff met with officials at Woodstream to discuss the reasons behind the failure of these modified traps, particularly the ones using padded jaws. At that time, Woodstream presented a sound argument against manufacturing such a trap: the rubberized material used to wrap the steel jaws would retain human scent; the material itself would not be durable (since the trapped animal would tear through it in an effort to get free); and trappers would not use the new trap because of the expense and effort involved in its maintenance.

Now, Woodstream is touting the padded-jaw modification in Connecticut as a compromise to cruel trapping methods. In reality, the trap is no compromise at all. It inflicts stress and pain on the trapped animal; it costs twice as much to manufacture as the steel-jawed trap, and trappers have shown in the past that they just don’t like using it. Why, then, is Woodstream promoting a trap that it once refuted so strongly? We don’t know that answer. We do know that we remain opposed to the use of the cruel leghold trap, and, indeed, all traps used to exploit, injure, and kill wildlife.

Television Series Announced

The HSUS will launch a weekly television series about the world of animals early this year. The program, called “Pet Action Line,” will offer practical advice ranging from companion animal training to preventative and emergency pet health care and will feature controversial topics such as the use of drugs in horse racing, laboratory animal experimentation, and dogfighting.

The HSUS has joined forces with the Action Line Group, nationally syndicated television producers, to produce the series. The show will be hosted by broadcast journalist H. L. “Sonny” Bloch and produced by Gail Nemec.

“Pet Action Line” is currently being released to more than 900 communities through cable systems and will be made available to public broadcasting, cable, and commercial stations nationwide. A weekly television program addressing the importance of animals in our lives and the ways in which The HSUS is working to eliminate the suffering and abuse they endure has been one of our major goals for several years,” said HSUS President Hoyt. “We are tremendously excited at the possibilities this medium provides for advancing the rights and welfare of animals.”

Reaction to the Alert

The early response to our first Animal Activist Alert, published in October, has been encouraging. We’ve already found that letters do work.

One of our stories, for instance, covered sweepstakes that offer fur coats as grand prizes. We asked our readers to write to the sweepstakes companies in protest. The Action Alert Team received responses from the companies and sent copies of them to The HSUS.

A representative from the Independent Judging Organization, Inc., responded to our readers’ protest letters with the following:

“When choosing prizes for a sweepstakes, we usually try to tailor them for the market we are selling to—in this case, women. Judging from the large amount of mail received, I am doubtful that fur coats will appear as a prize again.”

In conjunction with our campaign against Norwegian fish products, we asked our readers to locate Norwegian sardines and salmon at their markets and send us the information. The Alert Team received responses from the companies and sent copies of them to The HSUS.

A representative from the Independent Judging Organization, Inc., responded to our readers’ protest letters with the following:

“When choosing prizes for a sweepstakes, we usually try to tailor them for the market we are selling to—in this case, women. Judging from the large amount of mail received, I am doubtful that fur coats will appear as a prize again.”

In conjunction with our campaign against Norwegian fish products, we asked our readers to locate Norwegian sardines and salmon at their markets and send us the information. The Alert Team received responses from the companies and sent copies of them to The HSUS.

A representative from the Independent Judging Organization, Inc., responded to our readers’ protest letters with the following:

“When choosing prizes for a sweepstakes, we usually try to tailor them for the market we are selling to—in this case, women. Judging from the large amount of mail received, I am doubtful that fur coats will appear as a prize again.”
Introduction

From the time of its founding almost thirty years ago, The HSUS has attempted to improve the conditions under which food animals are transported and slaughtered. In the late 1970's, however, it became imperative to address the cruelty and deprivation endured by animals raised in intensive confinement. Factory farming— the highly automated, capital-intensive system of raising animals for food—was causing millions of animals unnecessary stress, distress, and increased susceptibility to disease.

Through our publication Factory Farming, we alerted our members to the deprivation caused veal calves by confinement in stalls too small for them to stand up, turn around, or groom, and by diets inadequate in iron. We described hog confinement systems in which sows were kept in crowded pens, and by diets inadequate in vitamin and mineral conditions of beef cattle for months at a time; laying hens in banks of thousands of cages, for their eggs;Compare to the living conditions of farm animals as described in Factory Farming.

Although this relatively small grant was a welcome first step, scientists such as Dr. Fox remained concerned about whether all important aspects of farm animal welfare would be adequately explored through such research. In some areas, such as the raising of milk-fed veal calves, enough preliminary data exist to undertake a successful national public awareness campaign (see the Spring 1982 HSUS News). However, in other areas, we saw that more data would have to be analyzed and interpreted.

New Publications, New Ideas

Dr. Fox has now completed a new book which underscores the importance of animal-behavior studies in observing humane husbandry systems. Farm Animals, Husbandry, Behavior, and Veterinary Practice is a major reference text for students, researchers, veterinarians, agricultural engineers, farm animal scientists, and interested laypersons.

Farm Animals should provide the information needed by experts to formulate humane husbandry systems, codes of practice, farm animal welfare legislation, and guidelines. It established farm animal welfare as a scientific discipline in its own right, a discipline which needs to be incorporated into the teaching curricula of veterinary and agricultural schools for the benefit of not only the animals, but also all those involved in farming enterprises.

Farm Animals shows very clearly that most factory farming systems for livestock and poultry are stressful to the animal, cause unnecessary distress and suffering, and increase the animals' susceptibility to infections and metabolic diseases.

While much of the material in Farm Animals draws upon the decades of research done by European scientists, considerable supporting evidence from U.S. animal scientists and veterinarians is included as well. The data show clearly that, without extensive reliance upon drugs (a known consumer health risk), factory-farmed animals will have reduced productivity, profitability, and increased incidence of stress-related diseases. It is ironic that American researchers have ignored the implications of their own findings. To challenge factory farming could mean a loss of their jobs and research grants. It is understandable, even if it is ethically reprehensible, therefore, that the American Veterinary Medical Association's Animal Welfare Committee gave a virtual carte blanche approval of factory farming in its first report to the membership. When serious animal health and welfare problems are denied and rationalized in this way, we must question the ties between organized veterinary medicine, the pharmaceutical industry, and agriculture. It is difficult for veterinarians, like animal scientists, to be truly objective about the toll factory farming takes in animal suffering since their perceptions of intensive livestock and poultry farming are colored by their professional vested interests. So important do we consider Farm Animals that we are making the book an integral part of our public awareness campaign on farm animals. An HSUS press conference announcing publication of the book will be held in February in conjunction with Rep. James Howard's office in the House of Representatives office building. Rep. Howard is the sponsor of H.R. 3170, the farm animal welfare bill under consideration in the House (see "Federal Report"). Representatives of the general-interest media, agriculture trade publications, and appropriate congressional staff people will be invited to learn about this influential new book.

Dr. Fox has also prepared for The HSUS an informational monograph entitled Farm Animal Welfare and the Human Diet, which will strengthen the humane and ethical principles shared by those who feel a responsibility for the animals we use and exploit.

According to this publication, factory farming, in the long run, benefits no one—not the banks that hope to profit from a farmer's two-million-dollar mortgage on a new pig "factory"; not farmers, consumers and taxpayers; not the animals. A big "factory" that relies heavily on drugs to boost animal production.
and prevent diseases puts local farmers out of business and generates food products that wise people avoid. Its inherent problems create more jobs for research scientists and state and federal regulatory bureaucracies—mainly at taxpayers’ expense.

How all of us can “eat with conscience” to improve animal welfare, improve farmers’ welfare, improve personal and family health, and, by eating less of all farm animal produce, contribute to the nation’s best interest and alleviate worldwide starvation is the important conclusion of Farm Animal Welfare and the Human Diet.

While the picture is complicated, there is much that concerned humanitarians can do to help transform agriculture and improve the welfare of farm animals. If you buy meat products, first, to protect your health, to protect the quality of your land and the well-being of their land and stock, be they owner-operators or corporate contract managers.

