Snuggles the Seal: The Toy That Will Help Save Seals
"A Seal for the Seals"

The endearing seal pictured on the front cover of this issue of The Humane Society News is not just one more plush animal toy. Developed by Emotions, the gift division of Mattel, Inc., "Snuggles the Seal" has been created as a symbol of the tens of thousands of seals The HSUS and others have been attempting to save from brutal clubbing and death. In early 1985, Snuggles the Seal will be offered for sale in major department stores and fine gift shops nationwide as the "seal to help the seals."

Each Snuggles the Seal will carry a hang tag identifying it as a symbol of seals worldwide. Purchasers will be encouraged to return a portion of that card to Emotions, which will, in turn, send $1.00 for each Snuggles the Seal purchased to The HSUS in support of our efforts on behalf of the seals.

The creation of this unique and symbolic seal toy by Emotions is especially welcomed by The HSUS at this time. During the past several months we have been waging a major campaign to halt the annual slaughter of the North Pacific fur seal on the U.S. Pribilof Islands. Numerous efforts by The HSUS and others to halt this annual slaughter have been either ignored or rejected by the current administration. As you will read elsewhere in this issue of The Humane Society News, we are now launching a major effort directed at the U.S. Senate in the hope that the current "extended" treaty will not be ratified when the Senate reconvenes early this year. This symbol of those seals destined to be slaughtered this year unless this treaty is terminated is a most welcome addition to our efforts to awaken the conscience of the public to the inexcusable exploitation of these remarkable creatures.

At the same time, Snuggles the Seal will also serve to assist our efforts in seeking a permanent halt to the annual killing of the Canadian harp seals, those baby white coats whose innocence and beauty are reflected in this toy mascot. Though worldwide pressure resulted in a major reduction of the killing of these infant seals, no assurances have been given by the Canadian government that increased killings will not be resumed.

The HSUS wishes to express its sincere appreciation to Emotions and Mattel, Inc., for having joined us in this important endeavor. We also urge your continued support of these initiatives. And, in planning your gift giving this year, remember that Snuggles the Seal is more than a cuddly toy: Snuggles the Seal is a symbol of the right of seals worldwide not to be brutally slaughtered to enhance the vanity of humans.
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Calavares Claims Victory

When James Robello obtained a permit to establish a milk-fed veal operation in rural Calavares County, Calif., he didn't realize the fight he would have on his hands with the local humane society. Rachel Moffett, secretary of the Humane Society of Calavares County (HSCC), first read about Mr. Robello's crate-raised-veal ranch in the newspaper. By that time, the appeal period on his permit had expired, and the planning commission that issued the permit in the first place didn't know enough about humane versus inhumane ways of raising veal to question Mr. Robello's proposed method. Nevertheless, humane society members believed Mr. Robello's operation was inhumane and illegal (confinement without daily exercise in the crate method violates section 597 [t] of the California state penal code). HSCC President Charles Bell immediately wrote to Mr. Robello citing the advantages of the straw-bed system over crate-raising, pointing out violations of state law he could be involved in, and offering assistance to help him to "...reconcile the needs of a profitable business operation with humane treatment of animals." Mr. Robello chose to ignore the letter. Undaunted, the humane society asked for a study session with the planning commission and Mr. Robello and his representatives to settle the matter. Meanwhile, the society hired an attorney, Michael Arkin, to present its case to the commission, and Louise Berne, a state humane officer, prepared the agenda for the meeting and organized volunteers to circulate petitions and make phone calls to ensure a good turnout. As a result, the research and presentation by HSCC at the study session really paid off. HSCC speakers contrasted Mr. Robello's proposed system for crated, milk-fed veal with the more humane group-pen method, while volunteers turned in petitions showing the community's rejection of the crate method.

The coup de grace was delivered by Mr. Arkin, who pointed out that not only could Mr. Robello's permit be revoked but he could also be charged with a misdemeanor, punishable by a $500.00 fine and/or six months in jail, per calf! Mr. Robello quickly concurred that the group-pen method was the best solution. HSCC's victory proves that if you organize your plan of action, do your homework, and know your state and local laws, then, as Rachel Moffett said, "You can win, especially when you know you're right and you have the law behind you."

HSUS Shows at AKC Contest

The American Kennel Club (AKC) dog show that took place in November in Philadelphia, Pa., afforded The HSUS the opportunity to expose the cruelties of puppy mills to the 60,000 people attending the weekend celebration. The HSUS was among the forty-four organizations invited to set up booths in the convention center, where HSUS investigators Bob Baker and Paul Miller and Mid-Atlantic Regional Director Nina Austenberg answered questions, distributed literature, and showed films on inhumane puppy-mill breeding.

"People were shocked and upset," said Bob Baker, "we had a tremendous crowd around our booth asking for more information and offering to help in any way."

A segment of one of the films portrayed Irish wolf hounds in a puppy mill just as, ironically, owners of that same breed were preparing to show them for judging. One owner in particular was outraged by what she saw on film and cried, "We never knew they did this to our Irish wolf hounds!"

Bob Baker remarked, "We were encouraged by the number of local AKC clubs that expressed a real interest in doing something to alleviate puppy-mill atrocities, especially when, historically, the AKC hierarchy has shown little concern or interest in the situation."
NAAHE Director Kathy Savesky introduces Dr. Blaine R. Worthen of Utah State University to the HSUS conference audience. Dr. Worthen spoke on “Teaching Humaneness” on Thursday.

HSUS board member O.J. Ramsey (left), attorney for the defense, questions television star Earl Holliman, on the witness stand testifying on behalf of wildlife, during the HSUS mock trial. The Honorable Edward T. Butler (in robes) and the jury (seated at right) pay close attention to the argument.

New Jersey newspaper columnist Lois Stevenson; and Pacific Street Films, Inc., producers of “Man’s Best Friends,” a PBS “Frontline” program on laboratory animals. The coveted Joseph Wood Krutch Medal was presented to Dr. Dian Fossey for her years of work studying and protecting the mountain gorillas in Rwanda, Africa.

Friday evening, Dr. Fossey and her audience shared moments of genuine emotion during her slide presentation on the mountain gorilla. People were moved to tears as Dr. Fossey described the small band of mountain gorillas with which she had lived at the Karisoke Mt. Gorilla Research Centre and the threats they faced. Dr. Fossey, herself deeply affected, was able to finish her talk only with great difficulty and was rewarded with a standing ovation by the almost 500 people in attendance.

Less heralded than all of these unusual activities but equally important were the conference “nuts and bolts.” Three days of workshop sessions provided participants with the opportunity to absorb the professional and instructive information they have come to expect from the HSUS staff. HSUS board member and Secretary Amy Freeman Lee delivered a stirring keynote address on Thursday, October 25, that brought many in the audience to their feet. The day-long seminar, “Choices and Challenges for Humane Education,”
HSUS Director of Laboratory Animal Welfare John McArdle discusses laboratory animal issues and answers in a workshop.

A San Diego animal-regulation officer holds one of the hundreds of fighting cocks found by sheriff's deputies in multiple raids on Saturday, October 27. Four HSUS investigators took part in the raids.

sponsored on October 24 by The National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education, turned out to be a lively, fast-paced, varied program of workshop and general sessions led by HSUS staff and more than a dozen members of the Western Humane Education Association.

It would be hard to think of anything the 1984 HSUS Annual Conference lacked—unless it was you. If you couldn't come to San Diego last year, don't allow another conference to pass you by. Look for information on the 1985 conference elsewhere in this report and be part of 1985 conference history.

Midwest in October

This year, we will be holding our annual conference in the Chicago area. Plan now to join us at the Hyatt Regency Woodfield in Schaumberg, Illinois, October 16-19, 1985. The next two issues of The HSUS News will include more details.
Each year, those who attend the HSUS annual conference offer and vote upon resolutions proposed for adoption. These resolutions set forth a course of action The HSUS strives to follow during that and subsequent years. Resolutions from previous years remain valid so long as they are appropriate.

Horse-drawn Carriage Operations

Whereas, horse-drawn carriages are used as tourist attractions in many of our nation's cities; and

Whereas, there is frequently a lack of trained drivers and handlers, proper care and equipment for the horses, or protection for them from traffic, heat, cold, and overwork; and

Whereas, there is a rapid expansion of these businesses in major cities throughout the country; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that The HSUS urge that all such operations be regulated by licensing and that stringent standards be adopted and enforced to eliminate the above abuses.

Dogfights and Cockfights

Whereas, dogfighting and cockfighting activity involving the well-organized and professionally conducted fights continues unabated; and

Whereas, our nation now is experiencing a marked increase in the amateur, spontaneous, backyard, basement, and even schoolyard, dog and cockfights; therefore be it

RESOLVED, that The HSUS urge local humane societies and animal control agencies to call this to the attention of their communities and to encourage and assist law enforcement agencies to take all appropriate measures to stop this brutal practice.
Rabies
Whereas, during the past twenty years there has been a dramatic rise in the incidence of rabies among animals nationwide; and
Whereas, many pet owners forego the vaccination of their animals despite the need to contain rabies; and
Whereas, thousands of animals are inhumanely and unnecessarily destroyed in the name of rabies control; therefore be it
RESOLVED, that The HSUS expand its efforts to promote public awareness and to encourage practical and humane approaches to the control of rabies.

Whales
Whereas, the whale is a unique mammal and is a vital part of the marine ecosystem; and
Whereas, the protection of whales is of particular concern to members of The HSUS because of this and because of the cruel methods used to kill these highly sentient mammals; and
Whereas, the International Whaling Commission has passed a moratorium on all commercial whaling to begin with the 1985/86 season; and
Whereas, in 1971, the Congress enacted the Pelly Amendment, giving the president of the United States the right to embargo the fishery products of foreign nations whose nationals have conducted whaling operations that undermine international conservation programs; and
Whereas, in 1979, the Congress enacted the Packwood-Magnuson Amendment, which limits access to the U.S. 200-mile zone by any nation found by the Secretary of Commerce to be in violation of whale conservation programs; and
Whereas, Japan, Norway, and the Soviet Union have filed objections to the International Whaling Commission moratorium, thereby indicating they will not abide by that decision; and
Whereas, major portions of the fishing industry within the nations of Japan, Norway, and the Soviet Union also conduct whaling; therefore be it
RESOLVED, that The HSUS and its members call upon the president and Congress to ensure vigorous enforcement of U.S. laws against any nation thwarting the International Whaling Commission moratorium; and be it
FURTHER RESOLVED, that The HSUS call upon its members to actively boycott fish products from nations that formally object to the International Whaling Commission moratorium on commercial whaling.

North Pacific Fur Seal
Whereas, the North Pacific fur seal population is declining at an alarming rate of eight to ten percent per year; and
Whereas, the North Pacific fur seal population is already less than one-half of its pre-exploitation level; and
Whereas, the North Pacific Fur Seal Commission approved a quota of 22,000 seals in 1984, which is likely to further accelerate the population decline; and
Whereas, the treaty signed by Canada, Japan, the USSR, and the United States which condones this kill comes up for ratification by the U.S. Senate in 1985; and
Whereas, the 700 Aleut natives for whom this kill has been permitted have received, among other things, a $20 million trust fund to develop an economy not dependent upon sealing; and
Whereas, the European Economic Community has already forbidden the importation of some seal products; and
Whereas, the brutal practice of clubbing seals is abhorrent to the members of The HSUS and can not be condoned; therefore be it
RESOLVED, that the members of The HSUS call upon their U.S. senators to reject a renewal of the current fur seal treaty when it is presented for ratification; and be it
FURTHER RESOLVED, that The HSUS work to convince the current members of the North Pacific Fur Seal Commission to negotiate a new treaty that permanently ends the commercial hunt and protects the seals on land as well as on the high seas; and be it
FURTHER RESOLVED, that The HSUS and its members work to eliminate the sealskin market worldwide, including expanding the current European Economic Community ban to include North Pacific fur sealskin products.
The American greyhound, part of that species called "man's best friend," may endure exploitation as a racing animal and a laboratory subject during its short lifetime.

