A Dim But Certain Light

One of the most tragic and awesome responsibilities accepted by the vast majority of animal-sHELTERing facilities throughout the length and breadth of this country is that of euthanasia. Unlike those few "no kill" facilities that are motivated by a concern and compassion for homeless animals, those who endure the burdensome and thankless task of euthanasia go the second mile in extending mercy to those animals no one wants or will accept. Except for their forbearance during the past many years, the enormous suffering of these victims of human irresponsibility and greed would have been much greater, and the number of unwanted animals roaming county laxes and city streets or permanently confined in sheltering cells would have been overwhelming.

But euthanasia has never been the answer to the enormous overpopulation of unwanted animal problems—not will or should it ever be. Rather, it has been at best a remedial stopgap while a permanent cure was being developed and administered, a cure which is slowly but surely beginning to take effect.

During the past several years, The HSUS has aggressively promoted the three-fold concept of legislation, education, and sterilization (LES) as the most effective cure available for eradicating the unwanted animal problem and has vigorously insisted that any animal-welfare organization worthy of the name must make this emphasis a number one priority.

Elsewhere in this edition of The Humane Society News you will read the very positive and encouraging statistics resulting from a conscientious commitment to this program in numerous cities and counties throughout the United States. And, though the final numbers are not yet compiled and analyzed, it is clear that a major step has been taken toward reducing the pain and suffering that otherwise would have been experienced and that the light at the end of the tunnel, though indeed still dim, is nonetheless certain.

While these results are surely cause for rejoicing, they are not cause for complacency, for not enough animal-welfare societies have made LES a major priority; not enough veterinarians have joined wholeheartedly in this endeavor; not enough communities have embraced effective animal-control programs; not enough "puppy mills" have been eliminated; and not enough pet owners have become responsible pet owners. When all of these shall have changed for the better, then the dim but certain light shall surely become a beacon.
The top ten cat names were Pepper, Brandy, Lady, Bear, Rocky, Sam/Samantha, Misty, Sheba, Bandit, and Smokey.

We consulted with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources and provided help and assistance to defray the cost of feeding. The HSUS does not always think artificial feeding is the best way to handle wildlife problems. Feeding maintains numbers of animals at a higher level than the habitat can support, and wild animals often have trouble recognizing and digesting foods other than their natural ones. However, we believe each situation should be evaluated individually and, in some cases, such as these, feeding is clearly appropriate. We’re happy that many animals made it through the winter due in part to our contribution.

Help come too late for this starving antelope. Many other animals have been helped through HSUS assistance to local groups feeding wildlife hit hard by this winter’s extreme weather.

Feeding Starving Animals

This winter has not been an easy one for wildlife. In December, pronghorn antelope in Wyoming following their usual migration path to their winter feeding grounds were stopped by a thirty-two-mile fence erected by a local rancher. Millions of television viewers saw news footage of confused and frightened antelope running back and forth in front of the fence, trying unsuccessfully to jump over it. The HSUS as an organization demanded that the fence be taken down, as did many of our members individually. Wyoming Governor Ed Horschler and a host of federal officials responded to public pressure and finally convinced the rancher to let the state take down sections of the fence so the pronghorns could get through.

In Florida, endangered brown pelicans were starving because the unusually cold weather made their food hard to find. The HSUS sent funds to a group in Florida that fed the animals to get them through the critical period. In Utah, the unusually cold winter and deep snow were taking their toll on deer and elk. Many of you saw a national news report on this situation in early January.

The top ten dog names were Sam/Samantha, Rocky, Princes, Patches, Muffin/Muffy, Smokey, Fluffy, and Tom. While 1982’s top cat name, Kitty, only slipped to number two, the top dog name, Max, dropped to fourteenth. Other more creative names reported among the animals given up for adoption were Foggly Bottom, Taj Mahal, February 14, Piffle, Malley, and Dangar Red River. Now, if only their former owners had used some of that creativity to come up with ways to keep their pets rather than unloading them at the animal shelter.

Pet Win

Results are in for the 1983 Dog Writers’ Association of America annual writing awards and, once again, The HSUS News has received a top award. Former staff writer Julie Rovner’s Spring 1983 article “Do Tenants Fear a Petless Future?” won first place in the category of best single article in a special-interest magazine. This is the second year in a row a News article has received this award.

Feeding Starving Animals

This winter has not been an easy one for wildlife. In December, pronghorn antelope in Wyoming following their usual migration path to their winter feeding grounds were stopped by a thirty-two-mile fence erected by a local rancher. Millions of television viewers saw news footage of confused and frightened antelope running back and forth in front of the fence, trying unsuccessfully to jump over it. The HSUS as an organization demanded that the fence be taken down, as did many of our members individually. Wyoming Governor Ed Horschler and a host of federal officials responded to public pressure and finally convinced the rancher to let the state take down sections of the fence so the pronghorns could get through.

In Florida, endangered brown pelicans were starving because the unusually cold weather made their food hard to find. The HSUS sent funds to a group in Florida that fed the animals to get them through the critical period. In Utah, the unusually cold winter and deep snow were taking their toll on deer and elk. Many of you saw a national news report on this situation in early January.

The top ten cat names were Sam/Samantha, Kitty, Tiger, Boots, Princess, Patches, Muffin/Muffy, Smokey, Fluffy, and Tom. While 1982’s top cat name, Kitty, only slipped to number two, the top dog name, Max, dropped to fourteenth. Other more creative names reported among the animals given up for adoption were Foggly Bottom, Taj Mahal, February 14, Piffle, Malley, and Dangar Red River. Now, if only their former owners had used some of that creativity to come up with ways to keep their pets rather than unloading them at the animal shelter.

Pet Win

Results are in for the 1983 Dog Writers’ Association of America annual writing awards and, once again, The HSUS News has received a top award. Former staff writer Julie Rovner’s Spring 1983 article “Do Tenants Fear a Petless Future?” won first place in the category of best single article in a special-interest magazine. This is the second year in a row a News article has received this award.

Feeding Starving Animals

This winter has not been an easy one for wildlife. In December, pronghorn antelope in Wyoming following their usual migration path to their winter feeding grounds were stopped by a thirty-two-mile fence erected by a local rancher. Millions of television viewers saw news footage of confused and frightened antelope running back and forth in front of the fence, trying unsuccessfully to jump over it. The HSUS as an organization demanded that the fence be taken down, as did many of our members individually. Wyoming Governor Ed Horschler and a host of federal officials responded to public pressure and finally convinced the rancher to let the state take down sections of the fence so the pronghorns could get through.

In Florida, endangered brown pelicans were starving because the unusually cold weather made their food hard to find. The HSUS sent funds to a group in Florida that fed the animals to get them through the critical period. In Utah, the unusually cold winter and deep snow were taking their toll on deer and elk. Many of you saw a national news report on this situation in early January.
One-third fewer animals are currently being handled in surveyed U.S. animal shelters as compared to late 1971 and early 1972, according to a recent HSUS survey. This fact appears to confirm the significance of increased animal legislation, education, and sterilization as a means of reducing the number of unwanted animals. 

The HSUS mailed 3,225 surveys in July of 1983 to societies and animal-control agencies on its mailing list and to agencies in selected cities with a population of 25,000 or more. Of 684 surveys returned, 51 groups provided data that could be compared with responses to a similar but less comprehensive 1972 HSUS survey. Of the 51, groups handling over 1,000 animals annually (The HSUS estimates that there are approximately 1,800 in the U.S.) provided the most complete information about local human and animal populations, sterilization programs, number and age groups of sheltered animals, euthanasia methods, budgets, and licensing programs. Smaller shelters, while no less important to communities, were excluded from the analysis for this reason.

Several factors besides LES also have influenced the decline in the number of animals handled by shelters. Survey returns suggest that the number of shelters in the U.S. has increased since 1972. This has, however, spread among more organizations the animals being handled in any one community. An unrelated study shows that the total number of households owning dogs or cats has declined (the demand for pet dogs decreasing and demand for pet cats increasing) over the past decade. Perhaps, too, as the public has learned more about the fates of sheltered animals—some must be euthanized; others may be sold for research—pet owners have declined to relinquish their animals to shelters. Nonetheless, the hard data points to the conclusion that shelters are more successful than ever before in coping with pet overpopulation and irresponsible pet owners with the help of the LES plan.

Positive as these findings are, one grim reality remains for many sheltered animals: there has been little positive change in the percent of animals that must be euthanized because responsible, loving, lastingly homes cannot be found for them within an acceptable time period. In fact, 34 of the 51 shelters responding to the HSUS survey indicated that, overall, in late 1971 and early 1972, these organizations euthanized 63.57 percent of the dogs handled. By 1982, that figure had risen to 69.02 percent, more than a 4 percent increase. Thirty-six shelters responded that, in 1972, 69.83 percent of cats handled were humanely euthanatized; the figure grew to 62.35 percent in 1982. Much has been accomplished, but there is an ever greater need for The HSUS’s LES blueprint for reducing pet overpopulation.

Our experience has shown that only a small percentage of animals in shelters can be placed in responsible, loving homes. Therefore, The HSUS does not advocate high adoption rates but, rather, high adoption standards. Lax adoption procedures cause further animal suffering when new but unfit pet owners abuse, abandon, or give away pets. According to the 28 groups reporting adoption data for both the 1972 and 1983 surveys, the number of dogs adopted from shelters decreased by 1.74 percent during the decade. Cat adoptions increased by 0.91 percent during the same period—a slim gain. More dogs than ever were reclaimed by their owners between late 1971 and 1982. There was no detectable change in the number of reclaimed cats.

With fewer dogs now handled by shelters, more of them euthanized, fewer adopted out, and more than ever reclaimed, it seems there are fewer unwanted, stray dogs. This is good news, but there are still too many homeless dogs. Cats suffer even more by comparison, and according to HSUS Director of Accredita-
Improving Things in Paradise

Strict leash laws, recently enacted, are designed to control dog populations in Hawaii. Educating our society on the benefits of spay/neuter programs is a crucial step in reducing animal problems in the islands.

Ms. Morris, a volunteer at the Hawaiian Humane Society, is involved in a spay/neuter program that includes education and legislation. She emphasizes the importance of spay/neuter programs, which have led to a significant decrease in the number of animals requiring shelter care. In 1982, the number of animals euthanized was down by 20%, and the number of animals released from the shelter increased by 200%.

According to Ms. Morris, education is key to the success of spay/neuter programs. She believes that educating the public about the benefits of spay/neuter can lead to a decrease in animal overpopulation. She credits the Hawaiian Humane Society's education program with leading to a decrease in animal overpopulation.

In conclusion, the Hawaiian Humane Society's education program has led to a decrease in animal overpopulation. The society's success is attributed to its education program, which focuses on spay/neuter and responsible pet ownership.

Halloween weekend at the Hawaiian Humane Society. The message is black cats aren't bad luck.