The humaneness of any husbandry system is also influenced by the attitude of persons tending the animals and the quality of care and attention given to each animal. While an intrinsically inhumane, restricting, depriving, or overcrowded and stressful environment for the animals can only be worsened by indifferent human attention and barely improved by careful attention, the quality of human care does play an extremely important role in those systems designated as being “less inhumane.”

Basic, the less inhumane, less automated and industrialized husbandry systems depend greatly upon refined husbandry skill and high quality human attention, vastly different from the management techniques needed to operate a highly automated factory system.

Once you get used to the idea of being a person with conscience, becoming even more selective and conscientious comes easily and brings many rewards, including better health and the certain knowledge that by changing your consumer habits, you are making a personal contribution to improving the welfare of farm animals and actually helping to end the species-specific moral and spiritual entropy through unselfish frugality. In the final analysis, this is enlightened self-interest.
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FARM ANIMAL WELFARE: NEW DIRECTIONS AND DEVELOPMENTS

This farming operation (right) gives new meaning to the description “pig factory.” The difference below is obvious: animals cannot suffer from the extreme stress that are inherent aspects of factory farming.

Animal welfare is the issue of the nineteen eighties, and it won’t go away.

The American Farm Bureau Federation objected to The HSUS’s Humane Education Curriculum Guide developed by The National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education for use in schools. The Farm Bureau attempted to have this guide for teachers censored and blocked in Utah schools.

The Problems of Agribusiness

The over-reaction to this guide and to our farm animal welfare program has given us more beneficial publicity than we could have ever hoped for. It reflects the paranoia of capital-intensive agriculture that is creating its own nemesis (which we have termed “agricide”). The industry rationalizes and denies that it is inhumane to animals or responsible for increased consumer health risks from antibiotics and other drugs given to animals to boost productivity and to prevent diseases, that the direct result of the stresses of intensive confinement husbandry practices. Agribusiness continues to deny that it is responsible for pesticide, herbicide, and other agrochemical contaminants in our food and water and in our own bodies as well as responsibility for a decline in the quality of rural life and the demise of the family farm, with thousands being forced into bankruptcy as larger factory farms take over and reap short-term economic advantages.

Future Directions

There are an estimated 700,000 small farms and part-time farmers in the U.S. now who do not follow agribusiness practices of chemically producing crops and raising animals in factories. These farmers are concentrating more and more on raising organic animal produce for export and setting up colonies of U.S. agribusiness technology, genetic stock, and chemical and drug dependence abroad. Many states, such as New Hampshire, Vermont, and Michigan, are actively supporting the formation of marketing, distribution, and information networks for farmers who wish to sell their produce locally by farmers’ markets. A cautiously optimistic rejuvenation of the small farm is occurring nationwide. These farms are concentrating on supplying local goods to suburban and urban areas within their regions. Agricultural college and USDA farm extension advisors are looking for information resources to help small farm operators. These resources are in great demand but short supply since most research and development has been focused on agribusiness’ factory–scale farming operations.

Consumers still have a choice between local and “health” foods, and producers are competing in this area. Consumers, including many organic producers’ markets and, at the same time, work toward humane and ecologically sound reforms in agribusiness.

However, in spite of the significant progress that the farm animal welfare and agricultural reform movements have made, we should heed the Battelle Memorial Institute’s study entitled “Agriculture 2000—A Look At The Future.” This study forecasts that 20% of the U.S. will be more and larger confinement systems of livestock and poultry production. Several studies have shown that these systems, requiring considerable capital to erect, are also costly to maintain and require considerable energy to run, in contrast with less intensive systems. Then there are serious problems of manure disposal, water pollution and air pollution with odors which prohibit confinement systems from populated areas. In less populated farming areas, they will contribute to the bankruptcy of local farmers, and since they are highly automated, they will contribute also to local unemployment. Manufacturers of swine confinement buildings have been strongly opposed by the Center for Rural Affairs in Nebraska, and local communities and the Michigan Federation of Humane Societies are actively opposing one company seeking over one million dollars in public funds to set up swine factories in Michigan. These systems benefit only the manufacturers, and the power, petrochemical, and drug companies.

The Battelle Institute predicts that genetic engineering will be an integral part of agribusiness enterprises. Genetically engineered animals may be even more dependent upon antibiotics and hormones to maintain health and productivity.

Conclusion

Our agricultural base is our life-support system, not simply the cornerstone of the industrial system. The social, ecological, and political ramifications linked with our concern for the welfare of farm animals has drawn The HSUS into a wide-ranging and complex arena. It is clear that we will have to continue our efforts to inform the general public, encourage the small or medium–scale, humane farmers, support important legislation, and promote a responsible, sustainable model of welfare throughout the eighties, and beyond; otherwise, the suffering of farm animals will become even greater and “agricide” may be irreversible.

and newspapers, have ranged from outright denial that factory farming can be inhumane to stating that our concerns were misinformed, sentimental, and anthropomorphic. One university professor and department chairman, in defense of the status quo, stated in one agribusiness magazine that “farm animals do not have emotions,” implying that they cannot suffer from the extreme deprivation, frustration, and crowding stress that are inherent aspects of factory farming.

Agribusiness, defensive because of consumer health concerns over nitrites, and hormone and antibiotic residues in farm animal produce, has been under pressure from organic farming advocates and farmers’ organizations that see agribusiness as a threat to the livelihood of the independent mid–sized family farm.

With the considerable media attention that the agribusiness establishment has been getting since 1980 and 1982 by their opposition to and denial of our concerns, fueled further by The HSUS’s nationwide “No Veal This Meal” campaign, the smoke screen began to lift. Agribusiness spokespersons proclaimed that “farm
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HSUS Farm Animal Materials

Factory Farming (1980) describes in detail how farm animals are raised and what humane reforms are needed. $1.00.

Farm Animal Welfare and the Human Diet (1983), by Dr. Michael Fox, with an afterword by Dr. Fox. (1984) A 288-page scientific book describes how the animals are raised, and what you can do about it. $55.00.

Fact Sheets on Factory Farming (1983) Separate fact sheets on dairy cattle, veal, beef, laying hens, chickens, and hogs describe how the animals are raised, what humane reforms are needed, and what you can do to help. $1.00 per set of six.

Farm Animals: Husbandry, Behavior, and Veterinary Practice (1984) A 288-page scientific book by Dr. Michael Fox, with an analysis of various intensive farm animal husbandry systems currently in operation in the U.S. and Europe and what reforms are needed. $19.95 (price includes 25% dis-count for HSUS members).
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When a well-behaved animal suddenly starts to bark, spray, or chew the sofa, a change in your pet's behavior may be the cause.

Susan and her husband waited a long time to have a baby. When Jeremy finally came along, they never dreamed that their gentle six-year-old, mixed-breed dog, Scarlet, would cause trouble. At first, Scarlet ignored the baby, but by the time Jeremy had started crawling, the dog had begun to growl and bare its teeth at the baby. The problem became so severe that the new parents realized they had to act or give up their beloved Scarlet for Jeremy's sake. They decided to consult an animal behaviorist.

This professional spent forty-five minutes in their home, observed the baby-pet interaction, and suggested a behavior modification strategy that has successfully preserved Scarlet's place in the family. The behaviorist noted that the smiling, crawling baby was inadvertently inviting the dog to fight. Jeremy, in his crawling position, made eye-to-eye contact with Scarlet, and, in smiling, bared his teeth. These two factors spelled confrontation to Scarlet, and it returned the gesture by baring its teeth and growling—its way of saying "I was here first—beat it."