Why We Oppose Greyhound Racing

"There is a revulsion against the wholesale destruction of animals... used as... an economic commodity..."
plus greyhounds. Based on statistics for the first five months of 1984, it appears that 1984's registration will exceed 1983's. It seems likely, therefore, that massive destruction will continue, perhaps in even greater numbers than in prior years. And when one considers that "approximately fifty percent are killed before ever reaching a real track" (according to Richard Kiper, a greyhound trainer in Florida, *St. Petersburg Times*, May 6, 1983) and eighty percent by the age of five years, is it any wonder that there is revulsion at this wholesale destruction of animals viewed as little more than an economic commodity, though they are among that species which long ago was crowned with the title "man's best friend"?

It is only recently that humane societies and the general public have become aware of the degree of this destruction. Until now, the most pointed criticism of greyhound racing has focused on the abuse and suffering experienced by the animals used in training. However, as the picture of the massive destruction of the greyhounds themselves unfolds, including the ways in which they are destroyed or otherwise disposed of, I predict that this issue will replace the "live bait" issue as the number one objection to greyhound racing.

In a conversation with Dr. Harry Sherman (8/31/83), track veterinarian at Plainfield Greyhound Park, Dr. Sherman indicated that the usual method of disposing of unwanted greyhounds was shooting them because that was a cheaper method than paying a veterinarian to inject a lethal dose of a barbiturate. Dr. Sherman said that kennel operators at most tracks usually remove unwanted dogs from the track for destruction, usually by shooting, or send them back to the owner or breeder where they meet the same fate.

Without going into the several reasons why humane societies are strongly opposed to the use of domestic animals, including greyhounds, for research purposes, let me tell you quite unequivocally that nothing will generate greater opposition to greyhound racing where it already exists than to discover that excess or injured and old dogs are becoming the victims of research. The efforts to oppose greyhound racing in this country are minuscule when compared to the enormous and growing efforts to oppose the use of live animals for research purposes, especially domestic animals. And, if greyhound racing hopes to avoid becoming the object of a far greater protest than now exists, it had better avoid completely and without exception the selling or giving of greyhounds to research establishments, which is surely akin to going from the frying pan into the fire.

Finally, let me comment on the stress and injuries to greyhounds resulting from certain training procedures, racing conditions and frequency, as well as their housing and care. While these conditions appear to be somewhat less obvious and, thus, of less concern to the public, they can not and will not be ignored.
by humane societies and concerned individuals. One of the most serious concerns is the high percentage of dogs sustaining injuries during racing.

According to Veterinary Medicine/Small Animal Clinician (August 1983), "Racing greyhounds are prone to a plethora of injuries including skin lacerations, ‘dropped’ and torn muscles, ruptured tendon sheaths, and fractured bones."

Estimates derived from statistics kept by the track veterinarian at Plainfield Greyhound Park indicated that approximately 160 dogs had to be destroyed due to the severity of their racing injuries during a twelve-month period (August 1, 1982—July 31, 1983) at one racetrack.

Dogs with less severe injuries are even less fortunate since they are forced to continue racing despite painful ailments. An unfortunate fate also awaits the permanently crippled dogs that are kept alive, despite painful ailments, for breeding purposes.

Few, if any, persons associated with the humane movement are of the opinion that dog racing in the United States is on its way out in the foreseeable future. But neither do we expect to see it spread to other states or expand to any significant degree in states where it is already approved so long as the abuses and suffering I have addressed today remain. Only as these conditions are changed and improved will humane societies focus their energies and efforts on other, more serious issues and concerns. But under no circumstance, no matter how significant the changes and improvements made, will greyhound racing as now practiced be approved or endorsed by those within the animal-welfare/rights movement. For even if the apparent abuses be removed and the suffering and stress eliminated, there is a developing ethical consciousness within our society and culture that views the exploitation of animals for any nonsensical purpose as wholly inappropriate. Even so, it would appear to be sometime in the very distant future before even the most obvious of cruelties and abuses are mitigated.

ALICE MORGAN WRIGHT—EDITH GOODE FUND TESTAMENTARY TRUST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December 31, 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statement of Assets and Liabilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Corpus 12/31/82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983 Income from Investments—Net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Distribution of 1982 Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Represented by</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Interest Receivable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments—Securities at Book Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance 12/31/83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Statement of Receipts and Disbursements** |
| **Receipts** | $139,342 |
| 1983 Income from Investments—Net |
| **Disbursements** | |
| Grants of 1983 Income to Organizations at Right | $139,342 |

Organizations Receiving Aid From Alice Morgan Wright—Edith Goode Fund 1983 Trust Income

- **Actors and Others for Animals**, Hollywood, California
- **American Fonduek Maintenance Committee, Fes**, Morocco
- **Animal Legal Defense Fund, New York, New York**
- **Animal Protective League, Milwaukee, Wisconsin**
- **Animal Rights Network**, Westport, Connecticut
- **Animals’ Crusaders, Inc., Everett, Washington**
- **Association for the Prevention of Cruelty in Public Spectacles, Barcelona, Spain**
- **Association for the Protection of Furbearing Animals, Vancouver, Canada**
- **Association Uruguaya De Proteccion A Los Animales, Montevideo, Uruguay**
- **Brocke Hospital for Animals (Old Warhorse Memorial Hospital)**, London, England
- **Bund Gegen Den Missbrauch Der Tiere e.V., Munich, Germany**
- **Council for Livestock Protection, New York, New York**
- **Dublin Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Dublin, Ireland**
- **Ferne Animal Sanctuary, London, England**
- **Fund for the Replacement of Animals in Medical Experiments (FRAME)**, Nottingham, England
- **Hardy Jones/Julia Whitty Productions**, Sausalito, California
- **Hellenic Animal Welfare Society, Athens, Greece**
- **Irish Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Dublin, Ireland**
- **Lehigh County Humane Society, Allentown, Pennsylvania**
- **Missouri Anti-Vivisection Society, St. Louis, Missouri**
- **Morristown-Hamblen Humane Society, Morristown, Tennessee**
- **National Equine Defense League, Carlisle, England**
- **Nilgiri Animal Welfare Society (Nilgiri Animal Sanctuary)**, Tamilnadu, South India
- **Nordic Society Against Painful Experiments on Animals (Nordiska Samfundet)**, Stockholm, Sweden
- **Peoples’ Dispensary for Sick Animals, Surrey, England**
- **Performing Animal Welfare Society (PAWS)**, Pacifica, California
- **St. Huberts Giraldus Shelter and Education Center, Madison, New Jersey**
- **Scottish Society for the Prevention of Vivisection, Edinburgh, Scotland**
- **Society for Animal Rights, Inc., (National Catholic Society for Animal Welfare)**, Summit, Pennsylvania
- **South African Federation of SPCA’s and Affiliated Societies, Claremont, Republic of South Africa**
- **The Dight Fund, Rubengi, Rwanda, Africa**
- **Tierschutzverein Fur Berlin Und Umgebung Corp., Berlin, West Germany**
- **World Society for the Protection of Animals, Zurich, Switzerland**
The HSUS Tries Legal Remedies To Combat Genetic Engineering Experiments

by Dr. Michael W. Fox

In a strategy designed to force examination of one of the potentially widest reaching animal issues of our time, The HSUS and the Foundation on Economic Trends recently brought suit against the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). The suit charged that current genetic engineering experiments being conducted jointly by Dr. Ralph Brinster of the University of Pennsylvania Veterinary School and USDA scientists violate federal laws and statutes designed to protect the welfare of domestic animals.

The experiments involve the transferring of a human or bovine gene-regulating growth hormone into pig and sheep embryos which are then inserted into female pigs and sheep. Researchers hope to produce piglets and lambs that will express the human or bovine gene for growth hormone. The objective is to increase dramatically the speed of maturation, height, and weight of these animals. Researchers also hope that these "super animals" (which could grow to twice the normal size of any existing breeds) will permanently incorporate the human gene into their germ line, or hereditary makeup, passing it on to all future generations of their offspring.

The co-plaintiffs contend that the crossing of species' borders between human beings and other animals raises significant moral and ethical questions not yet adequately addressed; poses a grave potential threat to the biological integrity of each species; and represents the potential for a new and insidious form of cruelty toward animals by robbing them of their unique genetic makeup.

Scientists have made (so far) unsubstantiated claims that these super animals would grow more "efficiently" and require less food. This flies in the face of reason. The only savings would be of time, not of precious grain resources. More meat would be produced more quickly. This acceleration of a natural process is, according to several studies, contrary to real progress in developing an ecologically sound regenerative agriculture that entails the production and consumption of less, not more meat.

We believe that by inducing such genetic alterations in animals, scientists will profoundly alter animals' structure and physiology. Since animals so treated would not be genetically or otherwise preadapted to cope with these changes to their bodies, there is a high probability that they would be afflicted with a variety of developmental, structural, and physiological malfunctions and suffer as a consequence. They might, in addition, be susceptible to new diseases which, prior to their recognition, diagnosis, and treatment, would cause additional suffering.

Since the animals' bodies and not their minds are altered by genetic engineering, the specter of their psyches being trapped in an alien body could become a reality.

Scientists have also speculated that they could profitably engineer animals so that they would produce excessive quantities of hormones and other biochemicals that could be extracted from them for various purposes, much in the way horses are kept simply to provide a source of pregnant mare's serum.

If humanitarians agree that it is morally wrong to cross species borders (by putting one or more genes from one species into another), then we must surely oppose the development of a new industry that hopes to attempt to create new animal models of human inherited disorders and genetically related diseases (such as cancer) via genetic engineering that will result in even more animal suffering.

To date, there is no evidence to support the speculations that any of this inter-species gene transference will ever benefit humanity, but you can rest assured that "basic" genetic research on animals will continue until commercially profitable discoveries are made. These will be used as justification for more genetic manipulation of animals.

We must remember that, today, there is no medical or other commercially valid reason to support scientists' claims that such research is necessary and essential. Scientists can only hope that there may be some potential benefits that may research may uncover.

If you feel that all genetic engineering that entails putting one or more genes of one species into another is morally wrong, then contact the National Institutes of Health to express your concerns and demand that all genetic engineering research on animals be prohibited. Write to: Dr. William Gartland, RAC-NIH, Building 31, Room 3, B-10, 9000 Rockville Pike, Bethesda, MD 20205.

Write to the National Institutes of Health if you believe that while there may be some valid medical benefits to be derived from other kinds of genetic engineering research on laboratory animals, it is wrong to turn animals into biomachines for agribusiness and for the medical industry. Urge the National Institutes of Health to set up strict ethical guidelines to ensure that concern for the welfare of animals will be a major constraint upon all genetic engineering research and that the nonmedical application of this biotechnology should be prohibited where animals are concerned.