Hawaiian Humane volunteers during Adopt-a-Cat Month.
Fewer animals are adopted in Charlotte, there were 780 dogs adopted in 1982, for example, as opposed to 3,086 in 1972. Careful screening of potential adopters means adopted animals are less likely to bounce back to a shelter later, or worse, be abandoned or abused.

"Stray and unwanted animals create a costly control problem that continues to escalate at an enormous rate," says Ms. Quisenberry. "Although sterilization is available today, not enough pet owners choose to have their animals spayed or neutered because of the cost of the surgery and the lack of education regarding the results of animal overpopulation... The need for reduction in growth of the animal population and the escalating cost of animal control activities warrants the involvement of local government."

The Calhoun Humane Society (64 S. Edison, Battle Creek, MI 49017) oversees animal problems in a predominantly rural area that includes the city of Battle Creek. The area's population has grown by over 41,000 over the past ten years. Although the animal population is difficult to estimate because of the area's rural nature, former director Shirley D. Hilk provided impressive humane society statistics for 1982 compared to those in 1972: the number of sheltered dogs has decreased by nearly 4,000 in ten years, the number of sheltered cats nearly halved. Someone is doing something right in Calhoun County. Shelter Manager Mike Pearson said the society gains its best results from educating shelter visitors about the need for spay/neuter surgeries before they leave the premises. He said the society operates the only shelter in the entire county, and the group assists low-income pet owners with spay/neuter fees on a case-by-case basis, sometimes paying for the entire operation.

The group's volunteers handle an education program. Once a cat or dog has been adopted, the society requires that a new owner have it altered. They also stress that an animal is an adult, and, otherwise, within two months after it is six months old. The society lacks a spay/neuter ordinance. Battle Creek has differential dog licensing; Calhoun County does not differentiate, and cats don't have to be licensed.

"Reduction" seems to be a household word at the Dane County Humane Society, Inc. (2250 Pennsylvania Ave., Madison, WI 53704). The number of sheltered dogs and cats, animal adoptions, and euthanasia declined considerably over the past ten to eleven years, according to survey responses from 1972 and 1983. At the same time, the community's population rose by 60,000.

In 1982, 3,265 fewer dogs were sheltered than in 1972, and nearly 2,000 fewer cats were handled as well. The society requires sterilization of animals released from its shelter, and community veterinarians provide spay/neuter services for reduced fees. The humane society has not released animals for research since 1981. Cats and dogs must have a license and rabies vaccine in the city of Madison, where there are differential license fees. Outside of Madison, where the county is checkered with farming communities, cat licensing and vaccination are not county requirements. Some towns have newly enacted leash laws.

Deborah Blackburn, humane educator, began the society's humane education program six years ago. She's assisted by another part-time staff member, and, together, the pair reached 20,000 children in 1983, as opposed to only 4,000 in the program's first year. To date, 20 towns have newly enacted cat ordinances, the educators stress wildlife needs as well.

Ms. Blackburn is extremely enthusiastic about the education program and believes that it is largely responsible for the reduction in number of animals handled. "The humane society's community image has improved as a result of our education program," she says. "Everyone who walks in our front door gets educated." The media have been very supportive, providing newspaper coverage as well as public service announcements. Every Monday, a local television channel airs the humane society's show live. Several years ago, the society's membership rolls began to drop, Ms. Blackburn says. New efforts to promote membership have worked: now it is steadily growing. The staff concentrates on long-range planning, and the board of directors is becoming more progressive. The shelter will soon be remodeled.

Replied to by Phyllis Wright, HSUS vice president of companion animals, "There is a lot each citizen can do to reduce pet overpopulation and its accompanying miseries. Through its survey, The HSUS reconfirmed that the LES blueprint—legislation, education, sterilization—does help reduce the number of unwanted, stray animals. Citizens can directly influence animal legislation, and, remember, responsible pet owners are educated pet owners. You and LES can determine whether or not animals continue to suffer.

A complete summary and analysis of the HSUS surveys will be available in several months. Questions or concerns can be answered by the Companion Animals Department, The HSUS, 2100 L St., N.W., Washington, DC 20037; telephone, (202) 452-1100.

Deborah Reed is editor of Shelter Sense, published by The HSUS.
by Deborah Salem

**THE CURIOUS WORLD OF KRUMEICH'S CATS**

“Peaches and Cream” were on one of the first collector’s plates done for the Anna Perenna company.

Cats—cats pensive, placid, per­plexed, stoic, striped, spotted, and calicoed—crowd the world of painter Thaddeus (“Uncle Tad”) Krumeich. And, to the delight of all of us at The HSUS, we are able to introduce our members and friends to his work through a set of note cards now available (see the front cover and inside back cover of this issue). Mr. Krumeich’s cats flourish not only in his note cards and paintings but also on collector’s plates, prints, and greeting cards. There is a glori­ous, slightly old-fashioned world where every window and china cabinet is filled with antique toys, blooming houseplants, Delft pitchers, tin tea can­nisters, cut flowers, and ripe, fresh fruit.

Mr. Krumeich, who paints from life (and only rarely from photographs) twelve hours a day, seven days a week, has definite ideas about why a particular cat appeals to him. “It is the personality and the coloring that catch my eye first,” he observes. People familiar with his work often send him pictures of their cats, but, for local inspiration, he relies on his own two shelter orphans, Smokey and Frankie, and a varied assortment of neighbor cats. “One woman has sent me a new photograph of her cat every other month—or so it seems,” the artist laughs. “The last one arrived with the cat wearing a hat—what patience it has!”

Born in New York City, Mr. Krumeich spent his early years sum­mering in Southampton, New York, where he now makes his home. He started drawing at an early age and helped to design his high school newspaper. After stints at New York University and in the Navy, he returned to civilian life working at a New York advertising agency. He then returned to NYU and taught art courses to help with his college expenses. (He later earned a masters degree at Columbia University.) Teaching art turned into practicing art; he undertook commissions for commercial publications such as *The Rooter’s Digest, Family Circle,* and *Women’s Day* and, then, went to work for the children’s textbook publisher Silver Burdett in Morris­town, New Jersey. There he dis­covered his talent for portraying dogs, cats, and other animals. He saw the demand for his trompe l’oeil (or “eye-fooling”) primitive style in­crease until, in 1975, he settled per­manently in Southampton, gave up commercial painting, and concen­trated exclusively on his own work. Exhibits in New York and California and contacts with local artists brought him to the attention of a collector’s plate manufacturer, Klaus Vogt, of Anna Perenna. For that company, Mr. Krumeich decided to create a series of beautiful, limited-edition collector’s plates featuring different—and very indi­vidual—cats. These proved to be tremendously popular with collec­tors and cat fanciers alike, who didn’t seem to mind whether the cat subject was purebred or mixed breed, tabby or butterscotch. Every plate and every painting has a very per­sonal title, and, although most of the cats have dignified names like Dudley, Henry, Julius, Basil, Stan­ley, Oliver, and Walter, an occasional Pepper or Marmalade sneaks in as well. That first successful plate four­some was followed by another, “Uncle Tad’s Seasoned Kittens,” and a third series, of musical cats this time, is to come.

Mr. Krumeich has found cats such successful subjects, he thinks, be­cause “cats are so mystical. You never know quite what they are thinking.” His “are not cat por­traits, as such, but paintings in which the cat plays an important role.” Although he grew up with bulldogs and Labrador retrievers as children, he finds dogs less satisfactory to his audience because dog fanciers identify so strongly with a particular breed. There is less universal acceptance of a toy poodle, for example, among other breed ad­vocates, and this limits the potential audience for the artist’s works.

Every one of his creations reflects Mr. Krumeich’s meticulous fascina­tion with the beauty of small house­hold objects. Although he is often at work on six paintings at a time (“Sometimes your creative energy flows in one direction rather than another or involves one color rather than another”), he is always on the lookout for authentic touches that make his artistic conceptions so appealing. He prowls antique shops and flea markets for additions to his collection of antique trains, boats, and wind-up toys, and once bought home a perfect bit of lace he found on a daily in an Indiana restaurant. (It later surfaced in one of his paint­ings.) “My paintings are like memo­ries—or the distilled essence of an experience,” the artist explains. Even the cats seem other worldly—Cheshire cats, critics have called them—since they look as though they could disappear from their creator’s carefully constructed scene at any moment, perhaps to reappear in another one.

His passion for electric trains and an interest in gardening and travel aside, Mr. Krumeich donates his talents to his local humane society, UNICEF, and now, to The HSUS. His future holds plans for an art show in Carmel, California, next year, a series of jungle paintings, and a set of figurines, in addition to the musical cat plates.

Although the audiences for his plates and his paintings differ, believes Mr. Krumeich, they share in common a desire to enter the small, brilliantly colored, self-con­tained world captured by the artist’s eye.

We are sure that The HSUS’s members will want to join them.
Twentieth Century Cruelty Leads to Twentieth Century Cruelty

In the 1860s, when the first humane societies were founded in the United States, the pathetic spectacle of cart and carriage horses dying in their traces on city streets was a common one. One hundred and twenty years later, horses are still dying in city streets, victims of the "picturesque" carriage trade in American cities as far-flung as Chicago, New York, New Orleans, and San Antonio. In these and other cities, as few as 3 and as many as 120 horses pull carriages filled with visitors from tourist attraction to attraction. Every day, they must compete with urban noise, traffic congestion, fumes, and driver recklessness. They are, on occasion, overloaded, struck by cars, stabled in hot, filthy quarters, and killed by beatings or other maladies.

Over the last four years, the plight of carriage horses has repeatedly made the news headlines. In 1980, during a July heat wave in New Orleans, two horses owned by La Petite Carriage Tours died on the street, in separate incidents, in view of hundreds of spectators. The owner of La Petite Tours, Louis Hufnaghetti, had been arrested twice earlier in the year and charged with health code violations at his stable and cruelty to animals. Local animal protectionists had asked for and received—help from the HSUS in prosecuting Mr. Hufnaghetti even before his arrests. After them, Marc Paulthen, as an HSUS field investigator, flew to New Orleans to testify in favor of a complete ban on carriage horses in the crowded French Quarter of the city, and HSUS President John Hoyt sent a strongly worded letter to members of the New Orleans city council in support of our position. Mr. Hufnaghetti died suddenly and the city council, believing that the carriage trade was part of the old world charm of the French Quarter and a considerable tourist attraction, decided to allow the other two New Orleans carriage horse operators to stay in business. Some changes were made. The number of carriage horse permits was cut from twenty-five to fourteen, and more stringent guidelines for working conditions for the horses were instituted. Humane officials were particularly concerned about the animals during periods of extreme heat, which often coincide with peak tourist seasons. In New Orleans, more rest periods, drinking fountains, and horse inspections were added as safeguards.