Scarlet's unacceptable behavior was a symptom of its insecurity. The behaviorist told the worried parents that they had better obstruct the dog to what its place was in the family and show it that it hadn't lost its affection. Every time Scarlet threatened Jeremy, the behaviorist told them, they should clap their hands and shout, "Scarlet, no!" then offer the dog a toy as a distraction. The behaviorist also urged them to give Scarlet its own time with them by taking the dog for regular walks.

After three weeks of this consistent treatment, the parents noticed that Scarlet and Jeremy had become playmates. "Now Scarlet really wants to be Jeremy's friend," Susan notes. "We had a success story and I'm glad of it."

Whenever pets suddenly change their behavior, the pet owner's anxiety, guilt, and grief can be just as stressful as those of the other member. Your pet may have a mental health or physical problem. In dealing with a troubled animal, the pet owner does not have the luxury of a shared verbal language with which to ask, "What's the matter with you?" The best people can do is try to avoid problems before they start, study the behavior problem to find the solution, and turn to a veterinarian, animal behaviorist, or humane society for advice. For many of us, the final consideration is "How long can I tolerate this new behavior and will what I do once I can't?"

There is, of course, no such thing as a dog or cat guaranteed not to bark, chew, spray, scratch, or soil the house. However, no pet is guaranteed the most stable, constant, and ideal environment in which to live, either. Today, many pet-owning households break up in divorce; families and single people move from large houses to small apartments; and a home can change its cast of characters as family members move away, move in, get married, or die. Even in the most stable of households, someone is bound to go away to college and leave the devoted pet behind. The troubled pet might react to these changes by barking, destroying the furniture, spraying the corner potted palm, or repeatedly jumping the backyard fence to wander the streets. The educated pet owner will try to keep a beloved animal safe and well-behaved by compensating for the unpleasant changes, whatever they may be, and helping the animal cope. Although many changes in lifestyle are beyond the control of the pet owner, with insight and empathy, that person can control the pet's reaction to them.

Conversely, the careless or insensitive pet owner can also make matters worse. One woman, for instance, shared a spacious home with two very large, purebred dogs, three cats, and a potted palm. Everything was ideal: there was plenty of space, and the roomate worked at home so there was also companionship for the animals. Suddenly, however, the roommate had to move away and the set-up crumbled. The woman was left with one large dog, one cat, and a small efficiency apartment in which to live. When the dog, alone, missed the estranged roommate, it took out its frustration on the small apartment. First, it attacked a pillow, but each day cost the woman one more item in the apartment, including the kitchen floor's peeling tiles. The dog chewed everything. Finally, after

Even in the most stable of households, someone is bound to go away to college and leave the devoted pet behind.
The dog felt it had been banished to the backyard. It missed its regular evening rounds with the folks. "You'd think he would love the backyard as an outdoor haven with trees and squirrels and room to walk," said the woman, "but the high point of his day was that regular 8:00 p.m. jog around the block with us." The couple, with their long experience of successful pet ownership, had to exercise a little extra insight in order to realize that although the dog had been given an enlarged world, it still thrived on the daily, personal attention of its human companions. Once the evening ritual was returned to the dog's routine, the problem disappeared.

When a well-behaved pet starts showing troubled behavior, it's important not to react with anger. It's time to look around its environment to see what major element in its life might have changed, says Dr. Fox. Has its routine been modified? Has the new spouse brought along a pet? Has furniture been moved around in the pet's living environment? Is there a new baby? In worrying about a disruptive animal, it's important for the pet owner to keep a cool head and trace the cause of the problem as quickly as possible. As changeable as modern society is, there are few guarantees that the new family will accept the family pet.

Recognize and accept normal behavior. No matter how educated the pet owner might be concerning the animal, it's possible to misunderstand normal animal behavior as abnormal. For instance, cats may spit or scratch if touched at the base of the tail or on the abdomen. This seemingly hostile behavior occurs simply because many cats feel vulnerable at these places. Young dogs might urinate in a non-aggressive gesture to the owner. This is not "misbehaving" or a sign of incontinence. It's an action that harks back to the days of wild dogs pack.

4. Know how to spot abnormal behavior. It's often very easy to recognize either aggressive or fearful or if a cat suddenly becomes unhousedbroken, this is a sign of either a physical or emotional problem.

"Always remember this rule: do not judge the animal's behavior as good or bad, but look under the surface—fear, anxiety, aggression—for a possible cause," says Dr. Fox. "Also, a veterinary examination is in order at this stage to rule out the possibility of some underlying physical cause."

5. Look for a change in social relationships. A new personality, animal or human, in the household can reorder the hierarchy. The only dog meeting the new baby for the first time must somehow identify where that baby fits in the household's "pack." Cats often refuse to use the litter box when there is a change in the family. It's important to reassure the cat and keep it secure in the bathroom with box, food, and water for a few days to reestablish its litter box habit. The sequestered cat, however, needs supervised time-outs from the bathroom so that it gets the loving companionship it was used to before the upsetting change had occurred.

6. Know the specific traits of the pet's breed and specifics of its environment. Influencing these cats, for instance, are talkers. Constant meowing is a delight to some owners, a nuisance to others. Cocker spaniels, says Dr. Hamilton, tend to bark more than the average dog, terriers tend to be aggressive when disciplined. A young dog that is introduced into a home after spending its first four months in a kennel is not going to warm up to the family as quickly as it might have had it been taken home as an eight-week-old puppy and given loving care.

7. Be sensitive to individual fears. A cat or dog that fears the unknown, people in uniforms, strangers, riding in cars, etc., needs to have those phobias respected. Dr. Fox also points out that many of these fears can be gently overcome by gradual desensitization, often with tranquilizers.

Dr. Hamilton advises that, because modern households are so changeable (and insecure for the pet), it can be a good idea to give the pet a companion animal of its own. If the second animal is assimilated into the household before predictable trouble appears (the primary pet owner going off to college, for instance), this animal will give the first pet companionship, diversion, and a thread of continuity. Don't, however, try to remedy an already bad situation by bringing in a second pet.

"By the time people have the misbehavior problem," says Dr. Hamilton, "it's too late for a second pet."

She also warns against having more than two cats in a household. Cats, however social they may be, are not pack animals. Although a multitude of happy, multi-cat households exists, the situation can cause problems. One woman had five cats living in her home, and she inadvertently encouraged more visitors by installing a cat door. "I had my cat's bathroom with box, food, and water for a few days to reestablish its litter box habit. The sequestered cat, however, needs supervised time-outs from the bathroom so that it gets the loving companionship it was used to before the upsetting change had occurred.

We are again making available our "Club Sandwiches, Not Seals" T-shirts in honor of Seal Day. We've sold thousands of this best-seller over the past few years. Order yours now.

Shirt Success

We are again making available our "Club Sandwiches, Not Seals" T-shirts in honor of Seal Day. We've sold thousands of this best-seller over the past few years. Order yours now.

| Shirts are royal blue with white print. The front reads: CLUB SANDWICHES, NOT SEALS; on the back is the HSUS logo. Shirts are available in MEN's sizes S, M, L, XL. (Small fits a small woman or large child). Shirts are $6 each ($5.50 each for 4 or more). Please send me ______ shirts at ______ each. |
| Please send me ______ shirts at ______ each. |
| I need ______ small ______ medium ______ large ______ extra large. |
| My check (made payable to The HSUS) for $______ is enclosed. |

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY STATE ZIP

Please return this coupon with full payment, to SEAL SHIRTS, HSUS, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20037. Please allow 3 weeks for delivery. |
One abusive trainer is investigated by the USDA, but The HSUS has found he is only one of many exploiting performing animals in movies and television.

by Sue Pressman

A recently concluded, year-long probe by The HSUS into accusations of animal abuse made by performers and trainers has resulted in the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) charging affords against an animal trainer. For once, it looks as if a case of abuse of animals used by the entertainment industry is not to be swept under the rug.