I would welcome correspondence from HSUS members on this issue.

Dr. Michael W. Fox is scientific director of The HSUS.
RABIES:
An Age-Old Disease Finds New Life

First Part of a Two-Part Series

by Guy R. Hodge

Washington, D.C., is a city seemingly under siege. The invading force threatening the nation’s capital is not an army but a deadly and frightening virus—rabies. It is a disease almost always fatal to man and animal. Despite vaccines and animal-control programs, rabies continues to thrive, not only in Washington, but throughout the country.

Rabies, together with the plague, has a special niche in medical lore. Human fascination with and fear of rabies are attributed to the fact that the disease is incurable. Once a person contracts rabies, there is little that can be done to help him. As one epidemiologist noted, “It’s one of those things for which there is no hope. Once you get it, you have to sit and watch yourself die.”

While rabies is not treatable, it is preventable. A person exposed to rabies can...
undergo a series of inoculations that will protect him from the virus. But few find the fact that there is a vaccine of much comfort. This treatment, which once involved a lengthy series of injections administered in the abdomen, has the reputation for being as painful and frightening as the disease itself.

Washingtonians are scared. Books and films such as Stephen King’s “Cujo,” about a pet Saint Bernard turned murderous monster, foster a misleading image of rabies. The public reacted predictably when newspapers and television reported that Washington residents were required to undergo vaccination after attacks by berserk raccoons and woodchucks diagnosed as rabid. It insisted, unrealistically, that each and every possible carrier of the disease be eradicated. The District of Columbia and neighboring jurisdictions became a battleground in a war on wildlife. Residents took after wild animals with every weapon at their disposal—traps, guns, rakes, poisons, and clubs. Creatures great and small, from chipmunks to mockbirds, were viewed with suspicion. Neighbors formed posses to trap and shoot woodland creatures. In suburban Alexandria, Virginia, a friendly raccoon that for years had been a neighborhood mascot was bludgeoned to death. In Reston, Virginia, golfers chased a young raccoon right onto a resident’s porch and beat the hapless animal to death with clubs.

Animal wardens in the Washington metropolitan area are being kept busy dealing with the hysteria that has accompanied the rabies outbreak. The animal shelter in Fairfax County, Virginia, destroyed and tested approximately 2,000 animals in 1983. Despite a staff of twenty-five wardens, the shelter has had difficulty handling the telephone calls of panicked citizens who insisted that the wild animals on their land be trapped or shot. One woman telephoned tearfully to report a rabbit hopping across her front lawn. A man called at his wife’s urging because he had been feeding squirrels. The public is afraid and insists that action be taken to protect families from raccoons.

Public health and animal-control agencies, under pressure, have resorted to the use of traps, guns, and lethal drugs.

The response of Washington, D.C., residents and municipal officials is an all too familiar scenario. Earlier, in West Virginia, Governor Jay Rockefeller authorized an emergency expenditure of more than $30,000 to trap raccoons. In Arkansas, wardens set fire to fields in an attempt to burn out skunks. Wherever raccoons surfaces, the response is simple and direct—the wholesale execution of stray and wild animals. Ironically, it is an approach which most authorities, such as Dr. John Debbie of the New York State Health Department, consider “an exercise in futility.” The problem, according to Dr. Suzanne Jenkins, a veterinarian with the federal Centers for Disease Control, is that, “There aren’t any good or workable methods of controlling raccoons in wildlife.”

Rabies Today

Following World War II, epidemiologists developed improved strains of rabies vaccines and, in the process, changed the course of rabies in the United States. Historically, the dog had been the primary carrier of rabies in the United States. But, as more dogs were vaccinated against raccoons, their role as a source of infection began to decline. In 1958, for the first time, more cases of raccoons were reported in wild animals than in dogs.

The decline in raccoon cases gave rise to the view that raccoons, like polio, had been conquered by modern medicine. People began to regard rabies control as little more than an excuse to collect revenues by taxing dog owners. What had occurred, however, was not the demise of raccoons as an important infectious disease but a shift in the source of infection. Beginning in 1960, there was an inexorable increase in the number of rabies cases reported in wild animals. Public health officials, however, were not unduly alarmed. Raccoons had always been present in wild animals, and the gradual increase in reported cases might simply have been the result of improved surveillance and diagnosis techniques.

Since 1975, however, there has been a dramatic upswing in the number of raccoon cases reported to health departments. In a seven-year period, the number of reporting states has increased from 21 to 46, and the number of cases reported in wild animals tripled. The raccoon has played a key role in this resurgence. Since World War II, raccoons had occasionally been infected with rabies and, in the mid-1950s, an outbreak of raccoon rabies had occurred in Florida. But these animals were not considered an important source of infection. That changed in 1977, when raccoon rabies appeared in West Virginia. Within three years, raccoons spread through the raccoon populations of Virginia and West Virginia. Public health officials labeled the epidemic the “mid-Atlantic raccoon outbreak” and acknowledged it as the most intensive, widespread outbreak in memory. It has followed a northeastern course, spreading through Virginia, West Virginia, the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania. The mid-Atlantic raccoon outbreak is expected to continue its northward progression. Raccoon rabies could appear in New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and New England during 1985.

The records of the Washington, D.C., health department document the seriousness of the outbreak. In 1968, the District recorded 1 confirmed rabies case, in a bat. For the next fourteen years, the nation’s capital was free from raccoons. Then, in 1982, it logged 5 cases. In 1983, the number grew to 162 cases.

The mid-Atlantic states are not the only region threatened by raccoons. Actually, there are three distinct “epizootics,” as public health officials term full-fledged outbreaks. The other two are centered in the Midwest and Southeast. In 1982, there were 6,278 clinically diagnosed cases of raccoon rabies in animals. Rhode Island and Hawaii were the only states not to report a single case. Nineteen states each recorded more than 100 laboratory-confirmed cases, with Texas and Virginia leading the nation.

Some animal-welfare workers and wildlife rehabilitators remain skeptical about the severity of these raccoon outbreaks. They point out that...
RABIES: An Age-Old Disease Finds New Life

6,278 cases of rabies among millions of domestic and wild animals do not constitute a menace to people or wildlife. But epidemiologists counter that the reported numbers of rabies cases is just the tip of the iceberg. Only a small portion of rabid animals is captured and tested. The statistics collected by public health agencies serve only to indicate trends in the progress of rabies, and they show an unprecedented rise in its incidence in this nation.

What is rabies?

In medical jargon, rabies is an acute infectious disease of the central nervous system. The virus attacks and destroys the brain and spinal cord. The victim suffers from delirium, convulsions, and paralysis. Most warm-blooded animals are susceptible to rabies virus infection and, with rare exception, infection leads to death. The virus is often present in the salivary glands of infected animals and is transmitted through a fresh wound, usually as the result of a bite. Less frequently, rabies is transmitted when saliva contacts a scratch, abrasion, open wound, or mucous membrane. The bite introduces saliva laden with virus into the bloodstream of the victim.

Under favorable conditions, the virus is replicated in the muscle cells at the site of the bite. It then becomes established in the central nervous system and usually moves along the spinal cord to the brain.

Once the rabies virus invades the brain, clinical symptoms of the disease appear. The symptoms often begin with excitation of the central nervous system, expressed as irritability and viciousness. A loss of coordination or paralysis may occur. Painful spasms of the muscles of the throat prevent the victim from swallowing water and are the origin of the disease's medical description, "hydrophobia," or fear of water.

The inability to swallow and the production of saliva also lead to frothing of the mouth—perhaps the best-known symptom of rabies. Another is marked changes in behavior. In the "furious" stage of the disease, the animal may run about attacking anything that moves. But veterinarians caution that symptoms vary from individual to individual as well as from species to species. A variety of animal ailments can mimic the symptoms of rabies. Confusion, irritability, or misbehavior are not reliable indicators of rabies. The presence of the disease can only be confirmed by a laboratory test.

—Centers for Disease Control

This dog displays a common symptom of rabies, frothing of the mouth, indicated by moisture beneath its chin.

Finally, the infection spreads to the glands and is introduced into the saliva of the animals, assuring that the chain of transmission will be continued. In the terminal stage, the victim lapses into a coma. Death often results from respiratory arrest.

Susceptibility to Rabies

Most warm-blooded animals are susceptible to rabies. Some species, however, seem to have a natural resistance to the disease. Rodents—including squirrels and chipmunks—birds, and marsupials (including the oppossum) rarely, if ever, contract the disease.

Animals prone to rabies infection are termed vector species. According to 1982 statistics published by the Centers for Disease Control, the species most commonly infected with rabies, in descending order, are skunks, raccoons, bats, cattle, foxes, cats, and dogs. Skunks accounted for more than half (fifty-six percent) of the reported cases of rabies in wildlife. There has been a significant increase in raccoon rabies (twenty-one percent of all reported cases in 1982). For the second straight year, rabies in cats was more prevalent than in dogs.

The emergence of the raccoon as a leading carrier of rabies troubles public health officials. As a vector species, the raccoon is particularly dangerous to humans. Skunks and bats live apart from man, but raccoons thrive in suburban areas, living in attics and feeding on garbage. The mid-Atlantic raccoons outbreak is the first raccoon epidemic focused in urban communities, thereby creating an unusual risk for human infection.

This unexpected appearance of rabies in an urban area initially perplexed epidemiologists. Raccoon rabies had been common in the Southeast but it was unlikely to have traveled through several states undetected. Although public health officials have not conclusively established the source of the mid-Atlantic outbreak, there is compelling circumstantial evidence to link the epidemic with raccoon hunters. The outbreak apparently had its inception when rabid raccoons were unknowingly included in shipments from commercial wild animal dealers in Florida to hunting clubs in Georgia, Alabama, Virginia, and West Virginia. Wildlife-disease specialists examined eight shipments of raccoons shipped through the Atlanta, Georgia, airport. Raccoons in two of the shipments were found to be rabid.

Incubation of Rabies

Dr. Suzanne Jenkins is quick to admit that "there's still an awful lot we don't know about rabies." One of the mysteries is the incubation period for different species. The amount of time that it takes from bite to onset of symptoms is highly variable, depending on the location of the bite, severity of the wound, amount of virus present in the saliva of the biting animal, and the susceptibility of the victim. The incubation
period may last from several days to more than six months or even a year. A rabid animal usually has virus in its saliva only during the final stages of infection, beginning about the time symptoms appear. During this period, the animal can transmit the disease. Dogs and cats rarely live beyond ten days after the onset of signs.

Quarantine and observation is one of the methods health officials use to detect rabies in biting dogs. It is not possible to diagnose rabies either by observation or physical examination of the patient, but if rabies was transmitted through a bite wound, then evidence would be revealed when the dog developed signs of rabies. If the animal survives in quarantine for ten days, it is unlikely to have rabies and almost certainly did not have the virus in its saliva at the time of the bite. The bite victim is then presumed not to have been exposed to rabies, and both pet and patient can return to normal lives.

In the case of wild animals, there is less certainty about the duration of the infectious stage of rabies. Public health officials contend that they do not know how long to quarantine wild animals or exotic pets. They, therefore, rely on modern laboratory techniques which provide for the rapid and accurate diagnosis of rabies. The presence of rabies can be confirmed by laboratory examination of a specimen from the brain of the biting animal. Unfortunately, this procedure requires that the animal be sacrificed. Yet, throughout the United States, it is standard procedure to order this test performed on exotic pets that bite or scratch people.

