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HSUS Welcomes New Board Members

The HSUS would like to welcome three recent additions to its board of directors. Ms. Brook Speidel of Washington, D.C., has been an active supporter of animal issues for more than a decade. Ms. Susan Selby of Mission, Kans., is co-founder and president of Animal-Kind, a Kansas animal-welfare organization. Mr. John Mosher of Washington, D.C., is founder of the Initiative gegen Tierversuche, an animal-welfare organization in Salzburg, Austria. All three bring very special talents to their role as director. They were elected to the HSUS board in October.

Dogwriter’s Results

The HSUS News was named one of three finalists in the category of best special-interest animal magazine in the 1984 Dogwriter’s Association of America annual competition. The News received a certificate of this achievement at the organization’s awards banquet, held in New York City in February.

Paté Resolution Lives

The HSUS has announced its support of a shareholder resolution asking Iroquois Brands, Ltd., to investigate whether geese are treated inhumanely in the manufacture of one of the company’s imported products, Edouard Artzner paté de fois gras.

A shareholder in the company, former HSUS staff member Peter Lovenheim, filed suit in U.S. district court seeking an injunction to require Iroquois Brands to include the investigation proposal in its proxy materials.

Mr. Lovenheim originally presented the proposal for an investigation at the shareholders meeting in 1983 (see the Spring 1983 HSUS News). The proposal received more than five percent of the total votes cast, thus making it eligible for resubmission in subsequent years.

In a 1984 attempt to resubmit the proposal to shareholders, however, Mr. Lovenheim was notified that Iroquois would not include the proposal under a Securities and Exchange Commission exemption which allows the exclusion of shareholder proposals “not significantly related to the issuer’s business.”

Paté de fois gras is produced commercially by enlarging an animal’s liver through manual or machinated force-feeding. Beginning at about four months of age, geese are force-fed large amounts of corn mash up to four times a day.

“Force-feeding is an aberrant and unethical practice causing stress and suffering to the animal,” said HSUS President John A. Hoyt. “We believe the practice would violate state anti-cruelty laws if conducted in the United States. We would like to see Iroquois be more responsive to the shareholders who find this practice unnecessarily cruel.”

Recently, celebrity Sally Struthers (center) met “Snuggles the Seal” when she was a guest on The HSUS’s television show, “Pet Action Line.” Host “Sonny” Bloch, producer Gale Nemec, and HSUS Vice President Patricia Forkan (right) performed the introductions. “Pet Action Line” is broadcast by public broadcasting stations across the country. Be sure your local station carries it and watch “Pet Action Line” every week!
Rescue for Circus Chimps

Four chimps formerly performing with the Ringling Brothers and Barnum & Bailey Circus are now enjoying a comfortable retirement at Gene and Rusti Schuler's Wild Animal Retirement Village in Waldo, Florida.

Last August, when the chimps' trainer died unexpectedly, the animals were sent to a research laboratory. Recognizing that a lab was not an acceptable environment for these animals, several animal-welfare groups, with the cooperation of both the circus and the laboratory, relocated the chimps.

Early on, the International Primate Protection League alerted its members to the plight of Louie, Tony, Butchie, and Chipper and initiated a fund-raising effort. Subsequently, The HSUS worked out an agreement with the circus, and the Elsa Wild Animal Appeal (Chicago, Ill.) negotiated with the laboratory for the animals' release and relocation. The HSUS, the Elsa Wild Animal Appeal, the New England Anti-Vivisection Society, and the circus signed an agreement calling for them to contribute to the cost of new cages and to pay for the cost of the chimps' transportation to Waldo and perpetual care.

The laboratory was most willing to turn the chimps over to the animal advocates once it was learned that we had an appropriate placement for them at the Schulers'.

Through dedication and love for these animals, Gene and Rusti Schuler were able to build a fine new enclosure within our budget limitations. They provided most of the labor themselves and were successful in finding people willing to donate time and materials for the project.