In September of 1982, The HSUS received its first report that a tiger supplied by trainer Ralph Helfer (doing business as “Gentle Jungle”) for an appearance in a movie’s “stand-ins,” had died as a result of cruel treatment. Our initial information came from a young woman who had been a Gentle Jungle trainer assigned to that film. She told a horrifying tale of an animal that had been tranquillized so it could be dyed black for use in the movie. "Steal" the movie "The Beast from 20,000 Fathoms," was done in California. In reviewing permits relating to the seals used in the movie "The Golden Seal," The HSUS learned that one of the animals developed health problems related to its nutrition after it was returned to Moorpark College, a junior college in California that specializes in "exotic animal training and management."

Our West Coast Regional Office and the San Bernardino Valley Humane Society conducted a raid on a private sanctuary in California where they discovered a number of animals, including a bear owned by an animal trainer, in extremely poor condition and living in squalor (see "Around the Regions"). The HSUS has been investigating a facility in Nevada that is a "dumping ground" for animals owned by Hollywood and Las Vegas trainers. The inspector described it as one of the worst places she had ever seen and as being rife with deficiencies ranging from inadequate nutrition and veterinary care to inadequate living quarters. Even when the work is done in this country, AHA inspectors have acknowledged in newspaper interviews that they do not always enjoy the cooperation of the cast, crew, and trainers. They suspect they may have been influenced in some instances, during filming by moviemakers who wanted to conceal what was actually happening to animals.

The death of this Gentle Jungle orangutan is being investigated by USDA.

Unfortunately, we have met with intense, hostile resistance on both fronts. By their very inaction, show business people are contributing in a major way to the perpetuation of inhumane training methods and unacceptable treatment of show business animals. Similarly, by their very unwillingness, good trainers share the blame with the bad. As far as The HSUS is concerned, until these people step forward to demand professional and humane practices by all their colleagues, there is no such thing as a "good trainer." It is in these areas that The HSUS has concentrated its efforts over the years. We have appealed to trainers to face up to their responsibilities to the animals they use to earn a living. We have worked especially hard to encourage them to adopt a code of ethics which would put pressure both on the trainers and on the studios where they work. At the same time, we have insisted that studios, directors, producers, and executives, stand up and, if necessary, fuse to deal with trainers who abuse or otherwise inadequately care for their animals. We have written to Jack Valenti, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, do you step forward to demand professional and humane practices. We have written to Jack Valenti, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, asking him to take all necessary steps to end animal abuse in their industry.
HSUS Periodicals: Many Ways to Stay Informed About Animal Welfare

We’re glad we can count you as part of The HSUS, but we find many people aren’t aware of the variety of periodicals we publish to serve the many different—and important—interests of those in animal welfare.

All of these publications are prepared by The HSUS’s nationally experienced professional staff. Shouldn’t you order one today?

The HSUS News Quarterly membership magazine of The Humane Society of the U.S., with up-to-date reports on HSUS activities in national, international, and regional animal–welfare issues. $10 minimum membership contribution.

Shelter Sense A lively, unique, informative newsletter for animal-sheltering and -control personnel that offers answers to community animal problems. Ten times a year. $5 per subscription.

Humane Education A practical, colorful publication of The HSUS’s National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education, filled with activities and suggestions for classroom teachers and educators in animal–welfare organizations, animal–control agencies, nature centers, and zoos. Quarterly. $7 per year.

Animal Activist Alert A four-page, quarterly newsletter with the latest information on state and federal legislation and special activist campaigns. Free to HSUS members on our Action Alert Team.


I would like to receive these periodicals of The HSUS:
The HSUS News. Enroll me as a voting member of The HSUS ($10 for one year) and send me four issues. I enclose
Shelter Sense. Enter a subscription to Shelter Sense ($5 for one year) and send me ten issues. I enclose
Animal Activist Alert. I am a voting member ($10 per year) of The HSUS. Please add me to the HSUS Action Alert Team. I enclose
Kind News I. I enroll as a subscription to Kind News I ($10 for one year) and send me 35 copies of each of 4 quarterly issues. I enclose
Kind News II. I enroll as a subscription to Kind News II ($10 for one year) and send me 35 copies of each of 4 quarterly issues. I enclose
Humane Education. I enroll as a subscription to Humane Education ($7 for one year) and send me four issues. I enclose

Total:

The HSUS Loxahatchee Suit All But Stymies Hunt

This is not the end of the fight. Because the judge dismissed the cases without a full hearing “on the merits,” and without a chance to present witnesses and additional evidence, we can and will sue the FWS again next year if it attempts to hold another hunt. Our public protest, in concert with other animal–welfare groups, at the refuge on November 12 was covered by local and state television and newspaper reporters and successfully made our point that a wildlife refuge is no place for hunting. This added public awareness may very well help us next year if we must make this fight once again.

In September, the FWS proposed allowing or expanding hunting on eight national wildlife refuges. This brings to over forty the number of refuges on which hunting has been allowed to encroach in just two years. The HSUS protested this irresponsible decision to the FWS in early October. We continue to oppose vehemently every one of these proposals as they come up, while demanding an end to sport and recreational killing of refuge wildlife.

The Hunt that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) planned to hold in Florida’s Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge took place in November, but, as a result of an HSUS lawsuit, it was quite different from what the agency had had in mind (see the Fall 1983 HSUS News). In September, the FWS published final regulations for the hunt, a clear sign it was going ahead with its plans to kill up to twenty-seven deer out of a population of only 180 to 400. The HSUS immediately sued the FWS just before the hunt’s scheduled beginning, asking for both a temporary restraining order and a permanent injunction against killing animals on land designated for their protection. We were joined in our suit by the Florida Federation of Humane Societies, the Florida Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and one of our Florida members. Defenders of Wildlife and the Florida Audubon Society sued on the hunt at the same time, and the cases were combined.

On October 28, Judge Louis Oberdorfer in Washington, D.C., granted our request for a temporary restraining order and transferred the case to Florida federal court. The next day, the government’s attorney tried to get the Florida court to hold an emergency hearing on their request to allow the hunt. The court refused, and the hunt was canceled for the first two of its three scheduled weekends. Then, a hearing was held in the Florida court to determine whether Interior Secretary James Watt had acted properly in approving a hunt for Loxahatchee. The judge decided that Secretary Watt had followed all the established procedures for holding a hunt, and that it could proceed. He lifted the restraining order and dismissed the cases, allowing the hunt, finally, to take place on the third and weekend originally scheduled. Twenty-nine hunters killed two deer during this abbreviated slaughter.

While we feel the judge’s decision was not the right one, we are happy that our action resulted in canceling two out of the three weekend hunts, especially since the first weekend’s hunters would have been allowed to use bows and arrows and muzzle-loading guns. (Secretary Watt had, earlier, decided to cancel a potentially damaging airboat hunt.)
The kinship of all living things served as the theme of the 1983 HSUS annual conference.

For the first time in seven years, the HSUS annual conference came to the southwest in October. No matter that three hundred animal-welfare supporters were venturing into the heart of rodeo country (although our anti-rodeo stand brought front-page headlines in one Ft. Worth newspaper)—our welcome in Ft. Worth was warm, nonetheless.

Wednesday’s symposium, “Can Love Be Taught?: Empathy, Animals, and Education,” co-sponsored by the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education and the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems, brought behavioral experts from across the country to The HSUS’s forum. Drs. Michael Fox, Carolyn Zahn Waxler of the National Institutes of Health, Nancy Eisenberg of Arizona State University, and Stephen Kellert of Yale presented papers during the morning session. Two panel discussions completed the afternoon.

On Thursday and Friday mornings, addresses by President John Hoyt, Dr. Richard Morgan of the Mobilization for Animals, Dr. Michael Fox, and Ms. Marilyn Wilhelm of the Wilhelm Schole in Houston gave conference participants different insights into and interpretations of the “All One Family” theme.