Dr. John McArdle, HSUS director of laboratory animal welfare, believes that health officials are overzealous in exercising their authority to order the sacrifice of biting animals. He and other critics point to the great disparity between the number of animals tested for rabies and the small portion of cases in which animals are found actually to harbor the disease. Dr. McArdle likens the attitude of some health officers to that of the

(Continued on page 31)
Time Expires for Fur Seal Treaty, Grows Short for Seals

On October 15, 1984, the North Pacific Fur Seal Convention, allowing the annual seal slaughter on U.S. and Soviet territories, officially expired, according to the terms of the treaty. However, before this happened, the U.S. Departments of State and Commerce had already negotiated with the other signatory countries—Japan, Canada, and the Soviet Union—for a virtually identical treaty!

Indeed, the Department of State has now signed an agreement that would continue the annual seal hunt for the next four years unless we can stop it. This tentative agreement to continue the hunt is not official unless the U.S. Senate votes by a two-thirds majority to continue the treaty. It is, therefore, essential for HSUS members to contact their U.S. senators and urge them to vote against the treaty officially known as the Interim Convention on the Conservation of Fur Seals.

The HSUS and other groups have petitioned the government to list the North Pacific fur seal as a threatened species. At the current rate of decline, the seal population will be cut in half in a mere seven years.

Because many senatorial races were decided in the recent election, there will be several new faces in the Senate and on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that considers all treaties. The most important change of these is the new chairman, Sen. Richard G. Lugar of Indiana. He will play a major role in the fate of the treaty. If you live in Indiana, please contact Sen. Lugar, congratulate him on becoming the new chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and ask him to pledge to work to defeat the fur seal treaty.

When the new Congress convenes this month, the State and Commerce Departments, which administer the fur seal treaty, will submit the new—albeit practically identical—treaty to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. If approved by the committee, the treaty will be put to a vote by the entire Senate. Ratification requires that a two-thirds majority of the Senate vote in favor of the treaty. While this may seem to be a time-consuming process, it is entirely possible for this procedure to take place so quickly that it could be accomplished almost without any outside knowledge, let alone publicity.

That is why it is imperative for everyone to write, call, or visit his or her senators’ offices and urge them to vote against any fur seal treaty that will allow seal hunts on American soil.

The HSUS expects this vote to take place in February or March because the North Pacific Fur Seal Commission will be meeting in Japan in April to determine the 1985 kill quota for the fur seals. If the U.S. Senate does not ratify the treaty, it will expire. The present seal mortality rate would be reduced by eighty percent because commercial slaughter on the U.S. Pribilof Islands would be prohibited.

Please write to: The Honorable Richard G. Lugar, Chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, SD-440 DSOB, Washington, DC 20510.

All other senators may be addressed U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510.

Since March 1 has been officially designated by Congress as National Day of the Seal, The HSUS encourages everyone to plan Seal Day activities for his or her communities. For a Seal Day action packet filled with ideas, send $1.00 to The HSUS, attention Campaigns Department.
Coalition Works to Modify Impact of “Project WILD”

These days, many parents may find that one new academic program is teaching youngsters a utilitarian approach to wildlife management at odds with animal-welfare perspectives. Project WILD, an “environmental and conservation education program emphasizing wildlife” now being introduced in schools throughout the country, purports to instill an understanding of and appreciation for wildlife in youngsters from kindergarten through the twelfth grade. Unfortunately, Project WILD fails to present a balanced view of several key issues.

In November, The HSUS joined forces with The American Humane Association, The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Animal Protection Institute, Fund For Animals, International Fund for Animal Welfare, Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals to oppose the use of public funds for the dissemination of Project WILD materials. These groups fear that the program—which promotes hunting and trapping as necessary, normal, and wholesome activities—could have a negative impact on the minds of schoolchildren. HSUS President John Hoyt issued a joint statement of protest in cooperation with these organizations and, in addition, sent letters on their behalf to all fifty state governors and superintendents of public education, expressing grave concern over the implementation of the program in schools nationwide.

Sponsored in part by the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (which operates primarily on funds derived from hunting and trapping licenses), Project WILD consists of two activity-oriented curriculum guides, one for elementary grades, the other for secondary. Thousands of teachers across the country have already participated in Project WILD workshops, where they have learned how to utilize activity guides and incorporate Project WILD into their classroom curricula. To date, thirty-one states have indicated their intent to sponsor the program, and Project WILD coordinators throughout the United States expect to introduce the new materials to ten million students next year!

The joint position statement issued by the coalition in November states that, while Project WILD appears to be an objective educational tool on the surface, its “…explicit acceptance of animals as resources for human use and the acceptance and support of sport hunting and… trapping as necessary or desirable tools for controlling or manipulating animal populations represent strong biases which permeate much of the document and destroy its credibility as objective educational material.”

Such biases are evidenced throughout the program’s text. For example, Project WILD advocates the management of wildlife as a “public resource” for hunters and trappers and fails to address the ethical considerations associated with killing animals for sport. Project WILD never explains that the primary motivations for hunting and trapping in the United States are recreation and sport but, instead, leads students to believe that these practices are carried out chiefly for necessary management and subsistence purposes.

After reexamining such Project WILD materials, the American Humane Association—an original sponsor of the program—signed the joint statement of protest. The coalition has invited local humane societies opposed to the use of Project WILD in its present form to sign the statement as well and has already received favorable responses from a number of these groups.

While The HSUS and others believe that many of the teaching materials in Project WILD have educational merit, it is the position of these groups that, until balancing materials are developed and distributed in conjunction with Project WILD, no public funds should be used for further purchase, distribution, and/or promotion of this teaching unit. These groups believe that in those states and provinces where the materials have already been purchased and distributed, acceptable balancing materials should be distributed at the earliest possible time and utilized by those teachers currently using the Project WILD guides.

The National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education is currently developing acceptable balancing materials that will be available early this year.

Project WILD personnel have indicated their willingness to review our criticisms but have made no specific commitment regarding alterations of those portions of the current materials. The HSUS and others find extremely biased toward promoting wildlife as a “renewable” resource and hunting, trapping, and lethal predator control as “critically important tools” for modern wildlife management.
Less than two years ago, Jenny Jennings was a clinical psychologist completely unfamiliar with the plight of laboratory animals used to test cosmetics. Then, she saw a brochure produced by a national animal-welfare group that described in detail the suffering endured by hundreds of thousands of rabbits, rats, mice, and other animals to test cosmetics and household products.

Now, Jenny Jennings is president of My Brother’s Keeper, a company that distributes high quality, competitively priced cosmetics, health and beauty aids, and household products, all of which are “cruelty-free.” She advertises her products through a professionally produced catalogue as attractive as any manufactured by Madison Avenue and fills the orders she receives out of her home in Richmond, Indiana.

“I had always supported animal causes, but seeing that pamphlet in 1983 was really a revelation to me,” she says now. “A friend introduced me to the Beauty Without Cruelty line of products soon afterward.” That company had available quality products that had not been tested on animals, but its ads appeared primarily in small publications. It didn’t have the budget to compete with the enormous, sophisticated, costly advertising campaigns waged by glamorous international cosmetic conglomerates. People who wanted to purchase products not tested on animals had to hunt through small ads in health and animal-welfare periodicals for cruelty-free soaps, lipsticks, eye shadows, laundry detergents, perfumes, lotions, and other items. They often had to buy them a few at a time from a limited selection of products, sometimes without adequate information on color, content, or other details. Although animal-welfare proponents could be reached through such a method, Ms. Jennings thought the general public would not be so deter-
the Motto of My Brother’s Keeper

Jenny Jennings, a private psychology practice, she was able to launch My Brother’s Keeper. She studied other cosmetic catalogues and decided in hers to present equally the messages of beauty and of kindness to animals. Through her system of referrals, her list of companies producing cruelty-free products grew. In her first catalogue, over twenty different companies, with names like Body Love, Kiss My Face, Rainbow Research, Golden Lotus, and Autumn Harp, are represented.

Jenny Jennings published her catalogue in May of 1984. She bought mailing lists and spread the word about her project via direct mail. In the course of her promotions, she sent a letter to HSUS President John Hoyt. He was so impressed by her presentation that he proposed that Jenny distribute her catalogue directly to HSUS members. They would respond, he felt, to the opportunity to purchase My Brother’s Keeper products and to prove, in Jenny Jennings’s words, that “Kindness is always first class.”

Nine months after publishing her first catalogue, Jenny is in the midst of boxes in her home, fulfilling orders. She has already added some new products (most notably, a line for people of color) and dreams of adding other products this year (fashions of man-made materials, in particular). She would like to find more outlets for her wares — storefronts, perhaps — and to add to her staff. She knows several retail businesses and at least one other catalogue are attempting to reach the same market.

“Realistically, large companies will never get into this field. I don’t think,” Ms. Jennings says. “It will be up to small, alternative companies like My Brother’s Keeper to offer the public a choice.”

The HSUS is offering you the chance to learn about My Brother’s Keeper. For a full-color catalogue, up-to-date price list, and special informative pamphlet on cruelty in cosmetic testing, fill out the coupon below and send it with $1.00 to The HSUS, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.

Do Something Beautiful—
Buy Cruelty-free Cosmetics

You can receive the My Brother’s Keeper catalogue from The HSUS. Please send a $1.00 check made payable to The HSUS which can be applied toward your first order of $10.00 or more from My Brother’s Keeper.

Name ____________________________
Address ____________________________
Number of catalogues ______ Amount enclosed $ ______

Mail this coupon to My Brother’s Keeper Catalogue, The HSUS, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.

Please note: the catalogue will not be ready for mailing until February 1, 1985.
U.S. State Department Caves In, HSUS Files Lawsuit and Steps Up Fish Boycott

Japan Declares War on Whaling Moratorium

by Patricia Forkan

One of two sperm whales brought in by Nittio Hoge, whaling ship Ryuho Maru, at Wadaura, Chiba, Japan, on November 11, 1984, in violation of IWC quota restrictions.

The United States does have the Packwood-Magnuson amendment, a tough enforcement law which says that any country violating IWC decisions will automatically lose at least fifty percent of its fishing rights within U.S. waters. That spells millions of dollars worth of fish to the Japanese fishing industry.

The Japanese want it all. They want rights to $50 million worth of U.S. fish, plus they want to catch sperm whales—and the U.S. Department of State wants to give it all to them! Secretary of State George P. Shultz and the State Department bureaucrats who advise him have caved in to the Japanese pressure and fought hard to give whales to Japanese whalers! At the same time Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige (who normally makes U.S. whale policy) was holding a tough position in favor of protecting the whales, Sec. Shultz and his underlings at the State Department were demanding, instead, a compromise with the Japanese. Now, Sec. Baldrige has given in.

Beginning November 1, in what turned out to be marathon meetings lasting more than a week, U.S. and Japanese negotiators labored to reach a compromise solution. The so-called compromises under discussion were aimed at allowing the Japanese to continue whaling while ensuring that they would not lose a single fish.

On November 8, The HSUS, along with the American Cetacean Society, Animal Protection Institute of America, Animal Welfare Institute, Center for Environmental Education, Fund For Animals, Greenpeace U.S.A., International Fund for Animal Welfare, and The Whale Center, filed a lawsuit aimed at blocking the U.S. government’s sellout of whales. The lawsuit demands the immediate application of the Packwood-Magnuson sanctions against the Japanese fishing industry, now that illegal whaling has taken place. At press time, we had no word as to what the court will decide.