In New York City, where 120 horses clog the streets, four horses died in three weeks in a mid-summer heat wave in 1982. These highly publicized incidents spurred passage of New York carriage horse regulations that same summer. No horse could work more than ten hours a day and carriage trade was prohibited in hot and humid weather. There were no heat-related incidents in 1983, even though the summer was a hot one in New York. The ASPCA’s Elinor Frankenberg attributes the good record in part to that organization’s enforcement of the hot weather ban: “Our inspectors would keep track of the temperature and tell the drivers when to come in.” HSUS board member and New York City resident Regina Bauer Frankenberg is supporting a bill to limit carriage horse work only in extreme heat, which often coincide with peak tourist seasons. In New Orleans, more rest periods, drinking fountains, and horse inspections were added as safeguards.

In Chicago, where 60 horses operate in a five-square-mile area near the “Gold Coast,” Executive Director of Animal Care and Control Frankenberg is supporting a proposal for new carriage horse operations for their city. After considering the HSUS opposition, Corpus Christi city council members decided not to approve carriage horse operations for their city.

A carriage horse suffering from azoturia collapses on the streets of San Antonio. It was later destroyed.

Horse under extreme heat was fatal to this New York carriage horse in 1982.

Some conducted an investigation of the horse trade in New Orleans during a heat wave, looking into the problems to city officials. In the evening, even with lights, and are a traffic hazard.

- Waste from the horses causes sanitation problems that cannot be eliminated by diaper bags or other ludicrous solutions.
- Insufficient water facilities make working horses in the hot months hazardous to their well-being.
- Finally, the overloading of carriages, the potential for driver abuse, and the hours on hot, hard pavement in slippery steel shoes make the life of a carriage horse a misery.

For all of these reasons, the HSUS opposes the establishment of carriage horse businesses in urban environments everywhere. Even setting minimum standards, such as those in New Orleans, cannot eliminate all potential dangers to horses that must struggle day after day in bumper-to-bumper traffic. When the city of Corpus Christi, Texas, was considering adding carriage horses to its tourist attractions, Mr. Meade sent a letter outlining the problems to city officials. In a second letter, he reiterated HSUS opposition to all carriage horse operations but did offer a list of minimum standards that should be adopted as legal requirements should the city insist on allowing them. Among them: a four-person maximum of horse power operation from 12 noon to 7 p.m. when the temperature exceeds 80°; a ten-minute rest period during peak rush hours of 7 a.m. to 10 a.m. and 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.; one week of recuperation for every two weeks worked for each horse; a maximum of four hours of work a day; properly fitted rubber shoes on every horse; drivers experienced in livestock handling and driving; dumping the water available to horses at their passenger pick-up point and the midpoint of their route as a measure of emergency veterinary treatment; a four-person maximum in any carriage at one time; a ten-minute rest period after every hour of use; proper standards for all stabling facilities; only use of horses in good health and a proper weight.

After considering the HSUS opposition, Corpus Christi city council members decided not to approve carriage horse operations for their city.

In Chicago, where 60 carriage horses operate in a five-square-mile area near the “Gold Coast,” Executive Director of Animal Care and Control Peter Poholik has been trying to formulate an ordinance specifically addressing the carriage horse trade for all of the city. This opposition to the HSUS, which is supported by the HSUS, contains specific requirements for maximum hours worked in a day, minimum standards for stabling, and animal identification. Since the evening, the heat-related problems that have plagued warm weather cities have not been so common. Until the ordinance is passed, however, Mr. Poholik must rely on the department’s own vigilance to make sure no lame, run-down, or injured horses are used by carriage operators. The HSUS will continue to oppose proposals for new carriage horse operations and support strict oversight of those operations it cannot eliminate. So long as tourists and city officials enjoy the colorful if inadequate carriage horses and carriages in city traffic jams, problems that should have disappeared with the nineteenth century will remain.
Genetic Engineering
Cornucopia or Pandora's Box?

by Dr. M.W. Fox
and Linda Mickley

Introduction

Genetic engineering: to those familiar with Aldous Huxley's ominous futuristic novel Brave New World it evokes images of society's preoccupation with the genetic potential of humans to create a strict caste system. Currently, however, genetic engineering technologies promise to open new vistas of diverse and splendid research in a variety of fields.

Medical scientists are rapidly perfecting methods of producing scarce or expensive hormones and vaccines from genetically modified cells. For example, insulin needed by diabetics may now be manufactured by bacteria rather than extracted from the pancreas of slaughtered animals. Renin, a protein essential in cheese-making, can be harvested from genetically altered microbes instead of purined from stomachs of slaughtered calves. Technological development in the use of vaccines using modified tissue cultures rather than live animals is well under way. The experiments that led to the perfection of these techniques took place in well-monitored laboratories dealing with microorganisms that are genetically changed. Agricultural and animal scientists are also riding the crest of the wave of genetic research. Many of them view this research as a bonafide means of significantly improving the world food supply by developing drought-resistant crops, plants that grow faster and yield greater quantities of milk and meat.

The goal of so many noble and of immense potential benefit to society. Several darker, neglected aspects of genetic engineering do exist, however, and these must be examined and understood.

One is the issue of care and welfare of genetically manipulated farm animals. A second is that of the cost-effectiveness of maintaining such animals. A third is the possibility of accidental or deliberate release of genetically modified organisms into the environment. Lastly is the recent ruling by the Supreme Court that allows for altered life-forms to be patented, raising serious ethical questions as to how the public should allocate financial and consumer support for genetic engineering.

We must begin to address these issues now in order to prevent much potential animal suffering at the hands of over-zealous scientists and producers, as well as to avoid the probably irreversible damage to our environment. We must reach humane, ethical conclusions in order to act responsibly.

Traditional Methods of Manipulation

The practice of genetic engineering, per se, is not limited exclusively to recent laboratory breakthroughs. Mankind has been exerting a calculated, external pressure on the genetic material of plants and animals since the dawn of domestication by selectively breeding for desired characteristics. Nowhere is man's long-time influence more evident than in the astonishing diversity in form and function of our breeds of domestic dogs. To realize that human intervention alone is responsible for the myriad breeds that have been produced from one common canine ancestor is truly amazing. The flip side of this bright coin is that much of the over-specialized selective breeding of dogs has resulted in the perpetuation of inborn defects and the expression of chronic degenerative diseases, such as hip dysplasia. Such disorders, defects in the genetic blueprint itself, are transmissible to the offspring.

Additional harmful intervention by humans into the genetic material of domestic animals is widespread and, unfortunately, commonly accepted. This is especially true in the case of farm animals. Genetic manipulation via selective breeding has created many, if not all, of our modern farm breeds in the U.S. For instance, we have extremely high-producing dairy cows that must be managed expertly in order to avoid several severe metabolic disorders which cut short their milking careers and their lives; genetically selected broiler chickens that become lame because their joints are damaged by too-rapidly-growing muscle mass; laying hens that are genetically programmed to lay more eggs in less time at the cost of becoming "burned out"; and sows, selected for long back, leaness, and rapid growth, that are more susceptible to stress.

Inter-breed hybridization (such as the creation of mules from the breeding of a donkey with a horse; artificial insemination (which allows for the impregnation of females without having the male actually on the farm); super-ovulation (in which a high-producing female is hormonally stimulated to produce more ova than normally); and fertilized-ova or embryo transfer (a technique whereby fertilized eggs can be removed from the mother and grown in another female) are also entrenched in modern animal-breeding science.

All, with the exception of inter-breed hybridization, respect genetic boundaries: no matter how the egg was produced or fertilized, the species itself does not change. A calf does exact a price. All mules are sterile. Inter-breed hybridization, respect genetic boundaries: no matter how the egg was produced or fertilized, the species itself does not change. A calf does exact a price. All mules are sterile.

The Search for "Perfection"

Modern animal scientists and producers seem determined to create the farm animal that produces the most in the shortest time span and in less time at the cost of becoming "burned out"; and sows, selected for long back, leaness, and rapid growth, that are more susceptible to stress.

Inter-breed hybridization, respect genetic boundaries: no matter how the egg was produced or fertilized, the species itself does not change. A calf does exact a price. All mules are sterile.

The Search for "Perfection"

Modern animal scientists and producers seem determined to create the farm animal that produces the most in the shortest time span and in less time at the cost of becoming "burned out"; and sows, selected for long back, leaness, and rapid growth, that are more susceptible to stress.

Inter-breed hybridization, respect genetic boundaries: no matter how the egg was produced or fertilized, the species itself does not change. A calf does exact a price. All mules are sterile.
sired characteristics. For example, high productivity in certain breeds of laying hens is linked to aggressive behavior. A female dairy calf from a high-producer will itself produce no better than average if it does not receive gentle handling in its early months. And, no matter how strictly the experimenters must wait to ascertain their results. The new technologies being developed in the genetics labs may remove much of the guesswork from the animal sciences. More so than any other field, genetics and the biotechnology that it is developing are being applied to all aspects of animal production.

The Humane Considerations

The fervor with which genetic engineers and animal-production specialists are approaching genetic modification of our farm animals must be tempered not only with humaneness and regard for animal welfare but also by consideration of several important, timely questions. What guarantees exist that such tampering with genetic material will not create mutations or monsters? How many of these unfortunate creatures must be produced and discarded in the search for the "perfect animal-production traits?" Can we ever reasonably say with any amount of certainty or peace of mind that the development of the ultimate cow, pig, or chicken is worth the cost in terms of the probable loss and suffering of many experimental animals?

Let us assume for the moment that experiments can give rise to cows as big as elephants (as one social philosopher has already postulated) or pigs as large as beef cattle. Certainly, common sense alone tells us that such animals will produce more meat and milk, but at what cost to them, to us, and our environment? It is conceivable that they will require more feed, different housing conditions, and cause increased manure disposal problems. The genetically engineered farm animals, along with those of all possible scenarios. The practice of cloning is being viewed as a sure-fire way to predict production. The cloning of farm animals is being approached as a fundamental of extensive or exclusive herds of such animals, along with those of "super breed" factors and farmers of to-day: the economies of scale will force the farmers to raise more animals than they can realistically humanely care for. The vicious circle of treating production diseases with drugs will begin anew, and the consumers will again be taking the risk of eating animal products that have harmful residues.

Will these animals be capable of being genetically adapted to adjust psychologically to their larger sizes and increased production and growth demands? What of the more aggressive strains or breeds of animals — to make them larger would be foolhardy. The basic alteration of an animal’s genetic make-up does not automatically preclude its response to stressful or unhealthy conditions. Such animals may become even more dependent on drugs just to meet the demands placed on them by their new internal constitutions. As a result of the development of the few farm animal breeds "best suited" to human needs, scientists would, in essence, be practicing the genetic equivalent of putting all of their eggs in one basket. The world has been losing genetic diversity at an alarming rate just through the extinction of farm breeds. In the British Isles alone, twenty-three breeds of livestock have become extinct in the past century. The Lincolnshire Curly Coat pig, now extinct, was a robust, outdoor-type hog with an unusual coat of long white hair. No one will ever know what contributions this breed might have made to the modern swine industry in developing hogs that can live comfortably in colder climates. The Suffolks, once a hardy breed of boar capable of producing quality yields of milk even when kept on poor pastures and given the com-From the Humane Society News, Spring 1984
were not ominous enough, the genetically engineered mice used in some labs seem to have developed entirely new types of hereditary maladies. Large herds of genetically altered farm animals may also be prone to severe hereditary diseases that would show up in the population only after several generations or lack the ability to cope with infectious diseases.