Both afternoons were filled with workshops—ten each day—to challenge and inform members, animal-welfare professionals, and humane society volunteers alike. What energy participants had left over fueled exploration of the colorful Texas countryside, attendance at the humane educators’ sharing session, and touring the nearby Waterfall Ranch (see the Fall 1982 HSUS News) where endangered species are raised for eventual return to the wild.

Texan Charlotte Baker Montgomery, an educator instrumental in decades in bringing humane ethics into the classroom, received The HSUS’s Joseph Wood Krutch Medal at Friday’s banquet.

Each conference develops a unique personality and Ft. Worth’s was no exception. The tightly-packed program, extremely comfortable accommodations, and unusually articulate, involved group of participants combined to make this conference among our most valuable and enjoyable.

**Cali'4nia Bound**

The HSUS will hold its 1984 annual conference in San Diego, California, from October 24 through October 27. What better way to fend off winter’s icy blasts than to make plans now to join us in sunny southern California this autumn? Remember, our west coast conferences are always among our best attended. Don’t miss this one. Program details will appear in the spring and summer issues of The News.

**Call of the Town**
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From Consciousness
To Conscience
Excerpts from President Hoyt's Address

I recently received a letter from a gentleman in Camp Hill, Pennsylvania, expressing dismay and concern over the theme of this conference, All One Family, coupled with the logo depicting a man and woman with the animals. He writes: "From this it is my impression that the author's position (and in turn that of The HSUS) is that mankind and animals should be considered as one. While I am not a theologian nor a philosopher, permit me to quote such a man of world renown as Dr. Francis Schaeffer:

"Human life stands at a critical place because there is an unbreakable link between the existence of the infinite personal God and the intrinsic dignity of people. If God does not exist and has not made people in His own image, there is no basis for an intrinsic, unique dignity of human life... Consequently, to allow the devaluation of human life is wrong in principle. And if this is not enough for you, then pragmatically you must realize that it is your life that is being devalued."

"In summary," wrote my correspondent, "I believe a theme such as that being used by The HSUS is indicative of the devaluation of human life that is rapidly growing in our society."

Not unkindly, I replied to this gentleman: "We are certainly not suggesting by this theme that animals are in every respect equal to mankind, though we are most assuredly seeking to establish a much greater degree of respect, consideration, and compassion for animals. Why is it that you and others choose to conclude that in seeking to elevate the dignity and value of life in general, we are thereby devaluing human life?"

"I can only affirm that I believe human life takes on a greater degree of dignity and purposefulness when our compassion and care extend to all creatures. In closing, let me quote the great author and philosopher Joseph Wood Krutch who wrote, 'To be truly human has always meant to be compassionate.'"

We are aware of the many cures from disease that have resulted from animal research; the many advances in human well-being and prosperity that otherwise would have lain dormant; of the possibilities for extended life and prolonged death research has made possible.

But what of the animals made to suffer in the process? What of the ethicists who should control and circumscribe such uses, ethics born of a consciousness we believe capable of distinguishing between right and wrong, between dignity and obscenity, between compassion and cruelty? Are we naive to believe such an ethic exists?"

***

"In summary," wrote my correspondent, "I believe a theme such as that being used by The HSUS is indicative of the devaluation of human life that is rapidly growing in our society."

Not unkindly, I replied to this gentleman: "We are certainly not suggesting by this theme that animals are in every respect equal to mankind, though we are most assuredly seeking to establish a much greater degree of respect, consideration, and compassion for animals. Why is it that you and others choose to conclude that in seeking to elevate the dignity and value of life in general, we are thereby devaluing human life?"

"I can only affirm that I believe human life takes on a greater degree of dignity and purposefulness when our compassion and care extend to all creatures. In closing, let me quote the great author and philosopher Joseph Wood Krutch who wrote, 'To be truly human has always meant to be compassionate.'"

***

It is very difficult, indeed, to believe the research community is genuinely concerned about the quality of its research or the conditions under which the animals being used are housed, cared for, and frequently mutilated... If, as these ambassadors of human beneficence would have us believe, this is all for our own good, why so secretive? Why so unwilling to let persons—responsible persons—outside their own profession participate in these momentous decisions affecting our destinies? Why the unwillingness to support even the "more moderate" legislative proposals? Why? Because, if they did, they fear that much of what is now being done would no longer be tolerated or permitted. And they have long since decided that they, and only they, are capable of determining what's good for us in this arena of life. We are not asked to participate; we are not wanted to participate; we are not permitted to participate.

The poet, artist, philosopher, and theologian are becoming convinced that the ethics that should control and circumscribe such uses, ethics born of a consciousness we believe capable of distinguishing between right and wrong, between dignity and obscenity, between compassion and cruelty? Are we naive to believe such an ethic exists?

***

What is now being done would no longer be tolerated or permitted. And they have long since decided that they, and only they, are capable of determining what's good for us in this arena of life. We are not asked to participate; we are not wanted to participate; we are not permitted to participate.

The poet, artist, philosopher, and theologian are becoming convinced that the ethics that should control and circumscribe such uses, ethics born of a consciousness we believe capable of distinguishing between right and wrong, between dignity and obscenity, between compassion and cruelty? Are we naive to believe such an ethic exists?

***

Nor are these voices of the poet, artist, philosopher, and theologian heard to any great extent protest the injustices being perpetrated on animals. So obsessed are we with our intellectual and scientific advances that our moral and spiritual values have become second place. Yet herein lies the irony. For one would suppose, or at least hope, that out of consciousness grows conscience; that out of understanding grows feeling; that out of awareness grows sensitivity; and out of wisdom grows compassion. Can we hope that it will ever be so?

***

Truly, we who are the exploiters of animals, even when such can be judged either necessary or appropriate, are under a burden of indebtedness which must indeed be redeemed with unstrained mercy and compassion, the giving of which benefits not only the animal recipients but us, the givers, as well, making us ever more human and, consequently, ever more human.
National Wildlife Refuges

Whereas National Wildlife Refuges were established primarily as natural sanctuaries to protect, preserve, and improve wildlife; and
Whereas The HSUS has worked since 1934 to increase the number of federal refuges; and
Whereas The HSUS has successfully supported legislation to establish new refuges; and
Whereas The HSUS has sought to influence federal policies governing the operation of refuges; and
Whereas The HSUS is committed to ensuring that refuges serve the needs of wildlife and their human neighbors; and

Hunting in Grand Teton National Park

Whereas national parks are areas to be preserved unimpaired for future generations; and
Whereas it is a fundamental precept of national parks that the wildlife of the area be permitted to live a natural existence within the park; and
Whereas hunting in Grand Teton National Park is permitted off of park property; and
Whereas hunting in the park creates an environment which promotes poaching of other animals, endangers species, and results in inhumane treatment of some animals; and
Whereas hunting is permitted to live a natural existence within the park; therefore be it

Nutrition Studies in Schools

Whereas thousands of so-called nutrition studies have already been conducted by secondary school students in which one animal is fed a healthy diet and another is fed junk food; and
Whereas these studies are carried out to the point that the test animal suffers serious weight loss and shows other visible signs of physical breakdown; and
Whereas these studies require no scientific or creative thought by students; and
Whereas students are encouraged to go through the motions of obtaining data that has been well-documented for decades; and

Kosher Slaughter

Whereas slaughtering livestock before ritual slaughter is still practiced; and
Whereas such method of pre-slaughter handling is inhumane and not part of ritual requirement; and
Whereas humane organizations have succeeded in developing a restraining pen where the animal can be slaughtered the ritual way, the making the slaughtering process unnecessary; and
Whereas the adoption and operation of this pen need the moral and financial support of the Jewish community; therefore be it

RESOLVED that this conference gives high commendation to The HSUS approach the National Conference of Christians and Jews to arrange a conference for the purposes of abolishing this cruel method of animal handling and replacing it with the restraining pen.
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Fox Speaks Before Varied Groups

In September of 1983, the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems (ISAP)'s director, Dr. Michael W. Fox, addressed members of the Pet Food Institute at their annual conference in Washington, D.C., on the need for better public education (especially via television and pet food commercials), responsible pet ownership, and understanding cats’ and dogs’ behavior and needs.