On November 13, Japanese and U.S. negotiators agreed to a deal which would allow them to kill sperm whales for an additional four years (until 1988) and all other whales two extra years beyond the IWC moratorium date of January, 1986. In return, Japan had to agree officially to stop whaling by withdrawing its objection to the zero sperm whale quota no later than
December 13, 1984, and its objection to the total moratorium no later than April of 1985. Although the U.S. government accepted this agreement, at press time, Japan had not yet done so. If Japan does not withdraw its objections, then the United States says it will invoke the Packwood-Magnuson sanctions no later than the fall of 1985. However, if Japan does withdraw its objections, it gets the extra whaling and no U.S. sanctions.

In the meantime, a fast-growing coalition of animal-welfare groups has joined together to fight the State and Commerce Departments' sellout of whales. If the Japanese win this battle over sperm whales, the whole moratorium will almost certainly fall through as well. At present, many whale quotas, such as that for the endangered sperm whale, are already zero. With the implementation of the total moratorium in January of 1986, all remaining whale quotas will be zero. However, if Japan gets away with ignoring its quota of zero for four additional years, all other whaling countries will undoubtedly want equal treatment.

To combat the Japanese pressure, The HSUS has stepped up its boycott against Japanese fish imports. This action has direct impact on the whaling companies because they are part of the enormous fishing industry in Japan. Some of the biggest fishing companies own the whaling business.

An international action against the Japanese government has been initiated by a coalition of eighteen animal-welfare and environmental organizations around the world.* This action, a large-scale boycott of Japan Air Lines (JAL), will be launched on January 1, 1985, unless Japan agrees to end its illegal sperm whaling immediately and abide by the total moratorium in 1986.

In a letter from the coalition to the president of JAL, it was pointed out that JAL was targeted because the Japanese government is the major stockholder in Japan Air Lines. Ask them to use other airlines. In North America, for example, there are JAL flights originating in or going to Chicago, Honolulu, Los Angeles, New York, San Francisco, Seattle, and Vancouver, as well as to Japan.

* Don't Fly Japan Air Lines

Don't contact your travel agents and ask them to explain the pirate whaling situation to their customers and that the Japanese government is the major stockholder in Japan Air Lines. Ask them to use other airlines. In North America, for example, there are JAL flights originating in or going to Chicago, Honolulu, Los Angeles, New York, San Francisco, Seattle, and Vancouver, as well as to Japan.

* Conduct a peaceful and lawful rally outside the JAL office in your city.

Boycott Japanese Fish Imports

The HSUS has asked its members to refrain from buying Japanese fish over the past year. It is not always easy to determine country of origin but many products are clearly labeled. Send for the HSUS list of Japanese (and other whaling nations') fish companies and their products.

Of particular concern to us now is a new product the Japanese fishing industry is promoting in the United States. It is a specially processed fish paste called surimi.

This fish paste is marketed as imitation shrimp, scallops, crab legs, lobster, and other types of shellfish. It is then sold as "simulated" items called Sea Shapes, Shrimpees, Sea Bites, Sea-Stix, Sea Tails, etc. Surimi is much cheaper than the real thing.

The Japanese plan to vastly increase their surimi imports into the United States. We must stop these imports. The HSUS will work with Congress next year to put heavy import tariffs on this product. You can help by not buying surimi. Be sure to let your supermarkets, specialty fish markets, and restaurants know why. Write letters to the editors of your local newspapers explaining what the Japanese pirate whalers are doing and why we are boycotting their fish.

* Write to the Japanese ambassador to the United States. Tell him that you are boycotting Japanese fish, especially surimi, and Japan Air Lines until Japan stops killing whales.

Ambassador Yoshio Okawara
Embassy of Japan
2520 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20008

---

*Aktion Radda Valarna (Sweden); Animal Protection Institute of America; Animal Welfare Institute; Center for Environmental Education; Centrum for Studier av Valar och Delfiner (Norway, Sweden); Comite D’Action pour la Defense des Animaux en Peril (Switzerland); Faltbiologerne (Sweden); Fremtiden I Vaera Hander (Sweden); Friends of the Earth, Ltd; Greenpeace International; The HSUS International Fund for Animal Welfare; Natur Og Ungdom (Denmark); Nordiska Smfundet mot Plagsamme Djurforsok (Sweden); Norsk Lega for Dyre Rettigheter (Norway); World Society for the Protection of Animals.

---
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Taking Humane Concerns to College

by Randall Lockwood, Ph.D.

Traditionally, most humane education activities have been aimed at young children. Obviously, this is where we have to begin. This is the age at which the most basic attitudes toward animals are formed. The teaching of kindness to animals clearly promotes a positive attitude toward all life. Conversely, unpleasant or misguided experiences with animals in these formative years can have life-long consequences. While childhood is the most sensitive period for shaping these attitudes, it is becoming clear that we cannot stop there.

In ten years of teaching university courses in animal behavior, human psychology, and human-animal relationships, I often came across students, particularly those raised in cities, who had never given much thought to the needs, feelings, and rights of animals. For many of them, animals were just part of the background of life, unthinking and unfeeling. Quite often, I found that introducing these people to the basic concepts of humane education could open up all kinds of fascinating windows on the world. On the other hand, it was common to find students with strong love and understanding of animals who found themselves in classes where they were under enormous pressure to treat animals in ways they found objectionable. These students felt that they must either abandon the empathy and sensitivity they had learned as children or give up their goals of becoming doctors, nurses, veterinarians, or scientists. This common conflict is often a source of great distress and anguish to students. It can drive them away from a field where their talents and sensitivity are sorely needed or, perhaps worse, it can cause them to build a shield of callousness and insensitivity so that they may take their places beside desensitized colleagues.

The creation of a division of The HSUS devoted to higher education programs is a natural and necessary extension of our interest in humane education and our desire to foster a humane ethic among as many people as possible. The college years provide young people with unique opportunities to experiment with new philosophies, attitudes, and lifestyles. These years provide many students with their first exposure to concepts of animal rights, animal welfare, reverence for life, humane stewardship of the environment, and other new attitudes towards the relationship between humans and animals. These new ideas are often discovered at a time when young people are making key choices about careers, companions, and personal ethics. We want to be available to these people to help them develop or preserve a humane ethic as they go through this challenging period of their lives.

While university life provides rich opportunities to discover humane values, it also provides some serious dilemmas for those who care about animals. According to the National Academy of Sciences, an estimated three million animals are used in college-level instruction each year. Most of these are rats, mice, and frogs, the raw materials of undergraduate instruction in biology and psychology, but these numbers also reflect cats, dogs, pigs, and other animals routinely incorporated into laboratory exercises. Additional tens of millions of animals are consumed by faculty and graduate student research at universities.

Not all animal suffering on campuses takes place in the laboratories and classrooms. People often abandon dogs and cats near colleges, hoping that the animals will find sympathetic owners. All too often, students themselves leave the dorm cat to fend for itself when they return home for the summer. Campuses can also be the scene of entertainments, such as rodeos, races, and turkey shoots, that use animals in exploitative and inhumane ways. Concerned students can play an important role in identifying and correcting such problems.

The HSUS's higher education division will be trying to deal with all of these issues. Our basic objectives are:

- To raise the general awareness of humane issues on college campuses through publications, lectures, and other events
- To act as a reliable source of information on humane issues for concerned students and faculty
- To bring about specific changes in curricula, including helping students and faculty to establish courses in animal rights and animal welfare and providing support for the reform of existing programs that use animals in an inhumane fashion
- To investigate and follow up on specific issues involving the treatment of animals at academic institutions
- To provide guidance to students who wish to pursue a life-style that allows them to express their ethical concerns for the welfare of animals.

Today’s college students are more conservative, pragmatic, and career-oriented than those of the '60s and '70s. This doesn’t mean that they are unconcerned with animal welfare. Animal-rights issues have flared up dramatically on some campuses, most notably in California. The University of California’s history of flag-
routine violation of standards of laboratory animal care has led to numerous protests, including an August, 1984, sit-in at U.C. Davis that resulted in twenty-six arrests. Although animal rights may be a new issue on many campuses, it should not be looked on as either a radical cause or passing fad. Questions of ethics and our place in nature are as old as philosophy itself, yet as contemporary as today’s headlines. The questions that are being raised about the treatment of animals are not peripheral to student interests, rather, they are deeply intertwined with them. Today’s students of psychology, biology, medicine, agriculture, law, philosophy, religion, and business will all be faced with issues involving animals.

What will the higher education division be doing in the months ahead? We would like to make connections with as many campus organizations as possible. I welcome the opportunity to meet and speak with any group of students and faculty concerned about animals.

To reach an even broader audience, we have begun work on an HSUS student handbook. The handbook will address the issues most frequently raised by college students. It will provide concrete examples of the many things that students can do to improve the treatment of animals. Here are a few examples of the topics that will be included:

- The treatment of animals in classroom instruction. Many of the uses of animals in courses in biology and psychology are redundant and inhumane. Students are frequently under pressure from faculty and peers to treat animals in ways that they feel are cruel. The handbook will review the steps that can be taken to have alternatives accepted by faculty and administration.
- The treatment of animals in faculty research. Students are very concerned about the source and care of animals used in university research. Frequently, they are the ones who must deal with these animals on a daily basis. We will describe how to find out what is going on and how to improve the care of animals on campus.
- Career opportunities. We will review the growing number of fields that involve working for and with animals and the kind of college background that is appropriate.
- Volunteer opportunities. For many students, experiences with volunteer organizations lead to new friends, concerns, and career options. We will give examples of the many ways in which students can work with animals as volunteers with animal shelters, pet-facilitated therapy programs, ethological field studies, and others.
- New courses. Classes dealing with animal rights, animal welfare, and the human-animal bond are cropping up at campuses all over the country. We will offer suggestions on how to get such courses going and keep them going.
- Pets and wildlife on campus. We will look at some of the ways that students can be effective in improving campus environments and ensuring that pets, mascots, and other animals are treated humanely.
- Local action. Students can play an important role in identifying local issues and getting something done. This can involve discovering institutions in the area that may be involved in inhumane treatment of animals (such as roadside zoos and puppy mills) or local events that might involve animal cruelty (for example, science fairs or animal exhibitions).
- Humane lifestyle. This section of the handbook will provide information on identifying which products and companies are having an impact on the well-being of animals. It will also describe the steps students can take to avoid having to compromise their ethical beliefs while living on campus, including how to set up vegetarian alternatives to mandatory school meal plans.

The higher education program will support and promote courses in animal rights, animal welfare, and the human-animal bond by providing suggested course and lecture outlines, annotated bibliographies, resource lists, and information on suggested projects, speakers, and activities. We will provide general background as well as specific information tailored to such areas as psychology, biology, veterinary medicine, and law.

There are many forces that can lead people away from the kindness they learn as children. Humane education has to continue throughout one’s entire life. That is the goal of our higher education programs. We look forward to the challenging times ahead.

Randall Lockwood is director of higher education programs for The HSUS.
Animal-Research Dealer Arrested for Cruelty

A snarling dog stands over one of the half-eaten carcasses of dead dogs found at Henry Knudsen's Animal Laboratory Service site in Lathrop, California.