Long-term Considerations

All of these humane and animal-welfare arguments for the prudent use of genetic engineering are important to any discussion of the issue. No discussion of this type, however, would be complete without mention of the possible ecological consequences of the accidental or deliberate introduction of altered life-forms into the biosphere.

Granted, short-term commercial benefits may be garnered from the release of certain bacteria into the soil or of the planting of specifically altered crops. One example is the bacteria that lowers the temperature at which fruit will form, effectively protecting plants from damage during cold weather. Another is a strain of food crops which could be made to grow in dry or salty soil, allowing utilization of certain arid areas. These organisms sound wonderful on paper and could conceivably help grow more food, but the interrelationships between plants, their pests, the soil, and the effects they have on the ecology of the area are so complex that the true ramifications of such actions might not be comprehended until irreversible damage had been done.

An ever-widening circle of organisms is now afforded protection under patents. The patenting of organisms is not, in itself, a recent development. Asexually reproduced plants (those not grown from seeds) have been patentable since 1930, but have managed to give private enterprise exactly what it needs to charge ahead with its misinformed notion that living things and their constituents are nothing more than raw materials to be picked, processed, and capitalized on. From here, it is only a short step for industry to begin regarding animals and their own exclusive creations without inherent rights or worth, not unlike other manufactured goods.

The potential for abuse is an extremely ominous aspect of the ability to control life-form by dint of its power to tamper with the very blueprint of life, the gene, which, if the power to change the "good" genes and which are doing the "bad" ones possibly phoused, to be lost to the gene pool forever. An ever-widening circle of organisms is now afforded protection under patents. The patenting of organisms is not, in itself, a recent development. Asexually reproduced plants (those not grown from seeds) have been patentable since 1930, but have managed to give private enterprise exactly what it needs to charge ahead with its misinformed notion that living things and their constituents are nothing more than raw materials to be picked, processed, and capitalized on. From here, it is only a short step for industry to begin regarding animals and their own exclusive creations without inherent rights or worth, not unlike other manufactured goods.

The potential for abuse is an extremely ominous aspect of the ability to control life-form by dint of its power to tamper with the very blueprint of life, the gene, which, if the power to change the "good" genes and which are doing the "bad" ones possibly phoused, to be lost to the gene pool forever. An ever-widening circle of organisms is now afforded protection under patents. The patenting of organisms is not, in itself, a recent development. Asexually reproduced plants (those not grown from seeds) have been patentable since 1930, but have managed to give private enterprise exactly what it needs to charge ahead with its misinformed notion that living things and their constituents are nothing more than raw materials to be picked, processed, and capitalized on. From here, it is only a short step for industry to begin regarding animals and their own exclusive creations without inherent rights or worth, not unlike other manufactured goods.

Not all genetic research should be banned—that would be a narrow world view. Medical science has made its fingertips the means by which many diseases could be made less harmful or even cured, and such research must be supported. But the wholesale experimentation on sentient animals, merely for economics or short-term abundance is not to be encouraged, either financially or morally.

The essence of these concerns is encapsulated in this resolution, enacted by the HSUS Board of Directors December 9, 1983:

Whereas there has in recent years been a marked increase in actual and proposed experimentation in the genetic engineering of domesticated animals for the purpose of improving animal husbandry and increasing human food supplies; and
Whereas the purpose of such experimentation is to produce "super breeds" of animals or plants which are resistant to certain diseases or infections, or which are better suited to the production of particular foods; and
Whereas laboratories regrettably are engaged in the genetic engineering of domesticated animals for the purpose of improving human food supplies; and
Whereas the widespread experimentation on animal species such as cattle, sheep, chickens and pigs for the purpose of making them more productive or resistant to disease has been widely condemned; and
Whereas the widespread experimentation on animal species such as cattle, sheep, chickens and pigs for the purpose of making them more productive or resistant to disease has been widely condemned; and
Whereas the widespread experimentation on animal species such as cattle, sheep, chickens and pigs for the purpose of making them more productive or resistant to disease has been widely condemned; and
Whereas the widespread experimentation on animal species such as cattle, sheep, chickens and pigs for the purpose of making them more productive or resistant to disease has been widely condemned; and

The Humane Society of the United States, therefore, urges that the critical nature of these concerns be recognized and that those persons in government and private industry involved in genetic engineering act to preclude animal suffering and negative ecological consequences.

Dr. Michael W. Fox is scientific director and Linda Mickley is research assistant for The HSUS.

Seal Day Celebrated Across the Country

The Fourth Annual Day of the Seal was celebrated on March 1 throughout the nation. March 1 is traditionally the first day of the birthing season for harbor seals. To The HSUS and other animal-welfare groups and individuals, this day also symbolizes the rebirth of hope for all the world's seals.

In Washington, D.C., The HSUS gave an evening reception for representatives, their aides, and other figures key to the issue of protecting seals. Over 300 guests gathered in the Senate Caucus Room to celebrate the day and to discuss strategies for protecting the North Pacific fur seals which have been clubbed, at taxpayers' expense, throughout the twentieth century.

"In addition to our continuing concerns about the humanities and the welfare of the United States conducting an annual seal harvest, there is now serious concern about the very survival of the fur seal population," said HSUS President John A. Hoyt to the gathering of legislators and animal-protection groups. "The North Pacific fur seal population has drastically declined and continues to decline at a rate of eight to ten percent per year. Urgent and progressive action is needed to reverse the decline and restore the seal population.

In his speech to the guests, Sen. Carl M. Levin pointed out the irony of the Interim Convention on the Conservation of North Pacific Fur Seals, the treaty which calls for the annual slaughter of the seals. "You don't save seals by killing them, you save seals by stopping their slaughter," he said.

Musician Paul Winter performed for the guests between the speeches. As the house lights dimmed and a seal slide show was projected on a large screen behind him, he played moving musical interpretations of the marine world of whales and seals on his soprano saxophone.

The HSUS's fight to protect the North Pacific fur seals has several elements. First, we are demanding...
Psychological Experimentation on Animals: Not Necessary, Not Valid
by Dr. John McArdle

W hatever's dictionary defines torture as "the infliction of pain (as from burning, crushing, or wounding) to punish or coerce." Although it would be inappropriate to apply this concept to all areas of biomedical research, it is the founding principle and fundamental characteristic of one area of scientific investigation, experimental psychology. By this we mean the use of laboratory methods to study animal behavior as a model of human behavior. Animals used in experimental psychology are routinely exposed to severe pain, physical and behavioral stress, heat, cold, electric shock, starvation, and mutilation. Scientists condone and routinely expose to severe pain, scientists using animals in a vain attempt to understand the complexities of human behavior and the human mind and to create animal "models" of human mental disorders.

Laboratory animals have been used as models of human diseases since the mid-nineteenth century. Their use in experimental psychology, however, only dates from the work of the Russian physiologist Ivan Pavlov in the early part of this century. Scientists initially hit upon the idea of substituting animals for humans in the study of infectious diseases. In theory, if a laboratory animal was exposed to an infectious agent, developed the disease, and was cured by some experimental treatment, there was a high probability that a similar approach would also cure humans afflicted with the same problem. (At the time, this was a valid use of the concept of an animal model, now, however, we have humane alternatives in the study of such diseases.)

In those instances where a case may be made for the scientific validity of using an animal species as a substitute for humans, a prerequisite is that the animal and human examples of disease must share similar causes, symptoms and mechanisms, and responses to treatment. The concept of an animal model cannot be generally applied to situations in which a specific problem originates within a specific animal itself. Such problems are unique to each type of animal and include all aspects of behavior, both normal and abnormal. Animal models will never be directly relevant to understanding the complexities of human behavior unless that behavior results from a complicated interaction between the human brain and its genetic heritage and the complex society in which that brain functions. These factors are all unique to humans. Unlike many basic physiological processes, human behavior—and the behavior of all other species—developed in response to the environmental characteristics and evolutionary history of each type of animal. For that reason, individual and group human behavior cannot be studied—or assumed—by observing or inducing seemingly similar behavior in other animals. For seventy-five years, untold numbers of laboratory animals have suffered and died in experiments that were futile attempts to replicate or approximate normal human and abnormal behavior patterns. Many learning experiments and other primitive exercises have been performed on rats and mice, species which, obviously, have virtually no behavioral characteristics in common with human beings. The results of such primitive experiments have been touted as holding the key to understanding complex human behaviors. This simply has not been proven to be the case.

Are there any reasonable advantages to the use of human normal and abnormal behavior? Many scientists seem not even to worry about the question. A prominent Canadian experimental psychologist recently dismissed all concerns about the validity of inter-species transferal after lamenting that all mammalian brains are essentially the same and, for that reason, scientists could not be justifiably using the brain gained from the use of one species to another. Because all mammalian brains have the same neurotransmitters, this theory goes, scientists can forget about behavioral and anatomical differences and study only the brain regions, cell densities, internal organizations and connections, and mililiter-aspects of quantitative untruth. All mammals are nothing more than a bag of chemicals! This scientific myopia is frightening and dehumanizing to anyone alarmed by the cavalier attitude of many scientists toward human and animal suffering. For those scientists who do not believe this "bag of chemicals" theory, primates, our closest relatives, seem good models for human abnormal behavior. But the great complexity of non-human primate behavior, studied only recently in the wild by such scientists as Jane Goodall and Dian Fossey, provides that human society and non-human primate society have many important differences. Captive, stressed laboratory primate colonies, of course, would have even more differences, but few of these have been documented, much less observed systematically! Non-human primates are very different from human beings.