That month, Dr. Fox also attended the International Cat Show in Amsterdam, Holland, and gave an address to the European press. In October, he spoke at the Theological Society in Baltimore, Maryland, introducing the society to the concerns of the humane and animal rights movement.

In December, Dr. Fox gave a public address sponsored by the Monroe County Humane Society in Bloomington, Indiana, and spoke to the Theological Society in Baltimore, Maryland, introducing the society to the concerns of the humane and animal rights movement.

The project is designed to provide feedback on the effects of a curriculum-based approach to humane education as well as on factors that influence how children respond to humane education lessons.

Although an independent evaluation agency has been hired to design and oversee the project, the NAAHE staff has been directly involved in several aspects. NAAHE’s new research associate, Kathy Savsky, is serving as field coordinator for the project. The NAAHE staff has been actively involved in several aspects.

The project is designed to provide feedback on the effects of a curriculum-based approach to humane education as well as on factors that influence how children respond to humane education lessons.

During September and October, NAAHE launched the second phase of a two-year national humane education evaluation project. The project is designed to provide feedback on the effects of a curriculum-based approach to humane education as well as on factors that influence how children respond to humane education lessons.

The project is designed to provide feedback on the effects of a curriculum-based approach to humane education as well as on factors that influence how children respond to humane education lessons.

During September and October, NAAHE launched the second phase of a two-year national humane education evaluation project. The project is designed to provide feedback on the effects of a curriculum-based approach to humane education as well as on factors that influence how children respond to humane education lessons.

The project is designed to provide feedback on the effects of a curriculum-based approach to humane education as well as on factors that influence how children respond to humane education lessons.
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The Greenville action was a per­
fect example of HSUS and local police teamwork. According to newspa­
ner accounts, surveillance of the
farm had begun three months before
the raid. In January of 1983, HSUS
informants had told us that the
owner of the farm, a known dog­
 fighter, had moved into Bond Coun­
ty. We, in tum, passed this informa­
tion on to the police. Once the loca­
tion and timing of the fight had been
nailed down, the actual raid, involving
helicopters and SWAT teams, took
place without a hitch.

In October, yet another large­
scale operation in rural Mitchell
County, Georgia, netted fifty people
attending an early morning dog­
fight. These were the first arrests
made under a tough, new felony dog­
fight law in that state. This raid was
organized by the Georgia Bureau of
Investigations, with The HSUS,
Illinois state police and Bond County sheriff’s deputies arrest a number of people
found inside the farm building. The dogfight pit is in the foreground.

One of the pitiful casualties of the Green­
vilie raid, the losing dog awaits veteri­
inary attention. In shock and suffering
from serious injuries, the dog was eu­
thanatized.

An early October morning in Georgia found state Bureau of Investigation officers
handcuffing a number of people around the dogfight pit. One of the fighting dogs licks
its wounds in its corner of the ring.

HSUS Southeast Regional Director Marc Paulhus holds one of the dogs seized during
the Georgia raid.

The majority of those arrested
pled guilty or nolo contendre ("no
case") to the charges rather than
face jury trial. A Mitchell County
dogfighting magazine The Sporting
Dog Journal—were charged with
commercial gambling.

The needs of animal will continue
long after you are gone

Write in complete confidence to: Murdaugh Stuart Madden
Vice President/General Counsel, The Humane Society of the United States, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.
December 31, 1982

Statement of Assets and Liabilities

Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust Corpus 12/31/81</td>
<td>$1,240,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982 Income from Investments—Net</td>
<td>$116,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond against Den Defense of Tiere</td>
<td>$116,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU S. Societies for Protection of Animals, Dublin, Ireland</td>
<td>$116,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Tampa, Florida</td>
<td>$116,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humane Society of New York</td>
<td>$116,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,773,499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less: Distribution of 1981 Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant to assist in buying animals or &quot;other-use&quot;</td>
<td>$691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,267,364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Represented by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of New York</td>
<td>$26,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Interest Receivable Pension</td>
<td>$2,145,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income—Securities at Book Value</td>
<td>$2,145,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,145,853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balance 12/31/82

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,145,853</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants of 1982 Income to Organizations at Right</td>
<td>$116,342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizations Receiving Aid From Alice Morgan Wright—Edith Goode Fund Trust

Evidently, we can have it both ways. Despite the seemingly all-encompassing nature of the life-of-nature movement, reasonably intelligent reasons have been advanced to explain why certain animals must be killed. The argument is that man is the ultimate benefactor of the gunstock industry, and that the wildlife species must be thinned to keep the population under control. Human need is the motivating force. Unfortunately, the vast majority of the animals killed are not involved in the food chain at all. They are kept as pets; they are cherished as trophies; they are kept for scientific study; they are put on display. How can we justify the killing of these animals? The answer is, we cannot. But human beings have the ability to justify anything they want. And they will do so if they have the opportunity to do so. Therefore, the gunstock industry must be regulated. The only way to regulate the gunstock industry is to ban the use of guns. The ban on guns will stop the killing of animals. The ban on guns will save the lives of millions of animals. The ban on guns will bring peace to the world. The ban on guns will make us all better human beings.
and the Department of Agriculture (USDA) will write regulations necessary to implement this new law. The HSUS will be working both domestically and overseas to make sure that pets and pet owners will be well served.

Please write to Sen. Proxmire and Rep. Biaggi in thanks for their dedication to this issue.

Best Bet in the Senate

Legislation introduced by Sen. Robert Dole and Rep. James Oberstar of Minnesota to pass the Animal Welfare Act (AWA) is our best opportunity in the Senate to protect laboratory animals. Although hearings on S. 657 were held in July, the bill now languishes in the Senate Agriculture Committee. The full Senate cannot vote on it until it passes that committee.

The Dole bill is wider reaching than the Walgren amendments in the House. It would set stricter regulations to reduce pain and suffering during experimentation and discourage researchers from proposing painful experiments. It would require each research facility to have an animal-care committee whose members would include a veterinarian and another person responsible for animal-welfare concerns and not affiliated with the facility.

The only other legislation dealing with lab animals in the Senate is S. 964, introduced by Sens. Edward M. Kennedy and Orrin Hatch. The Kennedy/Hatch bill would effectively delay positive action on Senate animal-welfare bills. Due to slick political maneuvering there may be no time to hold committee hearings that are vital to this bill. The extension of alternative farming practices bill introduced by Sens. James Inouye of Hawaii, James Jeffords of Vermont, and Malcolm Wallop of Wyoming, is vital that your representatives have re-

Horses Lose Ground

Due to slick political maneuvering by Sens. Mark Hatfield of Oregon and Malcolm Wallop of Wyoming, U.S. animals are losing ground. Two bills aimed at improving the lives of lab animals removed from the ranges in the first place to bear the moral burden of condemning them to death.

S. 457 gives the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) three years to house, feed, and place thousands of wild horses and burros. The current BLM adopt-a-horse program would continue but, under S. 457, BLM would have new authority to sell the unsuitable animals to slaughterhouses.

The senators took an amendment to S. 457, a bill to remove “excess” wild horses and burros from public land, which would require the removal of 3,500 wild horses and burros from western ranges every year by an aircraft round-up. They would then be transported to local humane organizations which must either find a sponsor for the animals or allow them to be sold, mainly to slaughterhouses. The sponsoring organization is best sure that no one who wanted the animals removed from the ranges in the first place to bear the moral burden of condemning them to death.