When deputies of the San Joaquin County sheriff's department responded to complaints of "noise and stench" at Knudsen's Animal Laboratory Service in Lathrop, California, on November 1, 1984, what they discovered was a scene of horror—eighteen dead dogs, an equal number of dead cats, and eighty-eight starving animals, some feeding on the decaying remains of dead companions.

Animal Laboratory Service owner Henry "Bud" Knudsen was subsequently arrested on 124 charges of cruelty to animals, one count for each of the animals found at his premises. He was later released from the San Joaquin county jail after he posted a bond for the $31,000 bail.

One sheriff's detective described the Knudsen property as "one of the most completely disgusting situations" he had ever seen, according to newspaper reports. All of the surviving animals were seized in place, and animal-control officers spent the entire day cleaning pens and feeding the emaciated dogs and cats while investigators photographed and videotaped the animals and the compound for evidence.

According to United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) officials, Mr. Knudsen is the only operator in California currently licensed by the federal government to supply research laboratories with dogs and cats obtained from county or municipal animal-control agencies that continue to allow the release of impounded animals for research.

On November 2, a court order was obtained for the removal of all the animals, and they were taken to the animal-control facility in Stockton. The Delta-Stockton Humane Society offered to house twenty of the dogs to help reduce the burden on the facility. Earlier that same day, West Coast Regional Investigator Eric Sakach met with USDA officials to obtain inspection records on the Knudsen facility, and West Coast Regional Director Char Drennon made a formal request for the agency to revoke Mr. Knudsen's animal-dealer license. She also asked the San Joaquin County district attorney to pursue the case vigorously.

San Joaquin County sheriff's deputies had previously arrested Mr. Knudsen and four others in July of 1983 in an alleged scheme to obtain dogs from pet owners under false pretenses. Two of Mr. Knudsen's codefendants eventually served jail time, but Mr. Knudsen was acquitted by the jury on charges of receiv-
ing stolen property. The USDA did not feel there was sufficient evidence to revoke his license and his animals were returned to him. Although USDA officials advised Ms. Drennon within a matter of hours of the November seizure that they were suspending Mr. Knudsen's license for twenty-one days, it was learned that Mr. Knudsen had already voluntarily surrendered his license. This tactic left open the possibility of his reapplying to USDA at some point in the future. Ms. Drennon, therefore, urged the USDA to press its pending case as quickly as possible to prevent this from happening.

Prior to Mr. Knudsen's arraignment on November 13, 1984, the West Coast Regional Office learned that the 124 counts of animal cruelty against him had been reduced to four: one for the dead dogs, one for the remaining live dogs, one for the dead cats, and one for the remaining live cats. Complaining to the district attorney about his move to Texas, 124 counts of animal cruelty were returned to him. Although Mr. Knudsen's property have already been in contact with a number of local humane societies, including the Marin Humane Society, the Peninsula Humane Society, the Oakland SPCA, the Humane Society of Santa Clara Valley, the Santa Cruz SPCA, and the Monterey County SPCA, and that each of the agencies had offered to help place a portion of the animals. Mr. Knudsen's trial was set for January 8, 1985, in Manteca Municipal Court.

The HSUS has received information verifying that Mr. Knudsen sold animals to Stanford University, Travis Air Force Base, the U.S. Naval Hospital in San Diego, St. Mary's Hospital in San Francisco, Cutter Laboratories in Berkeley, and the University of Nevada at Reno in 1984.

These are some of the same institutions that have claimed federal laws, National Institutes of Health guidelines, and/or accreditation of the American Association for Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care make them closely watch all animal research. During recent hearings on the California bill to stop pound seizure and the importation of random-source animals, research institutions and universities claimed pets don't end up in research labs. Over the years, virtually every research institution, including the University of California at Davis, San Diego, and Los Angeles, has purchased animals at some time from Henry Knudsen. If the bill prohibiting pound seizure in California sponsored by State Sen. David Roberti had been passed last year, the Knudsen catastrophe would not have happened.

---

**Reflect for a moment...**

**how can I help animals even when I no longer share their world...?**

By your bequest for animal protection to The Humane Society of the United States.

Your will can provide for animals after you're gone.

Naming The HSUS demonstrates your lasting commitment to animal welfare and strengthens the Society for this task.

We will be happy to send information about our animal programs and material which will assist in planning a will.

---

Please send: Will information

Name ________________________________

Address ________________________________

City __________________ State ______ Zip _______

Mail in confidence to: Murdaugh S. Madden, Vice President/General Counsel, The Humane Society of the United States, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.
Legislative Note

With the end of the ninety-eighth Congress in October came the termination of all legislation introduced during that session but not passed into law. Bills must be reintroduced in the ninety-ninth Congress and will be assigned new numbers. The HSUS News will report newly introduced and newly numbered bills designed to protect the interests of animals in future issues.

Please continue to show your support for animal-protection legislation by writing to your senators and representatives, requesting that they introduce and cosponsor necessary animal-welfare legislation when the ninety-ninth Congress convenes this month. This is especially important if your state and/or district has elected a new congressional official. Write to incoming representatives and senators, impressing upon them the urgent need for legislation that protects the well-being of animals.

National Park Bill Stopped

In September, hearings were held on a bill (H.R. 2122) to legalize trapping in the Ozark National Scenic Riverway. This bill, one of several introduced in the last Congress to allow trapping in some units of the National Park System, seemed to have a good chance for success. The HSUS quickly joined with the National Parks and Conservation Association and Defenders of Wildlife to stop the bill. HSUS Staff Biologist Jennifer Lewis presented strong testimony against it at the hearing, citing the extreme cruelty of trapping, the long-standing protective policies of the National Park Service, and the prohibition against using park resources for private commercial gain. She also refuted trappers’ arguments that trapping was needed for population and disease control and presented evidence on the nonselectivity of traps. Our efforts paid off and the bill was not passed.

Kangaroo Ban Denied

In September, The HSUS and the Kangaroo Protection Foundation filed a petition at the Interior Department to reimpose a ban on the importation of kangaroos and kangaroo products. Citing the drought in Australia, which has resulted in a drastic decline of kangaroo populations, we urged the Interior Department to impose an immediate emergency ban on imports and promptly institute proceedings to ban imports permanently.

In October, the Interior Department refused to institute a ban, saying that kangaroos are still very abundant and need to be culled to prevent local people from killing them illegally and that Australia is reducing kangaroo take in areas where populations are reduced. While we are disappointed in this decision, we will continue to work for the protection of these animals.

Good-bye

With sadness, The HSUS says good-bye to these special members of Congress who were defeated in the November elections. We will sorely miss them.

- Sen. Charles H. Percy of Illinois, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which will consider the fur seal treaty. Sen. Percy had urged that the United States not renegotiate another treaty to kill fur seals.
- Rep. Clarence D. Long of Maryland, longtime sponsor of H.R. 1797, legislation to ban the steeljaw leghold trap. Rep. Long was an eloquent spokesman against the leghold trap.
- Rep. Bill Ratchford of Connecticut, member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior. We could always count on help and support from Rep. Ratchford, a real friend of animals in Congress.

Thank You!

The HSUS extends warm appreciation to the following members of Congress for their efforts to help animals in the final frantic days before the adjournment of the ninety-eighth Congress:

- Sen. Thomas Eagleton of Missouri, for offering an amendment to fiscal year 1985’s continuing resolution (special appropriations bill) to remove $20 million earmarked for the roundup and removal of 35,000 wild horses and burros. The Eagleton amendment was defeated.
- Rep. Bill Green of New York, for successfully offering an amendment to the Manpower Act which would allow federal funding to train laboratory animal personnel in the areas of care, use, and alternatives.
- Sen. Bob Packwood of Oregon, for working tirelessly to help stop the killing of whales and repeatedly calling upon the Reagan administration to enforce our laws against Japanese pirate whalers.
- Rep. Larry Smith of Florida, for sponsoring and enthusiastically supporting a successful amendment to the Department of the Interior appropriations bill to ban funds for the deer hunt at Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge.
Wild Horse Plight Worsened

Animals suffered their greatest injury at the hands of the ninety-eighth Congress during the final days and late nights when the House–Senate conference on a special appropriations bill added $16,739,000 to round up and remove 17,142 wild horses and burros from our nation's public lands. That number constitutes more than thirty-five percent of the total population.

The removal and inevitable slaughter of these animals represent an unprecedented congressional victory by the livestock industry in its attempts to wipe out wild horses and burros so that more cattle and sheep can graze on public lands.

This money, which was added to the senate version of the bill, is three times more than the amount Congress has ever appropriated in a single year for the wild horse program. Since the money is earmarked for roundup and removal, this appropriation virtually eliminates any protection for the animals included under the 1971 Free-Roaming Wild Horse and Burro Act.

Sen. James A. McClure of Idaho had been unsuccessful in bringing S. 457, which authorizes the roundup and sale of 10,500 wild horses to slaughter, to the senate floor. However, as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, Sen. McClure added the extra money without ever having the authorizing legislation passed.

Sen. Thomas F. Eagleton of Missouri, a longtime friend of wild horses, introduced an amendment to delete the McClure appropriation, planning to agree in conference to the $500,000 the House had added to last year's budget simply to feed those horses already rounded up and waiting for adoption.

However, while the legislation was in the senate committee, western senators bandied together, complaining that the American public “owned” far too much land in their states. After heated argument, the Eagleton amendment was defeated, seventeen to eleven.

The HSUS and other groups then took the fight to the House–Senate conference which met to work out differences between the two appropriations bills. Sen. McClure prevailed here, as well.

Now, more than 17,000 wild horses are condemned to endure cruel helicopter roundups, languish in the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) holding pens and, if the Idaho legislator has his way, be sold at auction to slaughterhouses.

Since the BLM puts very little effort into its Adopt-A-Horse program, humane organizations must now be on the lookout for these roundups and may be obligated to find homes for the animals captured.

Our government is spending almost seventeen million tax dollars to conduct this shameful subsidy of the livestock industry.

The HSUS will be needing your help to keep Sen. McClure and others from rushing through Congress very early in the session legislation authorizing sale of wild horses to slaughterhouses.

Please write your senators and urge them to oppose any legislation that would send wild horses to slaughter or that would appropriate funds for a similar roundup in fiscal year 1986.

Vetoed: Lab Animal Protection

On October 30, President Reagan vetoed legislation that would have established the first federal protection for laboratory animals since the Animal Welfare Act (AWA) was amended in 1970.

Provisions to improve protection for laboratory animals were part of two bills—the authorization for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the Manpower Act. The vetoes, which NIH recommended and supported, mean that the HSUS department of legislation must now start all over again; the entire legislative process must be repeated in the House and Senate.

The NIH authorization contained provisions, introduced by Rep. Doug Walgren of Pennsylvania, to improve protection for animals used in research. The provisions mandated that each federally funded research center have a functioning animal-research committee whose members include at least one outside member concerned with humane aspects of the research and a veterinarian. In addition, personnel involved with laboratory animals would have to have training available to them in both care of and alternatives to the use of animals. This would include members of the animal-re-search (continued)
Lab Animal Protection (continued)

search committees as well as laboratory technicians and personnel.

President Reagan said he vetoed the NIH authorization because it was too expensive and mandated "overly specific requirements for the management of research." *The Washington Post* cited the laboratory animals provisions as one of the major reasons for the Reagan veto.