One of the most prominent names in the history of experimental psychology is Dr. Harry Harlow. He maintained a lengthy career and considerable professional prestige by devising a seemingly endless series of new methods and devices to torment and manipulate monkeys in yet quantitative untruth. All mammals are nothing more than a bag of chemicals! This scientific myopia is frightening and dehumanizing to anyone alarmed by the brutal mechanical mother substitutes, and observed the resulting extreme mental anguish and disorientation of the infant animals. After decades of intense abuse of primates, what did Dr. Harlow discover? A grand new theory that altered our perceptions of each other? A successful breakthrough in the treatment of troubled human beings? Hardly. Strip away the labels, the self-serving platitudes, and pseudo-science, and you can summarize Dr. Harlow's conclusions in two sentences: mother love is important to young primates; and if you raise an infant of a naturally social species in isolation, it will have problems adjusting when reintroduced to that society. Such obvious observations, known to everyone but psychologists, seem to have eluded psychologists. Harlow stated it best himself when he observed that ninety percent of the research in experimental psychology was not worth publishing. For that reason, experimental psychologists often face formidable scientific hurdles. What if the researcher exposes an animal to a particular experimental situation, such as a sen-}
and appear unaware that it is, to quote Dr. Heim, "crassly unscientif-
ic," (b) exclude data which are rel-
vant but do not lend themselves to this quantitative approach. This de-
sire to enshrine data which, in fields of science (biology, chemistry, physics) may explain experimental psychologists' preference for working with the stan-
dard laboratory animals of the biol-
getic sciences, the rat and the mouse.

Experimental psychologists des-
perately want to be thought of as biomedical researchers. For one rea-
son, they do all the status, trap-
pings, paraphernalia, attitudes, and activities of "typical" classical scien-
tists such as biologists. It is interest-
ing to note that when researchers in the natural sciences, physi-
icians are asked to identify the one field of animal experimentation that involves the greatest abuses, has the least scientific foundation, and only minimal relevancy to human medi-
cal problems, they often identify ex-
perimental psychology.

In addition, an extensive pub-
lished literature in experimental psy-
chology, it quickly becomes obvious that near all are, rather than
basic categories: (1) observations that,
from our own collective experience,
are intuitively obvious, (2) observa-

tions that could be derived from hu-
man clinical studies, (3) information available from observations of natu-
ral, free-ranging populations of the sam-

di, and (4) studies simply not worth doing, either because they are
substantially redundant and involve an unac-
ceptably high moral cost.

Some of the most abusive and ethically questionable studies in ex-
perimental psychology purport to ex-
amine aggression and stress. Roger Ulrich was one of the principal inves-
tigators in that field, having, in his studies, repeatedly forced two animals to fight one another. He now admits to conducting studies that were essentially redundant and useless. He finally decided that to help stop human aggression, he would first have to cease his own "torturous experiments." Not only has he stopped his experiments but he has also reputed them as irre-
levant to the study of human aggres-
sion. Dr. Ulrich summarized his own discipline by noting that "behavior-

dal science and its applied technology have evolved into another religion in
which animals are used as sacrificial subjects. Like the faithful of ancient
times, we kneel at an altar of a modernized rationalization, where
these high priests of laboratory re-
search are paid to perform painful rituals on other life forms so that hu-
man suffering will be driven away.

Many of the typical experiments
in experimental psychology can be
replaced with comprehensive studies on human patients suffering from
disorders, on normal individuals in
various social and ethnic groups, or
by observing animals in natural hab-

Psychological experimentation on
animals has one unique character-
istic of interest to animal welfare. It among all scientific dis-
ciplines is the ideal candidate for
complete elimination! No major scien-
tific endeavor would suffer by such an act.

As long as the general public re-
ains unaware of the suffering and torture inflicted upon animals used in
experimental psychology, and we con-
tinue to allow experimental psy-
chologists to play at being scientists
without the rigorous intellectual foundations we expect from the basic
biomedical sciences, every human
life and taxpayers' money will be
wasted. Furthermore, human pa-
tients in need of assistance will not be
helped.

Can anything be made unat
natural and abusive as experimen-
tal psychology possibly benefit human society? Do murk

ly, unspecified, so-called scien-
tific experiments such as
are done in experimental psychology, and we con-
tinue to allow experimental psy-
chologists to play at being scientists
without the rigorous intellectual foundations we expect from the basic
biomedical sciences, every human
life and taxpayers' money will be
wasted. Furthermore, human pa-
tients in need of assistance will not be
helped.

Can anything be made unnatural and abusive as experimen-
tal psychology? It is possible to make
humane research, and it is possible
to influence psychologists to review their
way their colleagues view their lab-
oratory animal research. Over 250 psychologists have joined Psycholo-
gists for the Ethical Treatment of
Animals (PsyETA) to encourage the

American Psychological Association
(APA) to address ethical issues in
animal experimentation.

PsyETA was formed, according to
Dr. Kenneth Shapiro, its founder, as a response to the growing criticism of
psychological testing on ethical grounds that psychologists' "addiction to experi-
mentation" is lived in freedom. Any concept of
biomedical sciences, even more
importantly, it is distorted and untrue if it

Many scientists have not consid-
ered other, non-animal scientific op-
tions, says Dr. Joan Field, "it is possible to conduct humane research and
human research, and it is bet-

er research."
New Jersey Trapping Triumph Rewards Animal Welfarists

by Ann Church

Lance, Anita Joy, and Craig Austenberg (at left) were among the children who demonstrated their support for a leghold trap ban in front of the New Jersey state house in 1978.

After years of struggle, a law to ban all uses of the steel-jawed, leg­hold trap has been passed in the state of New Jersey. Under the bill’s provisions, the traps cannot be legally sold, possessed, manufactured, offered for sale, imported, or transported. Once in effect, this will be the most comprehensive state law in the country banning the steel-jawed trap.

How was such a great victory achieved? The answer lies in over a decade of work by HSUS staff and members, along with other dedicated animal activists, in New Jersey. In 1972, we were successful in outlawing the use of the trap in a number of New Jersey’s most heavily populated counties—primarily in the New York-New Jersey part of the state. However, even in these counties the traps could be legally sold and possessed, and, just not used. This loophole made enforcement of the ban virtually impossible. Therefore, we started a campaign to ban the trap statewide. The HSUS’s Mid-Atlantic Regional Director Nina Austenberg and her staff, along with many dedicated members and local groups, kept the issue before the legislators every year. Newly elected legislators were quickly made aware of the importance of the issue. And, several of the legislators who had long supported our efforts became leaders in the senate and assembly and were able to wield their power on our behalf. Repeatedly, we asked our members to keep the pressure on their local legislators to work for a ban. Even when they could easily have become discouraged, our members did not let up.

The HSUS testified before committees, lobbied intensively, sponsored newspaper ads, contacted the press, wrote letters to editors, and even arranged to have a plane fly over the state house with a pro-passage message. Our supporters never stopped coming to the hearings and never failed to attend sessions of the assembly and the senate. On the days the trapping bill was scheduled to be voted on, the state house was filled with hundreds of animal activists and trap­pers. Members of the public wearing copies of New Jersey’s constitution, wearing skin fur or other pelts to show their support for trapping. Anti­trapping advocates were often outnumbered and outmaneuvered by their yellow HSUS decals announcing that “EVERY FUR COAT HURTS."

When the day came for the senate to vote on the bill, 33 senators voted to pass the bill and send it to the governor for signing. Mrs. Austenberg was in the chamber with her own child and several others. They had been working for this ban and were delighted to be present when it finally passed the legislature.

The trappers, knowing, finally, that passage of the trapping ban was inevitable, had only a handful of professional lobbyists present at their last hurrah.

The trappers fought us hard all the way. They claimed that trapping was a useful industry; provided necessary extra cash for thousands of low-income individuals; aided in the control of rabies and wildlife populations; and was not cruel to the animals. Very recently, they had claimed that a trap manufacturer had invented a “new,” humane, steel-jawed leghold trap (see the Winter 1984 HSUS News).

But our arguments proved to be more persuasive. All along, we have contended that nothing could justify subjecting animals to the intense pain and suffering that trapping’s victims must endure. Studies have repeatedly shown that trapping does not prevent rabies, and, in fact, may help to promote it. The padded trap was not a humane trap—just a last­ditch effort in the trap ban.

Assemblyman D. Bennett Mazur, sponsor of the ban in the assembly, was unifying in his efforts to have the ban passed. Although we wanted to have the ban take effect immediately, the final bill provided that the law becomes effective after eighteen months after the governor signs it. All of the animal-welfare groups reluctantly agreed to this compromise. This means the trappers will have one more season in which to use the trap. During that eighteen months, Rutgers University will perform a study to determine whether alternatives to the steel-jawed trap are available. If the study reports that alternatives exist, the ban on the steel-jawed trap will go into effect immediately. Since a year and a half is not a long time, we hope that the New Jersey legislature will agree with this comprehensive study. (Of course, the HSUS is supporting all trapping alternatives, animals, however, our first priority has been to ban this particular trap.)

As the trap ban became law, we asked our members to keep the pressure on their legislators. After years of effort, we were successful in outlawing the use of national wildlife refuges.

In December 1982, the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) announced major developments at the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge near Newburyport, Massachusetts. Included in the plans were construction of several office and maintenance buildings, institution of sport hunting and trapping programs, and paving of the refuge’s main gravel road for two-thirds of its length. In detailed comments submitted to FWS in April of 1983, The HSUS strenuously objected to these developments as harmful to wildlife and the wilderness character of the refuge. The FWS proposal provoked a storm of protest from Massachusetts citizens and conservation groups and from national animal-welfare and wildlife groups. In November of 1983, the FWS bowed to public pressure by promising to find an off-refuge site for the new buildings and to withdraw the proposed sport hunting and trapping programs. They still plan to pave part of the main refuge road, but they will institute several measures to control traffic.

As those of you who live in New Jersey may know, the FWS has proposed a controversial plan to expand the amount of hunting allowed at Brigantine National Wildlife Refuge and the amount of trapping at Barrogat National Wildlife Refuge, both of which are on the New Jersey coast. The Brigantine plan would add 2,000 acres to the area currently open for waterfowl hunting; the Barrogat plan would extend the current two-month trapping season by a month and increase from one to six the number of species trapped. The situation is similar to that which existed at Lower­ahatchee National Wildlife Refuge last year (see the Fall 1983 HSUS News). These programs are in existence only to satisfy hunters and not out of any biological need for them.

The HSUS is working hard to combat these programs.

UPDATE

Attacks on National Refuge System Continue

The HSUS continues to protest the increased use of national wildlife refuges.

In December 1982, the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) proposed a controversial plan to expand the amount of hunting allowed at Brigantine National Wildlife Refuge and the amount of trapping at Barrogat National Wildlife Refuge, both of which are on the New Jersey coast. The Brigantine plan would add 2,000 acres to the area currently open for waterfowl hunting; the Barrogat plan would extend the current two-month trapping season by a month and increase from one to six the number of species trapped. The situation is similar to that which existed at Lower­ahatchee National Wildlife Refuge last year (see the Fall 1983 HSUS News). These programs are in existence only to satisfy hunters and not out of any biological need for them. The HSUS is working hard to combat these programs.
Institute Explores Publishing Plans

The Institute for the Study of Animal Problems is developing plans to print and distribute an annual book, now planned as Advances in Animal Welfare Science and Philosophy, which will replace the quarterly International Journal for the Study of Animal Problems. The Institute currently has a full complement of excellent manuscripts submitted by academicians, and this new publication should do much to help advance this growing field of interest. (See page 3 for obtaining back issues of the Journal.)