S. 457 gives the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) three years to house, feed, and place thousands of wild horses and burros. The current BLM adopt-a-horse program would continue but, under S. 457, BLM would have new authority to sell the unsuitable animals to slaughterhouses.

In another amendment to S. 457, Sens. Wendell Ford of Kentucky and John Melcher of Montana tried to eliminate the language giving BLM the authority to sell horses directly to slaughterhouses. In another amendment to S. 457, Sens. Wendell Ford of Kentucky and James Oberstar of Minnesota, the bill’s original supporters, Reps. James Inouye of Hawaii, James Jeffords of Vermont, and Malcolm Wallop of Wyoming, tried to eliminate the language giving BLM the authority to sell horses directly to slaughterhouses.

In another amendment to S. 457, Sens. Wendell Ford of Kentucky and John Melcher of Montana tried to eliminate the language giving BLM the authority to sell horses directly to slaughterhouses. In another amendment to S. 457, Sens. Wendell Ford of Kentucky and James Oberstar of Minnesota, the bill’s original supporters, Reps. James Inouye of Hawaii, James Jeffords of Vermont, and Malcolm Wallop of Wyoming, tried to eliminate the language giving BLM the authority to sell horses directly to slaughterhouses.

In another amendment to S. 457, Sens. Wendell Ford of Kentucky and John Melcher of Montana tried to eliminate the language giving BLM the authority to sell horses directly to slaughterhouses. In another amendment to S. 457, Sens. Wendell Ford of Kentucky and James Oberstar of Minnesota, the bill’s original supporters, Reps. James Inouye of Hawaii, James Jeffords of Vermont, and Malcolm Wallop of Wyoming, tried to eliminate the language giving BLM the authority to sell horses directly to slaughterhouses.

In another amendment to S. 457, Sens. Wendell Ford of Kentucky and John Melcher of Montana tried to eliminate the language giving BLM the authority to sell horses directly to slaughterhouses. In another amendment to S. 457, Sens. Wendell Ford of Kentucky and James Oberstar of Minnesota, the bill’s original supporters, Reps. James Inouye of Hawaii, James Jeffords of Vermont, and Malcolm Wallop of Wyoming, tried to eliminate the language giving BLM the authority to sell horses directly to slaughterhouses.

In another amendment to S. 457, Sens. Wendell Ford of Kentucky and John Melcher of Montana tried to eliminate the language giving BLM the authority to sell horses directly to slaughterhouses. In another amendment to S. 457, Sens. Wendell Ford of Kentucky and James Oberstar of Minnesota, the bill’s original supporters, Reps. James Inouye of Hawaii, James Jeffords of Vermont, and Malcolm Wallop of Wyoming, tried to eliminate the language giving BLM the authority to sell horses directly to slaughterhouses.

In another amendment to S. 457, Sens. Wendell Ford of Kentucky and John Melcher of Montana tried to eliminate the language giving BLM the authority to sell horses directly to slaughterhouses. In another amendment to S. 457, Sens. Wendell Ford of Kentucky and James Oberstar of Minnesota, the bill’s original supporters, Reps. James Inouye of Hawaii, James Jeffords of Vermont, and Malcolm Wallop of Wyoming, tried to eliminate the language giving BLM the authority to sell horses directly to slaughterhouses.
ANIMALS
It’s their world, too. But you’d never know it.

Take a look around you at the animals sharing our planet. Newborn calves thrust into solitary confinement grow up without room even to turn around. Millions of kittens and puppies are condemned to death annually because their owners didn’t care enough. Seal pups are brutally clubbed for laboratory animals; and end the brutality of clubbing seals, trapping with steel-jaw leghold traps, and harpooning whales.

Already, we’re speaking out against senseless killing and cruelty toward animals, helping to eliminate inhumane commercial farming practices; improve conditions for laboratory animals; and end the brutality and investigation techniques; exotic animals as pets; and investigation of roadside menageries. At the same conference, HSUS Director Anna Pennine was honored for her many years of service to the North Carolina Humane Federation. The program attracted sixty participants.

Director Paulhus also led a one-day workshop on investigations at a two-week-long animal-control seminar in Panama City, Florida, in November. The Bay County Humane Society sponsored the session, which drew participants from as far away as Arizona and Puerto Rico.

I want to join The Humane Society of the United States and help protect animals.

Membership categories:
- Individual Membership—$10
- Family Membership—$18
- Donor—$25
- Support—$50
- Sustaining—$100
- Sponsor—$500
- Patron—$1,000 or more

I am enclosing an additional contribution of $__________ to assist The HSUS.

Name ________________________________
Address ________________________________
City ___________________________ State: ___ Zip: ________

Membership includes a year’s subscription to The HSUS News and periodic Close-Up Reports.
Make checks payable to: The Humane Society of the United States, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20037

Gifts to The HSUS are tax-deductible.

Southeast

Great Lakes

Fall Round-up
The Great Lakes office has worked hard this autumn to repeal pound seizure in Chicago. Dr. John McArdle, HSUS director of laboratory animal welfare, presented testimony on the proposal at a hearing in September; we are now waiting for a report from a subcommittee assigned to study the issue further. We urge Chicagoans to contact the Great Lakes Regional Office (755 Haskins Street, Bowling Green, OH 43402) if they can help with our efforts to pass this ordinance. Please write to all your local aldermen, as well, to express your feelings on this very important legislation for Chicago and its pets.

No Dogs Allowed?
Rep. Michael Schwarzwald of Ohio is sponsoring S.B. 397 which, if passed, will allow humane society shelters and dog wardens to obtain sodium pentobarbital for humane euthanasia more easily and cheaply than in the past. The HSUS supports this measure.

Speaking Up
Great Lakes Regional Director Sandy Rowland was one of the speakers at a very successful workshop sponsored by the Michigan Federation of Humane Societies on November 10. Ms. Rowland discussed how to organize a new humane society and resolve problems facing existing organizations. Approximately 135 persons gathered at the Eastern Michigan University to learn about animal welfare in the state and strategies for change.

Southeast

Southern Seminars
The North Carolina Humane Federation held its annual conference in Asheboro on November 11 and 12. Southeast Regional Director Marc Paulhus conducted three workshops at that meeting, on dogfighting and cockfighting investigative techniques; exotic animals as pets; and investigation of roadside menageries. At the same conference, HSUS Director Anna Pennine was honored for her many years of service to the North Carolina Humane Federation. The program attracted sixty participants.

Director Paulhus also led a one-day workshop on investigations at a two-week-long animal-control seminar in Panama City, Florida, in November. The Bay County Humane Society sponsored the session, which drew participants from as far away as Arizona and Puerto Rico.

Great Lakes

Spring Workshop in Connecticut
A session of The HSUS’s popular workshop, “Solving Animal Problems in Your Community,” will be co-sponsored by the HSUS Mid-Atlantic and New England offices in Mystic, Connecticut, from April 26 through 28. Phyllis Wright, HSUS vice president, companion animals, Bill Smith, director of the HSUS Animal Control Academy, and other experts will lead informative and practical sessions to help participants increase their skills in dealing with community animal problems. Contact the HSUS New England Regional Office, P.O. Box 362, East Haddam, CT 06423 for details.
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Into the Jaws
For the first time, supporters of a ban against the steel-jawed, leghold trap took their cause directly to the major manufacturer of traps in the U.S. In an action organized by Trans-Species Unlimited, approximately 500 demonstrators marched down Main Street in Lititz, Pennsylvania, to the headquarters of the Woodstream Company. Trappers jeered as the protesters, many of whom were HSUS members who had traveled for hours to attend, marched to the gates. Then, in spite of the heckling, protesters listened tentatively to speakers, including HSUS Vice President for Wildlife and the Environment John Hancock, who condemned the trap as inhumane.