Also killed by veto was the Manpower Act, which extends medical loan programs and provides funding for community health centers for the poor. A major step was taken for laboratory animals when Congress approved an amendment, by Rep. Bill Green of New York, to establish, for the first time, the field of laboratory animal care, use, and alternatives as an important area of training eligible for federal funding.

The Green amendment authorized schools of veterinary medicine to compete for funding made available through the Manpower Act for curriculum development and training of personnel dealing with laboratory animals. Thus, it would have allowed veterinary schools to provide the training mandated by the Walgren provisions in the NIH authorization.

Because Congress had already adjourned, it had no opportunity to override the vetoes. However, The HSUS expects it to reconsider both bills very early in the session.

The HSUS will be trying to strengthen the Walgren provisions and will seek an amendment prohibiting the use of pound animals in federally funded research projects.

Key chairmen and ranking members to contact in support of strengthening language are:

*In the House*

Rep. Henry A. Waxman
Chairman
Subcommittee on Health and the Environment
2415 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

*In the Senate*

Sen. Orrin G. Hatch
Chairman
Committee on Labor and Human Resources
428 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy
Ranking Minority Member
(subcommittee and address above)

The HSUS expects it to reconsider both bills very early in the session.

All members of Congress can be reached by writing:

*In the House*

The Honorable
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

*In the Senate*

The Honorable
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510

Congressional switchboard:
(202) 224-3121

Arnett Resigns

Great news for wildlife! G. Ray Arnett, assistant secretary for fish, wildlife, and parks in the Interior Department, has resigned. The HSUS was the first organization to call publicly for Mr. Arnett's resignation, citing his destructive policies towards our nation's wildlife, refuges, and national parks. In strongly-worded letters sent to Interior Secretary William Clark and Congress last spring, HSUS President John Hoyt and John Grandy, vice president for wildlife and environment, pointed out Mr. Arnett's many failings and urged his dismissal. They cited his opening of many national wildlife refuges to hunting and trapping; his attempt to open refuges to more commercial uses, such as timber cutting and mining; his destructive predator-control policies, including use of the once-banned and dangerous poison 1080; his reluctance to implement a ban on illegal trapping in the National Park System; his attempt to open a sport trapping season on the threatened timber wolf of Minnesota; and his consistent refusal to ban lead shot, which poisons millions of waterfowl every year. The deaths of a critically endangered California condor and a critically endangered whooping crane in late 1983 and early 1984 can be laid at the door of Interior's policies on predator control and lead shot, respectively, policies which Mr. Arnett oversaw (see the Spring 1984 *HSUS News*).

Once The HSUS spoke out about Mr. Arnett, other organizations joined the fray. Many local humane societies and conservation and environmental organizations wrote to members of Congress and Sec. Clark of their dissatisfaction with the assistant secretary. It took some time but, clearly, these protests have had their effect. Happily, the strongly pro-hunting, pro-trapping Mr. Arnett will no longer be pushing his destructive policies towards America's wildlife.
Rabies
(Continued from page 17)

Red Queen in “Alice in Wonderland” whose favorite expression was “Off with their heads.” He has intervened in three recent cases in which monkeys and a baboon received death sentences after biting people. Dr. McArdle found that, “in each case, the animal bit in self defense because the people involved struck or did not properly handle it.” In the case of the baboon, he discovered that there was only a one-in-six-billion chance the animal had rabies, but that risk was unacceptable to a public health officer. The baboon won a last-minute reprieve from a district court judge who was informed by Dr. McArdle that there has never been a confirmed case of rabies in a nonhuman primate in the United States.

Dr. McArdle remarked that “while The HSUS does not approve of the keeping of exotic pets, neither do we endorse their systematic slaughter for acts of self-defense. It’s a shame that mankind has never outgrown its medieval fear of rabies, and public health officials have not outgrown their prejudices against biting animals.” He and other critics advocate a more reasoned approach to biting animal cases, one which considers risk and provocation in assessing the need to test animals for rabies.

Public health officers may soon be relieved of this dilemma, thanks to the work of Dr. Donald Blenden, a professor at the University of Missouri College of Veterinary Medicine. Dr. Blenden has pioneered the development of a technique for diagnosing rabies in a living animal. In a rabid animal, the rabies antigen is found in the nerves of the skin. The hairs of an animal’s muzzle are richly supplied with such nerves. Through the examination of a skin-biopsy specimen, Dr. Blenden can detect the presence of the rabies virus. He is presently raising funds for a national testing laboratory that will specialize in the skin-biopsy technique.

This technique has not yet gained the enthusiastic approval of public health officials. They fear that the biopsy specimen is not so sensitive as brain tissue and, therefore, not so reliable in detecting the presence of rabies. A negative test result does not remove all shadow of doubt that the animal is free from rabies. Dr. Blenden responds that no test is one-hundred-percent reliable and ambiguous test results occasionally occur even with brain examinations. He classifies the skin biopsy as a supplemental tool that can materially reduce the killing of animals for rabies risk assessment.

Treatment for Exposure
Rabies in humans is rare, but possible exposures occur frequently. Even though rabies occurs most commonly in wildlife, the main public health threat comes from dogs, cats, and cattle. Most of the potential human exposures to rabies occur as a result of bites and scratches inflicted by domestic animals.

Each year in the United States, approximately 25,000 to 30,000 people are treated for exposure to rabid animals or animals that might be rabid—especially stray dogs that escape after biting.

In the second part of this article, which will appear in the Spring 1985 issue of The HSUS News, Guy Hodge discusses treatment for exposure to rabies, the trapping controversy, and rabies control.

Guy R. Hodge is director of data and information services for The HSUS and an acknowledged expert on rabies control.

Victory at Loxahatchee

Good news for the deer at Florida’s Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge—no hunt will take place this fall! The amendment prohibiting the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) from spending any money on this year’s hunt, inserted in the Department of the Interior’s appropriation bill by Florida’s Rep. Larry Smith, passed in early October. Congressman Smith’s and his staff’s tireless efforts on the amendment’s behalf were key to its success.

The Florida Coalition to Protect Loxahatchee Refuge, formed in August, was instrumental in generating public support for the amendment and expressing that support to Congress. The HSUS, the Broward Sierra Club, Florida Federation of Humane Societies, and the Everglades Audubon Society were leading members of this coalition of fourteen groups.

While the amendment canceled the 1984 hunt and may also cancel any hunt FWS might plan in 1985, it does not ban hunting outright. We’ll keep a close eye on the situation, but we think it is unlikely FWS will try to hold another Loxahatchee deer hunt because of the massive public opposition sure to result.

The Florida Coalition to Protect Loxahatchee Refuge, formed in August, approached the Dayton, Ohio, Representative Larry Smith to emphasize the need to test animals for rabies.

Guy R. Hodge is director of data and information services for The HSUS and an acknowledged expert on rabies control.
Institute Completes Active Year

The final months of 1984 were very demanding ones for The HSUS's Institute for the Study of Animal Problems. The HSUS's suit against the United States Department of Agriculture to stop researchers from putting human genes into pig and sheep embryos (see p. 13) drew international media attention.

Institute Research Associate Linda Mickley completed the final editing of the new annual textbook, Advances in Animal Welfare Science (see ad on back cover), published by The HSUS in paperback at a special discount for all animal-welfare and -rights organizations and HSUS members. A hardback edition for the academic community will be brought out this spring by Martinus Nijhoff of Holland, an internationally known publisher of scholarly texts in medicine, science, and philosophy.

The Institute's director, Dr. Michael Fox, gave keynote addresses at the annual conferences of humane societies in Louisville, Kentucky, Greensboro, North Carolina, and Urbana, Illinois, and at those of the New York Outdoor Recreation Association and the Attorneys for Animal Rights.

NAAHE Publishes New Materials

Does the Idea of Dissecting or Experimenting on Animals in Biology Class Disturb You? is the name of one of the two new informational brochures released this fall by the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE). Designed to promote a humane approach to biology studies, the brochures are based on The HSUS's newly expanded "Guidelines for the Study of Animals in Elementary and Secondary School Biology."

The first of the new brochures is written for young people who care about animals and do not want to participate in classroom dissection activities or lessons that involve causing pain or stress to animals. The brochure provides support for the students' position; advice for working within school channels to obtain an alternative assignment; lists of resources for humane biology projects and teaching materials; and a centerfold poster of the new HSUS guidelines.

The second brochure, The Living Science: A Humane Approach to the Study of Animals in Elementary and Secondary School Biology, is written for teachers. It defines the objective of elementary and secondary school biology as developing "an appreciation for the uniqueness of each individual organism, the connections between living things, and the relationship of each individual to its environment," then points out the inconsistencies between this objective and activities that require dissection or manipulation of animals and their environment. The brochure discusses both the ethical concerns associated with dissection and invasive experiments and the potential negative impact on the students involved. Resources are provided for alternative projects and teaching materials.

The new HSUS guidelines, written with assistance from the HSUS laboratory animal welfare department, expand earlier prohibitions on invasive experiments on live animals to include prohibitions on dissection. They address as well prerequisites for bringing a live animal into the classroom, appropriate and inappropriate species to be used, and standards for care.

NAAHE is encouraging local animal-welfare organizations, teachers, parents, and concerned individuals to distribute the brochures to children, teachers, and administrators in their communities. Single copies of each may be obtained free from NAAHE, Box 362, East Haddam, CT 06423. Fifty copies cost $4.00; 100 are $7.00; 500 are $25.00.
Great Lakes

Minds Meet

The first meeting of the Indiana and Ohio humane educators' networks was held during a weekend retreat on November 17–18 at the Indianapolis (Indiana) Humane Society. Representatives from eight organizations held an informal session to share ideas and problems. These state networks, formed to aid in the development of more effective humane education programs, plan to meet again in early April in Columbus, Ohio. Contact either Terry Bowman, Ohio Humane Education Association, P.O. Box 546, Grove City, OH 43123 or Sue Blackburn, Indianapolis Humane Society, 7929 North Michigan Rd., Indianapolis, IN 46268 for more information.

The Great Lakes Regional Office will sponsor the Animal Control Academy in Ann Arbor, Michigan, from May 6 to 17. The Academy, in the past, has aided animal-welfare and animal-control workers in becoming more professional in their day-to-day work. Tuition is $224.00 and lodging on the University of Michigan campus is available at a very reasonable cost. For further information, please contact the Great Lakes office (735 Haskins St., Bowling Green, OH 43402).

New England

Protesting Proposed Hunt

The New England Regional Office has launched a campaign in cooperation with groups from New Hampshire to block a proposed experimental moose hunt in the Granite State. New Hampshire's Fish and Game Department has recommended a plan to open a three-day experimental season for moose in 1985 and permit fifty animals to be shot. Groups and individuals opposed to the hunt cite the facts that there are fewer than 2,000 moose in the state and no need for a hunt other than for recreation. Individuals who would like more details should write to the New England Regional Office, P.O. Box 362, East Haddam, CT 06423.

Chicago Considers New Bill

In an historic meeting last autumn, Mayor Harold Washington of Chicago, The HSUS, and representatives of metropolitan Chicago humane organizations considered a comprehensive new bill to establish a spay/neuter program and outlaw pound seizure.