Three new tape-cassette slide lectures, Cat Behavior and Psychology; Dog Behavior and Psychology; and Animal Control Psychology, Ethical and Social Issues have now been completed and will soon be available for distribution to schools, humane societies, and cat and dog clubs.

Before the famous Cruft's international dog show in London, Institute director Dr. Michael Fox spoke at an educational seminar for veterinarians on animal behavior, welfare, and rights philosophy. Research associate Linda Mickley attended the International Pig Trade Show and the International Poultry Trade Show in Atlanta, Georgia. At both of these shows was a strong promotional emphasis on capital-intensive "factory" farming systems. The most disturbing feature was an absence of exhibits dealing with improved systems that might enhance animals' welfare. One speaker, a public relations expert, advised producers to avoid using the term "confinement" systems and instead use the euphemism "environmentally controlled housing" systems, since this sounds better to the public, and to tell the public that hogs are genetically adapted to such housing—both of which statements are false and misleading!

Ms. Mickley is compiling a list of humane alternative farming systems. If any of our members knows of such farms, the Institute would appreciate hearing of them. Farmers may write to Ms. Mickley directly at 2100 L Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20037.

Full Schedule for NAAHE

During the spring months, the staff of the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE) is offering presentations and workshop sessions as part of regional animal-welfare meetings in Louisiana, Connecticut, Wisconsin, and Indiana. In addition, NAAHE director Kathy Soltow will conduct two sessions on humane education at the annual meeting of the National Animal-Control Association, held in Arkansas in May, and will teach a three-day segment of the annual humane education seminar at Stephen F. Austin State University in Texas this June. (For more information on these meetings, you can write to NAAHE at Box 362, East Haddam, CT 06423.)

NAAHE's membership magazine, Humane Education, acquired a new editor this past winter. Wil­low Soltow, a free-lance writer and former editor for an educational publishing firm, joined the staff in December to write and edit the quarterly magazine for educators. In addition to her work with the magazine, Ms. Soltow will be responsible for assisting in the development of new humane education teaching materials. She will also work with Kind News Editor Vicki Parker to coordinate the content and focus of the teacher's and children's components of NAAHE's education program.

Bill De Rosa, who had been interning with NAAHE since Aug ust, joined the staff in November as NAAHE Research Associate, replacing Vanessa Malcarne who left the organization to pursue full-time graduate work. During the past several months, he has worked in cooperation with the Wasatch Institute for Research and Evaluation coordinating the east coast activities for NAAHE's two-year humane education evaluation project.

The urgency and importance of the multitude of animal problems facing us today underscores the theme of this year's HSUS annual conference. Speakers with varied backgrounds and extensive experience in animal welfare will grapple with these vital issues in a carefully chosen program of workshops, formal addresses, and informal sharing sessions. Invited speakers include Dr. Amy Freeman Lee, who will deliver the keynote address, Roger Caras, nationally known author, lecturer, and television commentator, who will act as program moderator, and Dr. Blaine Worthen, professor and head of the psychology department at Utah State University and director of the Wasatch Institute for Research and Evaluation. On Wednesday, October 24, 1984, the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education will sponsor an all-day workshop featuring members of the Western Humane Educators Association. We hope to see you in San Diego for this valuable four-day gathering of animal-welfare advocates.

LISTEN...

LEARN...

EXCHANGE IDEAS...

Special arrangements have been made with United Airlines to offer HSUS conference a forty-five percent discount off coach fare for travel to and from San Diego from anywhere in the forty-eight contiguous states between October 18 and November 3, 1984. To make your reservation, call toll-free 800-521-4041 and tell the agent you are attending the HSUS annual conference or give the agent the special HSUS Conference Number: 4201. Further details will be provided upon request and in the next issue of The Humane Society News.

The Institute for the Study of Animal Problems is developing plans to print and distribute an annual book, now planned as Advances in Animal Welfare Science and Philosophy, which will replace the quarterly International Journal for the Study of Animal Problems. The Institute currently has a full complement of excellent manuscripts submitted by academicians, and this new publication should do much to help advance this growing field of interest. (See page 3 for obtaining back issues of the Journal.)

Three new tape-cassette slide lectures, Cat Behavior and Psychology; Dog Behavior and Psychology; and Animal Control Psychology, Ethical and Social Issues have now been completed and will soon be available for distribution to schools, humane societies, and cat and dog clubs.

Before the famous Cruft’s international dog show in London, Institute director Dr. Michael Fox spoke at an educational seminar for veterinarians on animal behavior, welfare, and rights philosophy. Research associate Linda Mickley attended the International Pig Trade Show and the International Poultry Trade Show in Atlanta, Georgia. At both of these shows was a strong promotional emphasis on capital-intensive “factory” farming systems. The most disturbing feature was an absence of exhibits dealing with improved systems that might enhance animals’ welfare. One speaker, a public relations expert, advised producers to avoid using the term “confinement” systems and instead use the euphemism “environmentally controlled housing” systems, since this sounds better to the public, and to tell the public that hogs are genetically adapted to such housing—both of which statements are false and misleading!

Ms. Mickley is compiling a list of humane alternative farming systems. If any of our members knows of such farms, the Institute would appreciate hearing of them. Farmers may write to Ms. Mickley directly at 2100 L Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20037.

Full Schedule for NAAHE

During the spring months, the staff of the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE) is offering presentations and workshop sessions as part of regional animal-welfare meetings in Louisiana, Connecticut, Wisconsin, and Indiana. In addition, NAAHE director Kathy Soltow will conduct two sessions on humane education at the annual meeting of the National Animal-Control Association, held in Arkansas in May, and will teach a three-day segment of the annual humane education seminar at Stephen F. Austin State University in Texas this June. (For more information on these meetings, you can write to NAAHE at Box 362, East Haddam, CT 06423.)

NAAHE’s membership magazine, Humane Education, acquired a new editor this past winter. Willow Soltow, a free-lance writer and former editor for an educational publishing firm, joined the staff in December to write and edit the quarterly magazine for educators. In addition to her work with the magazine, Ms. Soltow will be responsible for assisting in the development of new humane education teaching materials. She will also work with Kind News Editor Vicki Parker to coordinate the content and focus of the teacher’s and children’s components of NAAHE’s education program.

Bill De Rosa, who had been interning with NAAHE since August, joined the staff in November as NAAHE Research Associate, replacing Vanessa Malcarne who left the organization to pursue full-time graduate work. During the past several months, he has worked in cooperation with the Wasatch Institute for Research and Evaluation coordinating the east coast activities for NAAHE’s two-year humane education evaluation project.

The urgency and importance of the multitude of animal problems facing us today underscores the theme of this year’s HSUS annual conference. Speakers with varied backgrounds and extensive experience in animal welfare will grapple with these vital issues in a carefully chosen program of workshops, formal addresses, and informal sharing sessions. Invited speakers include Dr. Amy Freeman Lee, who will deliver the keynote address, Roger Caras, nationally known author, lecturer, and television commentator, who will act as program moderator, and Dr. Blaine Worthen, professor and head of the psychology department at Utah State University and director of the Wasatch Institute for Research and Evaluation. On Wednesday, October 24, 1984, the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education will sponsor an all-day workshop featuring members of the Western Humane Educators Association. We hope to see you in San Diego for this valuable four-day gathering of animal-welfare advocates.

LISTEN...

LEARN...

EXCHANGE IDEAS...

Special arrangements have been made with United Airlines to offer HSUS conference a forty-five percent discount off coach fare for travel to and from San Diego from anywhere in the forty-eight contiguous states between October 18 and November 3, 1984. To make your reservation, call toll-free 800-521-4041 and tell the agent you are attending the HSUS annual conference or give the agent the special HSUS Conference Number: 4201. Further details will be provided upon request and in the next issue of The Humane Society News.
that this summer’s hunt be called off. We are working with senators and representatives to see that message to Commerce Secretary Malcolm Baldrige. Second, we want a new treaty which Senate majority leader, would schedule a number of bills for full Senate consideration, among them S. 457, which would weaken the Wild, Free-Roaming Horse and Burro Act. The earlier in the legislative session the Senate puts on the calendar, the better the chances are that it will be passed without much debate. The sponsor of S. 457, Idaho Senator James McClure, plans to ask Sen. Baker to bring this HSUS-backed bill up for an easy vote.

At the end of the first session of this Congress, the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee passed S. 457 by a vote of ten to nine. That version of S. 457 would allow the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to round up and remove 5,000 wild horses and burros annually from the open range. The BLM would transport them to humane organizations, at taxpayer expense, all horses and burros are unable to find homes for. Any animals the humane societies are unable to accept would be sold at auction, most likely to slaughterhouses for pet food.

Sen. McClure has been trying to convince the Senate that S. 457 is a noncontroversial bill that should be passed quickly. The HSUS has sent an Action Alert to Tennessee members asking them to call Sen. Baker in opposition to the bill. As a result of the large volume of mail, it appears that Sen. Baker will not be given the early calendar date he has requested.

It is critical that your two senators continue to hear your opposition to the controversial S. 457. Whether they vote to pass S. 457 or not when S. 457 comes up for a vote in the Senate.

Alternatives Study Begins

The Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), a scientific research service for Congress, has begun an eighteen-month study of alternatives to laboratory animal experimentation, testing, and education. While OTA is ultimately responsible for producing an extensive report on this study, which was ordered by Utah Senator Orrin G. Hatch, the project will be monitored by a nineteen-member advisory panel. The panel will meet four times over the eighteen months, review drafts, and provide further direction for the final report.

Representatives of the cosmetic and biomedical research community comprise the larger portion of the panel, but after the big lobby from the HSUS and other humane organizations, OTA invited representatives from animal-welfare groups to participate. Dr. John McArdle, HSUS director of laboratory animal welfare; Dr. Connie Kagan, chairman of the Animal Political Action Committee; Henry Spira, director of the Draize and LD-50 Coalition; and Dr. Andrew Rowan of Tufts University’s school of veterinary medicine were named to the panel. Dr. Rowan is the former associate director of The HSUS’s Institute for the Study of Animal Problems.

The first panel meeting took place on February 9, 1984, at which time it reviewed the outline of OTA’s plan. The next meeting is scheduled for July.

Delay Is Desirable

The pages of the U.S. Senate’s 1984 calendar may hold the fate of this country’s wild horses and burros. This spring, Tennessee Senator Quentin N. Burdick has ordered a federal investigation into the quality of Animal Welfare Act (AWA) enforcement. This investigation will be conducted by the General Accounting Office (GAO), an accounting and investigating department of the federal government.