New Pet Law
Part of New York
New York City Mayor Ed Koch has signed into law a bill which permits tenants to keep pets in apartments. The bill protects tenants from later, arbitrary enforcement of “no pets” clauses landlords haven't enforced within a lease's first three months. Under the new law, landlords can disallow any pet which causes damage, is dangerous to other tenants, or is a nuisance. Regional Director Nina Austenberg wrote Mayor Koch of HSUS support for this bill, calling it a prototype of pet-owning tenant legislation for other communities.

Gulf States
Red-faced in Runge
In the midst of sweltering September heat, Gulf States investigators discovered in pens and yards of urgently needed reforms to the Spring 1983 HSUS News. Mr. Sakach suggested a number of urgently needed reforms to town officials, who now report the construction of a new, properly equipped city animal shelter, the hiring of a full-time animal-control officer to care for impounded dogs, and the retaining of a veterinarian to perform euthanasia as needed.

A victim of the summer heat, this cow died from dehydration, according to the attending veterinarian’s statement, on a Texas ranch. The owner later pled guilty to charges of animal abuse.

Western Academy
The HSUS Animal Control Academy will hold a two-week training session in Portland, Oregon, from February 27 to March 9, 1984, for animal-control and humane society personnel. Contact the West Coast Regional Office (1713 J Street, Suite 305, Sacramento, CA 95814) for details.
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Adoption Dilemma

In 1983, at least two local societies operating shelters were sued or threatened with a particularly distressing legal action by former owners of dogs brought to the shelters as strays, held by the society for the requisite period, and adopted by a new owner. In both cases, the old owner demanded that the dog be returned, and the issue of whether to reveal the identity of the new owner immediately arose.

These cases have a great potential for disrupting the adoption process, the time and energies of society officers into defending suits. There are a few steps a shelter-operating society can take to protect itself in these cases, assuming that the society's position is that adoptions of stray animals ought to be final and the new owner's identity and privacy protected.

1. A shelter should review its internal procedures to ensure that it is complying with the law mandating that animals be held for a certain period before being adopted or euthanized. A record-keeping system which identifies each animal received and the time and energy of society officers into defending suits. There are a few steps a shelter-operating society can take to protect itself in these cases, assuming that the society's position is that adoptions of stray animals ought to be final and the new owner's identity and privacy protected.

2. Examine the local statute or ordinance under which you receive strays and animals picked up off the street by your society for the requisite period, and adopt them.

3. The best solution for a shelter-operating society is to explain the circumstances to the person who appears to claim his animal shortly after its new adoption is to explain the circumstances to the new owner and ask for the animal's return.

Liability Insurance Coverage

Liability insurance coverage is more likely to be sued for such torts as libel, slander, malicious prosecution, false arrest, intentional interference with property, and invasion of privacy than are other kinds of nonprofit, charitable corporations. Humane societies have a great potential for disrupting the adoption process, the time and energies of society officers into defending suits. There are a few steps a shelter-operating society can take to protect itself in these cases, assuming that the society's position is that adoptions of stray animals ought to be final and the new owner's identity and privacy protected.

1. Obtain and read (or, better yet, have an attorney read) the actual text of the policy or contract of insurance. Do not stop with assurances of coverage which should be carefully weighed.

2. Consider the purchase of liability insurance, which will effectively protect their organization, and its directors, officers, and employees in the face of lawsuits. Such insurance is commonly available, but the exact policy must be chosen carefully.

We suggest the following when considering the purchase of liability insurance. First, animals often seek liability insurance, which will effectively protect their organization, and its directors, officers, and employees in the face of lawsuits. Such insurance is commonly available, but the exact policy must be chosen carefully.

3. Consider the purchase of liability insurance, which will effectively protect their organization, and its directors, officers, and employees in the face of lawsuits.

4. The best solution for a shelter-operating society is to explain the circumstances to the person who appears to claim his animal shortly after its new adoption is to explain the circumstances to the new owner and ask for the animal's return.

5. Liaising with barbed-wire fences, the leghold trap and Mass Extermination Programs

The only beneficiaries of trapping and mass extermination programs are the fur industry and wildlife management bureaucrats. No industry, agency, or individual has the right to conduct the kind of wholesale, premeditated extermination of animals that the so-called "humanely" killed by being stomped and clubbed to death. The HSUS is a major sponsor of the Mobilization for Animals' action against trapping and mass extermination, to be held simultaneously in Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles on April 7, and its action against psychological testing, which will include a massive, international gathering at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association in Toronto, Canada, on August 24-26. We urge HSUS members to participate in these protests against animal exploitation and abuse.

Mobilization Against Trapping and Mass Extermination August 24-26, 1984

The HSUS is a major sponsor of the Mobilization for Animals' action against trapping and mass extermination, to be held simultaneously in Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles on April 7, and its action against psychological testing, which will include a massive, international gathering at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association in Toronto, Canada, on August 24-26. We urge HSUS members to participate in these protests against animal exploitation and abuse.

With federal tax dollars, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is conducting a relentless war on wildlife in which untold millions of animals are needlessly and indiscriminately slaughtered. At the same time, the attitudes of this agency and a lack of legislation have permitted the continued use of the steel-jawed, leghold trap, a barbaric device that has been banned in dozens of countries.

Mobilization for Animals are a few steps a shelter-operating society can take to protect itself in these cases, assuming that the society's position is that adoptions of stray animals ought to be final and the new owner's identity and privacy protected.

Mobilization Against Trapping and Mass Extermination and Psychology Experiments August 24-26, 1984

The best solution for a shelter-operating society is to explain the circumstances to the person who appears to claim his animal shortly after its new adoption is to explain the circumstances to the new owner and ask for the animal's return.
Make Your Plans for Seal Day 1984!

March 1 is the traditional beginning of the season when harp seals come in from the seas and give birth to their white pups. For the past three years, on March 1 The HSUS and dedicated individuals throughout the country have joined together in celebration of this new generation of seals and all seals suffering at the hands of man.

This year, March 1 is particularly important because we will be working on a very special project—promoting the development of a new international treaty that will protect rather than exploit the northern fur seal on the Pribilof Islands, off Alaska. Now is our chance to end the commercial and political exploitation of these seals, but we need your help.

Ever since 1911, the Soviet Union, Japan, Canada, and the United States have conducted commercial fur seal “harvesting” under the Interim Convention on Conservation of North Pacific Fur Seals. The U.S. government pays the Aleut Indians who live on the Pribilofs to kill the seals. The skins are then divided among the signatory countries. This original treaty was designed to prevent pelagic sealing as well as control the amount of seal clubbing on the Pribilofs. However, it has not worked.

The North Pacific fur seal population has been rapidly declining by eight to ten percent each year.

This treaty expires October 1, 1984. It must be renegotiated this year. Now is our chance to pressure our senators to support a treaty which would protect seal interests, rather than commercial ones.

Here in Washington, D.C., The HSUS will host a special Seal Day reception in Congress for the senators and their aides. HSUS Krutch medalist Paul Winter will be our special musical guest, and we will distribute materials depicting the annual slaughter that occurs on the remote Pribilofs.

To publicize our need for a new treaty, ask your city officials to declare March 1 “Seal Day.” Hold candlelight vigils, bell-ringing events, and peaceful, friendly demonstrations at your senators’ offices. Ask your senators to work for and support a treaty to protect seals, not exploit them. And, be sure to distribute HSUS fact sheets on seals and our “Club Sandwiches Not Seals” T-shirts.

The HSUS is currently preparing an action packet which we will send you at no charge. It contains reproducible fact sheets and the successful HSUS 1981 resolution adopted by Congress making March 1 the official National Day of the Seal. Remember to contact HSUS regional offices to let them know you’re interested in taking part in whatever activities are already planned and to fill them in on your projects.

This can be our year to end the killing of Pribilof seals. With our coast-to-coast energy, that dream just might come true!