Mayor Washington appeared keenly interested in humane concerns and indicated that he would consider, and likely support, the bill proposed by the humane organizations. If enacted, the law would allow eligible citizens with low incomes to have their pets neutered for a greatly reduced fee. It is well known that the cost of having pets neutered is prohibitive for the poor, a fact that contributes to urban pet overpopulation. The Chicago program would be financed by an increase in the city's pet-license fees.

The proposed bill also includes a provision to stop the transfer of animals from the city's animal-control facility to area medical research institutions.

The meeting was attended by fifteen humane-society representatives, including HSUS North Central Regional Director Frantz Dantzler, Great Lakes Regional Director Sandy Rowland, and Director of Laboratory Animal Welfare John McArdle. Mayor Washington has requested an additional meeting with the group to make final plans for introducing the bill. The North Central office will notify HSUS members, humane organizations, and others of new developments.
Southeast

Rabbits Given "Chance"

On September 6, 1984, a trainer of racing greyhounds near Tifton, Georgia, was brought to trial for alleged violation of the state's animal-protection laws. Members of the Tift Area Humane Society had observed the trainer releasing wild jackrabbits into a fenced enclosure for his greyhounds to chase and kill.

During the trial, Tift Area Humane Society Vice President Bootsie Cottongim described the "training exercise" she had witnessed and the pitiful screams of the jackrabbits as they were savagely attacked by the dogs. The then barely alive, bloody rabbits were attached to a mechanical training device as lures and continually tormented until dead. Southeast Regional Director Marc Paulhus testified that the use of live bait was cruel and totally unnecessary because mechanical training devices had proven to be equally effective for teaching greyhounds to run competitively (see article on page 10).

The defense acknowledged that the use of live jackrabbits was commonplace in the training of greyhounds and that the wild rabbits were imported from western states. Their chief witness, who identified herself as the past president of the Macon, Georgia, humane society, admitted she had never seen greyhounds trained in this manner. Nevertheless, she testified the training practice was similar to foxhunting and was not cruel because the jackrabbits had a "sporting chance."

The judge ruled that the defendant had not violated the anti-cruelty laws. His written statement reflected his concurrence with the opinion of the defense's chief witness.

By repeatedly offering expert testimony in these kinds of local cases, HSUS staff hopes eventually to overcome local ignorance and misunderstanding of seemingly benign events that, in reality, are indefensibly cruel.

Stars in Misery

During October and November, some Florida and Georgia fairs featured the notorious "Jonny Rivers Diving Mules" act. During each performance, animals are made to ascend a steep ramp to a thirty-five-foot platform. From this precarious perch, mules and shetland ponies with monkeys chained to their backs are forced to plunge into a six-foot-deep water tank below. They are then left standing soaking wet in the cold night air to await another performance hours later.

Communities often become hosts to various objectionable animal exhibitions such as diving mules, wrestling bears, and others. In most cases, outside promoters arrange to bring the acts to town. Contracts are signed, publicity is arranged, and the show goes on.

Calls of complaint from concerned citizens, humane societies, and animal shelters often evoke unsympathetic responses. After all, these acts are billed as "good, clean family fun."

Efforts to stop these insensitive and offensive performances by enlisting the help of prosecuting attorneys and/or police departments are not generally successful.

There are several things local humanitarians can and should do to eliminate animal exploitation before such attractions come to town.

• Meet with your local civic group council, fair association, and the chamber of commerce to inform them of your position.

• Call upon the city and county officials designating uses of public facilities and funds requesting voluntary guidelines to eliminate these abuses.

• Persuade city or county commissioners to enact ordinances designed to monitor stringently all such attractions.

Gulf States

Progress in Texas

After almost a year of planning, The HSUS and other interested humane groups met with Texas governor Mark White's staff to discuss legislation that would prevent livestock starvation disasters such as last year's Falls County horse starvation case. Existing state laws are not sufficient to protect livestock involved in such profit-oriented schemes that go awry. The HSUS suggested that three bills be proposed: one, to set standards for livestock transportation and auction; a second to provide emergency feed, care, and euthanasia as necessary in the event of a disaster; and third, a new bill to provide for humane society officers to enforce cruelty laws. It appears as though the governor will support this legislation, and The HSUS will be working with all Texas humane societies to see it passed.
Oregon Ranch Raided

In mid-September, officials of the Oregon State Police, Central Coast Humane Society, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), and The HSUS raided an exotic animal game ranch near Siletz, Oregon. The ranch owner was charged with multiple counts of animal cruelty and other violations of state laws. More than a hundred animals were found on the ranch, including twenty-one lions, tigers, an elk, wolves, cougars, a jaguar, a bobcat, a raccoon, bison, and numerous other hoofed animals. Those animals whose lives were in imminent danger were removed, as were some young lion cubs and native wildlife that could be transferred to the facilities of local veterinarians and a wildlife rehabilitator. Due to logistical problems, all of the other animals were left on the property with instructions for their care. "It is hoped that all of the animals will be removed, once this case has been tried and settled," said West Coast investigator Eric Sakach, who assisted Oregon officials in inspecting the facility and removing distressed animals. The cost of rehabilitating so many animals has proved to be beyond the resources of local animal-welfare organizations, so The HSUS contributed $1,000 toward the animals' care. USDA officials in Oregon have requested funds from the federal agency to help defray costs.

Because of this and other problems created by the private ownership of exotic animals, representatives of the Central Coast Humane Society, the Heartland Humane Society, the Humane Society of the Willamette Valley, the Oregon State Police, and other agencies are reviewing model laws supplied by The HSUS covering exotic animals. With new legislation, it is hoped that similar tragedies can be avoided.

Cockfight Trials Coincide With Conference

Detectives of the San Diego County sheriff's department vice squad, assisted by HSUS investigators and officers of the San Diego County Department of Animal Control, San Diego Humane Society, National City Police, and Oakland SPCA, simultaneously raided five locations where about $20,000 worth of gamecocks and cockfighting equipment was confiscated early on the morning of October 27, 1984. Six people were arrested in connection with the crackdown, which coincided with the HSUS annual conference in San Diego and resulted in the seizure of assorted illegal fight paraphernalia, including training implements, scales, maps to fight locations, cockfighting club membership cards, cockfighting literature, trophies, and narcotics. About 500 gamecocks were placed in protective custody and an entire factory where illegal gaffs and slashers were manufactured for sale was shut down. Those arrested were charged with violations of the penal code covering possession of illegal cockfighting paraphernalia, training animals for fighting purposes, and possession of animals with intent to fight. According to HSUS investigator Eric Sakach, "The raids are a major setback for cockfighters in the East County area, and the message from the combined efforts of the agencies involved is clear...this cruel excuse for sport will not be tolerated."

Cockfight Trial Averted

Nine men accused of involvement in an April cockfight in Lake County, California, pleaded no contest immediately prior to their jury trials in September. The defendants had been arrested when a California fish and game warden stumbled upon a cockfight in progress and summoned assistance from local law enforcement agencies and the California Highway Patrol. Soon after the arrests, Lake County District Attorney Rick Martin and a member of the Lake County sheriff's department had contacted West Coast Regional Investigator Eric Sakach and arranged a meeting to review their evidence and obtain additional information about the illegal activity. Based on this information, Lake County sheriff's deputies subsequently raided a Kelseyville ranch in May, where they seized more than a thousand gamecocks. Mr. Sakach was subpoenaed to appear as an expert witness in the September trials but was never needed to testify. All nine men were fined and their birds and other items forfeited immediately prior to their trials. Mr. Sakach was not required to testify in the trial of the ranch owner arrested in May, either—the man died in his sleep before his trial date.
IRS Clears Michigan Societies’ Full-Service and Spay/Neuter Clinics

In October of 1984, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) ruled that the Michigan Humane Society’s (MHS) operation of three full-service veterinary clinics was part and parcel of its charitable, humane activities rather than being a trade or business.

Central to the favorable result in the Michigan case was the society’s demonstration that it used its full-service clinics as an integral part of its traditional humane society activities and programs: MHS veterinarians provided medical treatment to stray and unwanted animals, took part in cruelty investigations and prosecutions, neutered animals to control population growth, and collected information on animal diseases and injuries which was used in MHS’s humane education and cruelty-prevention programs in the community.

The ruling, in the form of a Technical Advice Memorandum (T.A.M.) issued by IRS headquarters in Washington, D.C., applies only to the Michigan Humane Society (MHS), is based on 1978-80 data, and does not set a precedent. The memorandum may be obtained without charge by writing Roger A. Kindler, associate general counsel, The HSUS.

Georgia Dogfighting Prosecution Upheld

In an extremely important decision, the Supreme Court of Georgia has upheld the constitutionality of a 1982 statute which makes the “causing or allowing a dog to fight another dog for sport or gaming purposes’’ a felony. In this case, it was applied to defendants who were apprehended at the scene of a dogfight but not actually caught conducting a fight.

A fighting dog seized in an undercover raid: the recently upheld Georgia statute will help prosecutors bring fight participants to justice.

An appeal by three defendants convicted under the statute, alleging that the statute is unconstitutionally vague and violates due process and that “men of common intelligence are not given fair notice of the conduct which is forbidden,’’ was denied by the Supreme Court. The court also construed “allowing” a fight to occur to include “any act which contributes to the cause of a dogfight for sport or gaming purposes or further the success of the enterprise of a dogfight for sport or gaming purposes. Thus, if a person engages on any level in the planning or financing of the event, including paying an admission, providing a location or wagering on the event, or if a person encourages the event by applause or cheering, such person violates the statute.” (Emphasis added.)

The Supreme Court’s expansive interpretation of the statute, which can now be used to prosecute even spectators, will, we hope, prove a strong deterrent to further promotion of this bloodsport in Georgia. District Attorney J. Brown Riley, Jr., are to be commended for their uncompromising efforts in prosecuting this case and in defending the statute at the appellate level.

The Law Notes are compiled by HSUS General Counsel Murdaugh Stuart Madden and Associate Counsel Roger Kindler.
An HSUS Exclusive: Note Cards from Thaddeus Krumeich

Noted artist Thaddeus Krumeich ("Uncle Tad") 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 “Basil’s Cabinet,” “Chauncey’s Toys,” “Oliver’s Chrysanthemums” (reproduced here in color), and “Walter’s Other Window.” All are part of Mr. Krumeich’s “Little Favorites” series. The note cards are 4¼” 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 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.

Orders will be sent by UPS and must be delivered to a street address.
The Institute for the Study of Animal Problems announces the publication of ADVANCES IN ANIMAL WELFARE SCIENCE, edited by Dr. Michael Fox and Ms. Linda Mickley. The first volume in what is planned as an annual series, ADVANCES IN ANIMAL WELFARE SCIENCE includes contributions by scientists, philosophers, and other scholars addressing key issues in animal-welfare science. It has particular value for a wide range of professional readers involved with animals for scientific, economic, altruistic, and legal reasons.

Books should be available in February of 1985. Each copy is softcover and can be ordered for $10.00, including postage. Use the coupon below for your order. Please allow six weeks for delivery.

Mail to:
Name ____________________________________________
Address __________________________________________
City ____________________________ State ________ Zip Code ______
Telephone ____________________

Send me ________ copies of ADVANCES IN ANIMAL WELFARE SCIENCE at $10.00 per copy (includes postage).
I've enclosed a check in the total amount of $__________.
Please make checks payable to The Humane Society of the United States.

Please enclose this coupon and your check in an envelope and return to:
The Humane Society of the United States, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037

National Headquarters
2100 L Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20037