The request, originated by the Senate Agriculture Appropriations subcommittee of which Sen. Burdick is a member, orders GAO to dig deeper into the performance of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHS), which enforces the AWA through inspections of animal facilities. Sen. Burdick wants to determine if enforcement problems cited by The HSUS, such as inhumane laborator y animal care, unsanitary puppy mills, and miserable roadside zoos, are due to lack of funding or some other internal problem at APHIS. The Reagan administration has tried to slash the APHIS budget for AWA inspections by seventy percent two years in a row, but with working with the Agriculture Appropriations subcommittee, The HSUS has assisted in having the funds restored each time.

The HSUS welcomes this official look into enforcement of this major piece of animal protective legislation.

Senate Orders
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NIH Authorization Held Up in Senate

Although the house version of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) authorization was passed last November, the final legislation is being held up by means not related to animal-welfare issues, the Senate is still haggling over its version of the authorization. Once the Senate passes its version, the House and Senate will meet in conference to combine their two versions, make necessary adjustments and compromises, and finally pass one authorization bill for NIH.

Of the two versions, The HSUS favors the house language because it contains provisions for laboratory animals. These provisions, sponsored by Rep. Doug Walgren of Pennsylvania, require an animal-care committee for each federally funded research facility and instruction in humane animal care and research methods that minimize the use of animals and limit their distress. The Walgren provisions also require that all applications for NIH support must include the results of using animals in the projects (see the Winter 1984 HSUS News). Additionally, the Walgren provisions give NIH six months to develop a plan for promoting alternatives to the use of lab animals. The Senate version contains none of these provisions. In a move to delay any further progress, the Senate is holding up the NIH authorization bill for the treatment of laboratory animals, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts and Orrin G. Hatch of Utah have sponsored a provision for an eighteen-month study on the issue of lab animal welfare. The Hatch–Kennedy provision will probably remain in the Senate version. Currently, there are no animal welfare protections in the conference session, when the House and Senate work on the final NIH authori-

Thank You!

The HSUS enjoys the friendship and support of many senators and representatives on Capitol Hill. Without them we would not be able to effect changes that benefit animals nationwide. In this issue we would like to thank:

North Dakota Senator Quentin N. Burdick for requesting and obtaining a study of how effectively APHIS enforces the Animal Welfare Act.

The following sponsors of the Fourth Annual Day of the Seal, which was celebrated at a reception in the Senate (see page 19):

Sen. Claiborne Pell (RI)
Sen. Bob Packwood (OR)
Sen. Lowell P. Weicker (CT)
Sen. Carl N. Levin (MI)
Rep. Charles Van hook (FL)
Rep. James M. Jeffords (VT)
Rep. Don Bonker (WA)
Rep. Barbara Boxer (CA)

Trapping Regulations Threatened

Despite overwhelming public support for a ban on illegal trapping in the U.S. National Park System (see the Fall 1983 HSUS News), the National Park Service has postponed the effective date of regulations prohibiting such illegal trapping from October 5, 1983, to January 16, 1985. In its public notice on the decision, the National Park Service cited the prevention of "supporting the HSUS in our efforts to persuade the Senate to accept the Walgren provisions as part of the final authorization.

There is still time for HSUS members to affect the outcome of the NIH authorization. Below is a list of the senators on the Committee on Labor and Human Resources. If any of these members represents your state, please write to him or her at SD-428 Dirksen Senate Office Bldg., Washington, DC 20510. Let the committee know that you want the Senate language, including the Walgren provisions, incorporated into the final NIH authorization.

Majority Members (Republicans)
Orrin G. Hatch, Chairman (UT)
Robert T. Stafford (VT)
Don Nickles (OK)
Gordon J. Humphrey (NH)
Jeremiah A. Denton (AL)
Lowell P. Weicker, Jr. (CT)
Charles E. Grassley (IA)
John F. East (NC)
Paula Hawkins (FL)

Minority Members (Democrats)
Edward M. Kennedy (MA)
Jennings Randolph (WV)
Claiborne Pell (RI)
Thomas F. Eagleton (MO)
Donald W. Riegle, Jr. (MI)
Howard M. Metzenbaum (OH)
Spark M. Matsunaga (HI)
Christopher J. Dodd (CT)

Focus on FY 85 Budget

Congress is currently studying President Reagan's proposed budget for fiscal year 1985 (effective October 1, 1984, through September 30, 1985). Although President Reagan has requested budget cuts in several programs important to The HSUS, the house and Senate committees on appropriations hold the federal purse strings and make the final decisions on how the programs are funded.

The appropriations committee is composed of subcommittees which specialize in the funding of each department in the federal government. The HSUS is particularly interested in the following subcommittees, because their work—and the budgets they approve for federal departments—can directly affect the welfare of the nation's animals, including wildlife, livestock, and companion animals.

Agriculture Subcommittee—The proposed budget includes a cut of $1.2 million from the funds designated for enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act. This would reduce the already pathetic and inadequate 1984 budget of $4.8 million to $3.6 million for 1985. The HSUS is not only fighting to get the budget restored but also seeking to see it increased so there will be sufficient funds to conduct meticulous inspections of every animal facility in this country, from zoos to laboratories.

Please write to the following chairmen and ask them to support higher funding for APHIS:

Rep. Jamie L. Whitten
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture
Committee on Appropriations
2362 Rayburn Building
Washington, DC 20515

Sen. Thad Cochran
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture
Committee on Appropriations
140 Dirksen Building
Washington, DC 20510

Labor/HHS (Health and Human Services) Subcommittees—For the third consecutive year, The HSUS is asking the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees to appropriate $30 million for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) authorization. Below is a list of the Senators on the Committee on Appropriations:

Sen. Thomas F. Eagleton
Chairman, Subcommittee on Labor/HHS
Committee on Appropriations
20515 Senate Dirksen Building
Washington, DC 20510

Our "Pet Action Line" television series is ready for airing.

We've alerted every Public Broadcasting System station in the country, but we need you to call your local PBS station and tell its programmers to include our series in its schedule. Don't delay—every call helps!
Corndor Death Outrage
A coalition of environmental, wildlife, and humane organizations has requested the immediate removal of all M-44 sodium cyanide devices from the range of the endangered California condor. According to laboratory tests performed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, a young female California condor found dead on a Kern County (California) ranch last November appears to have been poisoned by the poison-first type federal trappers use to kill coyotes. A "coyote getter" is a pipe containing sodium cyanide and a spring-loaded mechanism half buried in the ground and baited with a piece of meat. When an animal bites the top, the device is activated and the animal’s mouth is filled with poison.

The dead condor was found at a ranch where M-44s are still in use and not far from a triped M-44. Despite the evidence that the condor died from exposure to such a trap, the Fish and Wildlife Service continues to use M-44s in the condor range as part of the Aminal Damage Control Program. The coalition believes the continued use of M-44 is illegal under the federal Endangered Species Act and an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) use restriction on sodium cyanide.

Unfortunately, the EPA has approved the limited use of sodium cyanide in M-44 devices. Despite restrictions intended to protect endangered species, West Coast Director Char Drennon, "present federal and state administrations are disastrous for protecting wildlife."

Hectic April
A coalition of animal-welfare groups will participate in a busy week of activities in April to bring attention to the plight of laboratory animals.

On April 23, the Mobilization For Animals will sponsor a march and all night candlelight vigil at the University of California at Davis near the primate center. There will be a benefit showing of "The Animals Film," a feature film about animal abuse, at a Sacramento area theater on April 25. The public is invited to attend this award-winning documentary narrated by Julie Christie.

On April 28, there will be a demonstration at the U.C. Davis campus.

Numerous animal-welfare and celebrity speakers and scheduled as speakers.

Members who wish more information on these activities should contact the West Coast Regional Office at 1713 J Street, #305, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Close Call for CA
Active opposition by The HSUS and other organizations to the appointment of Howard Don Carper as director of the California Department of Fish and Game was rewarded when the senate committee withheld its confirmation of the former gun shop owner and sport hunting advocate. Mr. Carper’s complete lack of experience in wildlife management, wildlife biology, and government service—and his representation of various arms and ammunition companies—made him totally unacceptable to us as head of the state’s wildlife conservation agency. Mr. Carper had favored former Interior Secretary James Watt’s plans for massive drilling off the California coast and opposed virtually all new wilderness designations.

No new candidate for Mr. Carper’s position has as yet been named.

Pound Seizure Decision
The fate of Sen. David Roberti’s bill to end the practice of pound seizure in California (S.B. 883) should be known by the time this issue of The HSUS News reaches our members.

The West Coast Regional Office will work to keep all the dedicated humanitarians who responded by writing or calling their assemblymen on this important issue.

Great Lakes
Keeping Rodeo Away
Field Investigator Steve Putman presented testimony before the Fort Wayne (Indiana) City Council asking the city to continue its ban on rodeos.

Mr. Putman explained that The HSUS opposes rodeos because they are conducted in ways that inevitably result in injury, pain, torture, fear, and harassment for participating animals.

The Great Lakes office also worked with the Humane Society of Greater Akron (Ohio) in planning an issue warranting against cowboys in a recent rodeo there. Ohio law forbids the use of bucking straps, prodding rods, and other devices commonly used on rodeo animals.

Exoties Restricted?
A bill is pending in Ohio which, if passed, would outlaw or seriously restrict the ownership of dangerous or exotic pets.

In Akron, where a child was killed by her father’s pet tiger, regional director Sandy Rowland testified before city and county officials against exotic pet ownership.

Pound Protest
In December, The HSUS organized a protest as part of our effort to repeal pound seizure in the city of Chicago (see the Winter 1984 HSUS News). Nearly 100 people braved the cold weather to demonstrate against releasing pets from Chicago’s animal-control facility to research institutions. Staff members Dr. John Mcardle, Frantz Danzler, Sandy Rowland, and Steve Putman represented The HSUS.

The rally was held in front of the Chicago Sun Times Building, which houses the office of nationally syndicated columnist Ann Landers. She has publicly supported the practice of pound seizure. In another pound seizure battle, Dr. Mcardle testified in Jackson County, Michigan, in January in support of placing the pound seizure issue on the ballot.

Exotic animals will not shut their doors if pound seizure prohibition passes.

The New England Regional Office focuses on the efforts of HSUS members who, with other individuals and organizations throughout Massachusetts and New England, contribute a great deal of time and energy in support of this bill.

The HSUS supports Vermont’s bill to prohibit pound seizure, H. 191, which was reported favorably out of committee as of our press deadline. Vermont members are encouraged to contact their legislators to enlist their support for this measure.

And, final good news—the governor of Maine signed into law a bill repealing pound seizure in that state on February 23, 1984.
New England (continued)

Signs Do the Trick

Last year, the New Hampshire Fish and Wildlife Department decided to authorize mourning dove hunting, and many Granite State landowners responded in protest by prohibiting any hunting on their land. At that time, the New England office heard from a number of people who wanted to know where they could purchase durable "no hunting" signs for their use. The regional office now has available a lightweight, polyethylene sign at a substantial discount to our members and friends. These signs cost twenty-five cents each and can be purchased directly from the New England Regional Office, P.O. Box 362, East Hadley, CT 06423.

The New Hampshire decision backfired on the pro-hunting contingent, we are pleased to report. So many landowners decided to prohibit hunting on their property that the Fish and Wildlife Department canceled the mourning dove season rather than risk losing even more private land to hunting.

Deer Hunt Canceled

In October of 1983, The HSUS was alerted by two local citizens to the fact that The Trustees of Reservations, a Massachusetts land preservation group, was planning to hold a public deer hunt on one of its preserves, the Richard T. Crane, Jr. Memorial Reservation in Ipswich, Massachusetts.

As a result of these protests, The Trustees canceled the hunt one day before it was scheduled to begin. They have now hired a wildlife biologist as an independent consultant to study the deer. The HSUS will be acting as an advisor to the study as will several other animal-welfare groups including the Massachusetts SPCA and Friends of Animals.

Southeast

Stiffer Fighting Penalties

State Sen. Edgar M. Dunn, Jr., and Rep. Richard Crotty have introduced bills in the Florida legislature to increase the penalties for animal fighting. Under current law, the first degree misdemeanor, to cause the fighting or baiting of bulls, bears, or dogs and a lesser offense to attend such fights as a spectator. The proposed bills would make it a felony offense for any individual convicted of promoting, staging, or attending an animal fight. The pending legislation would also prohibit cockfighting which, until now, has been legal in the state unless specifically banned by county ordinance.

Southeast Regional Director Marc Paulhus helped to draft the bills and enlisted the support of the Florida Sheriffs Association to lobby for their passage. Thanks are due to the sheriffs association and the Orlando Humane Society for arranging the bills’ sponsorship.

Farm Animals Neglected

Complaints of neglected farm animals in rural Cotati, California, were referred to the Southeast Regional Office because the community does not have its own local humane society. Director Paulhus found several horses in need of immediate care and a number of dead dairy cattle. Reports from witnesses revealed that the cattle had died over an extended period of time, presumably from lack of sufficient available pasture.

Six horses were seized as evidence pending the outcome of a civil hearing and criminal trial.

A fool deformed by malnutrition was one of the neglected animals discovered by regional director Marc Paulhus on a Florida farm.

Pound Seizure Hearings

Hillsborough County, Florida, and Gwinnett County, Georgia, are considering whether to continue the sale of shelter animals for research. The county commissioners in both communities have responded to outcries from animal activists opposed to the use of dogs and cats from animal-control facilities, and they have scheduled public hearings to discuss the practice.

The Southeast Regional office is working with other interested groups and individuals to convince the commissioners that pound seizure is unacceptable on both humane and scientific grounds.

Seal Day in Florida

Gov. Bob Graham proclaimed March 1, 1984, as Florida Day of the Seal. To commemorate this occasion, members of The HSUS visited the district offices of Sen. Lewton Chiles and Sen. Paula Hawkins to present petitions urging the U.S. Congress to work for a treaty ending the annual Alaskan fur seal hunt sponsored by the United States.

Southeast (continued)

Tenth Swamp Protest

Despite torrential rainfalls, HSUS staff and members and representatives of other animal-welfare associations were on hand to protest the hunting of deer at the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge in December. Protesters refuted the claim of refuge officials that the hunt is necessary to control the deer population.

Although it seems that the deer hunt will continue, HSUS regional director Nina Austenberg believes that the protest brings the issue to public attention and has been effective in preventing, thus far, further hunting on the refuge.

New York Support Needed

New Yorkers are requested to write to their own state representatives and to The Hon. Stanley Fink, Speaker of the Assembly, urging their support of:

1. A.B. 2047-A, which limits experimentation on live vertebrate animals in elementary and secondary schools, now pending on the assembly floor. Also write to The Hon. James Donovan, Senate Education Committee Chairman, Albany, NY 12247 on behalf of this bill.

2. S.B. 5170-B, which prohibits the transferring of animals from shelters and pounds for experimentation on live vertebrate animals in state. The October meeting, which attracted animal-welfare representatives from throughout the state, was the culmination of many years of effort to prohibit this method of euthanasia.

3. S.B. 7173 and A.B. 5031, which would ban the use of steel-jawed, leghold trap in New York, are before the environmental conservation committee.

Decompression Ban

HSUS Director of Accreditation Lisa Morris testified before the Pennsylvania Senate Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee in support of legislation banning the decompression chamber in that state. The October meeting, which attracted animal-welfare representatives from throughout the state, was the culmination of many years of effort to prohibit this method of euthanasia.

Ms. Morris testified that "The HSUS is strongly opposed to the use of the decompression chamber and, for the past two decades, has been a leader in the movement to outlaw its use. Twenty states, including all of the states surrounding, Pennsylvania, have banned the decompression chambers for euthanasia."

Since that meeting, Pennsylvania has joined those twenty states. The legislation banning decompression chambers allows for the use of carbon monoxide if certain conditions are met and also allows humane societies direct access to the purchase of sodium pentobarbital.
Wolf Suit Won

In January, The HSUS and fourteen other groups achieved a victory for Minnesota wolves—and for all endangered species—when they won a lawsuit against the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) (see the Fall 1983 HSUS News). FWS had issued new regulations that allowed a sport trapping season on and increased killing of gray wolves in Minnesota. Judge Myles Lord declared that the regulations were illegal and the government’s interpretation of the law incorrect. He said both the Endangered Species Act and its legislative history (which reflects the intentions of Congress in passing the act) clearly show that, for endangered and threatened species, the government’s responsibility is to bring the species to a point at which they are no longer considered in danger of, or threatened with, extinction. He found that, while the Secretary of the Interior may allow the controlled killing of some members of a threatened species, he may do so only in “the extraordinary case where population pressures in an ecosystem cannot be otherwise relieved.”

This decision is a great victory for wolves and for any other threatened species for which FWS might have proposed similar regulations.

Reflections on a Tragedy

In late January, television audiences nationwide were exposed to the grim specter of hundreds of horses dying from starvation and disease in Falls County, Texas. There, reportedly up to 20,000 horses had been assembled from various parts of the country by two entrepreneurial horse traders and sold temporarily to a dozen local farmers and ranchers to be fattened. The horse traders were supposed to re-purchase the horses and ship them to slaughterhouses for the European market, but the plan went awry. In early January, the horse traders faced bankruptcy—and claimed to be unable to honor the re-purchase contracts. Some of the harshest weather of the century had descended upon Texas and the horses. Pastures were being grazed bare. The farmers and ranchers ended up the legal owners of livestock in which they had only a temporary, tentative stake and upon which they were reluctant to spend money for feed or veterinary care. The horses, to them, were nothing more than unwanted inventory and overhead costs. The county grand jury and district attorney bailed at pressing cruelty charges, even though it was never clear whether those immediately responsible for the horses’ care did not have the money or simply were just reluctant to spend it. The situation was finally somewhat improved by a combination of better weather, voluntary contributions of money to feed the horses, and the efforts of The HSUS and several other animal-welfare organizations.

The Falls County nightmare is ample proof that artificial concentrations of large numbers of animals created by poorly planned, fast-buck financial schemes are animal-welfare disasters waiting to happen. The underlying economies are too delicately balanced, the normal incentives for taking care of the animals are weak or nonexistent, and the sheer numbers of animals make adequate care difficult to provide should any adverse circumstances arise.

This case is evidence that state cruelty laws generally are not designed to protect livestock to the same extent as other animals. Many state statutes, including that of Texas, punish only “unreasonable” failures to provide essential food and care to these animals. Many prosecutors simply do not see the necessary criminal intent in a situation when those responsible for the livestock, in fact, have the money to spend but choose not to spend it. The disappearance of the economic incentive to feed horses becomes “reasonable”—and therefore excusable—neglect, according to this reasoning.

The HSUS believes that adequate care must be provided to livestock whether it is profitable to do so or not; animals cannot be treated like mere stock—in-trade inventory.

Lab Raided in Florida

On February 17, Tallahassee police, accompanied by HSUS Southeast Regional Director Marc Paulhus, officials from the Leon County Humane Society, two local veterinarians, and Dr. Michael W. Fox, served search warrants upon Florida State University. The warrants authorized searches of a laboratory in the experimental psychology department where several cats were reportedly being deliberately deprived of water as part of an ongoing experiment. The search party entered the laboratory, examined the cats, and seized a large quantity of documents. As this issue of the News was going to press, evidence was being considered to determine whether or not prosecution was warranted under a Florida statute which makes failure to provide sufficient water to confined animals a crime, as well as under the general anti-cruelty statute that outlaws unjustifiable torture or torment.

Assuming that the evidence shows that the cats were being deprived of essential water, the case would present a situation where a scientific procedure is apparently in direct violation of the criminal laws protecting animals. The resulting litigation would be a first step in defining the boundaries between experimental license in the name of science and the right of animals to be free of unnecessary torment.

An HSUS Exclusive: Note Cards from Thaddeus Krumeich

Noted artist Thaddeus Krumeich ("Uncle Ted") has created four unique, colorful cat portraits we have reproduced as note cards for our members and friends. Every package of twelve cards and envelopes includes three each of "Baci's Cabinet," "Chauncey's Toys," "Olive's Chrysanthemums" (reproduced here in color), and "Walter's Other Window" (reproduced on the front cover of this issue of The HSUS News). All are part of Mr. Krumeich's "Little Favorites" series. The note cards are 4½" x 6¼". Mr. Krumeich has generously donated to The HSUS the right to offer these cards in full color—the originals are already collector's items. Order yours now. Each package of twelve cards and envelopes is $5.00.

HSUS Note Card Order Form

Please send me _ boxes of HSUS note cards at $5 per box (three or more boxes are $4.50 each).

I enclose $__________

Send the cards to:
Name __________________________
Address _________________________
City ____________________________ State ________ Zip ______

Make all checks or money orders payable to The HSUS and send this coupon to: HSUS Note Cards, 2100 1 St Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.

Orders will be sent by UPS and must be delivered to a street address.
The ultimate joy of life, after all, is most permanently expressed in relationship. A most meaningful and lasting relationship with animal welfare can be expressed through The HSUS Deferred Giving Program. You can provide assets for The Humane Society, receive continuing income, realize substantial tax benefits, and also realize your goal — help for animals.

In return for a capital investment through our Pooled Income Fund or Annuity Plan, The HSUS will contract to pay you a life income, and the remainder of your gift will then be used for the direct benefit of animals through our programs. For more information (and a fact-filled brochure), write in confidence to:

Paul G. Irwin, Vice President/Treasurer
The Humane Society of the United States
2100 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037

Please send: Will information

Name ____________________________
Address ____________________________
City __________________ State______ Zip________________________

Mail in confidence to: Paul G. Irwin, Vice President/Treasurer,
The Humane Society of the United States, 2100 L Street, NW,
Washington, DC 20037.