The Schulers now report that the animals have settled in beautifully and are taking advantage of the comforts of their new home. They not only are playful with each other but also seem eager to communicate with the Schulers.

This happy ending could not have been achieved without the combined efforts of all of the involved parties. At least four chimps can prove that cooperation does work.

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.
THE BIRD WARS

by Guy R. Hodge

Blame it on Eugene Scheifflin, a flamboyant literature buff who decided to acquaint Americans with all the species of birds mentioned in the writings of William Shakespeare. On the morning of March 6, 1890, Scheifflin halted his carriage in New York City's Central Park, opened four large bird cages, and watched in delight as eighty starlings, imported from Europe, flew skyward. Today, North America supports a naturalized starling population estimated at 900 million birds.

If the behavioral idiosyncrasies of the starling were only an occasional annoyance, then we might overlook the transgressions of Eugene Scheifflin. But the starling has the disagreeable habit of gathering in noisy roosts and creating a stench with the accumulation of droppings deposited on trees, soil, and homes. The starling is also a prime culprit, together with blackbirds, in raids on farms, causing an estimated $50,000,000 yearly in damage to corn, wheat, rice, and other crops.

Scheifflin later committed another equally calamitous indiscretion. He released a flock of house, or English, sparrows into the parks of Brooklyn. Today, the house sparrow rivals the starling as a scourge to both city and farm. From a biological perspective, the house sparrow has been an overwhelming success. This pugnacious little bird frightens away from bird feeders more timid species, such as the cardinal. It also evicts bluebirds and wrens from nest boxes and constructs its own nests in these birdhouses.

The actions of Eugene Scheifflin are symbolic of many of the conflicts between man and birds. Humans have a unique ability to manipulate their environment. Unfortunately, in the process of altering the landscape, people have often driven birds from their natural habitats or provided accommodations so ideal that everyone's feathered friends attain population levels that never could be reached under natural conditions.
Starlings and house sparrows are not alone in incurring the wrath of man. The list of so-called pest birds also includes the common grackle, crow, cattle egret, whistling swan, brown-headed cowbird, red-winged blackbird, downy woodpecker, and herring gull. But the distinction of being the bird world’s Public Enemy Number One belongs to the domestic pigeon.

The pigeon that makes its home on city streets is “feral,” living in the wild but originating from domestic stock. The urban pigeon was domesticated early in man’s history. It traveled to the New World with the first settlers. Some of these birds strayed or were released. Nearly all of the pigeons today are descendants of these avian pioneers.

Pigeons have a penchant for provoking strong sentiments and controversy. Some people see them as filthy freeloaders—“a rat with wings” is how one pigeon-hater described the bird. But for many people, the pigeon holds a certain appeal. They gorge the birds with handouts, particularly at lunchtime, in city parks across the country. It is the pigeon’s remarkable adaptation to city life that has catapulted the bird into controversy. Its flourishing population, freeloading off the food scraps provided by park visitors and nesting in lofts, steeples, and other human dwellings, can become a nuisance within the close confines of urban living.

The proliferation of pigeons, starlings, and house sparrows can so outrage humans that they sometimes resort to bizarre actions. In 1982, the Tipton, Ia., city council approved a plan in which the local fire department was to turn its hoses on a roost of starlings and house sparrows. As the birds were knocked to the ground, they were to be clubbed with bats and crushed underfoot by neighborhood residents. Fortunately, word leaked out to a local animal-welfare organization, which recruited The HSUS to convince city officials to cancel the plan, labeled the “Tipton Bird Bash” by the town newspaper.

Municipal officials and businessmen are not always so easily dissuaded from killing birds. In one Illinois town, a woman suggested that feeding the birds a birth-control drug would be kinder than poisoning them with strychnine. The mayor responded, “Lady, I want those birds to fall down dead, not invite them to dinner.”

Assaults on birds are so commonplace that, in some communities, these battles take on the atmosphere of festivals. In Hoopeston, Ill., two residents wage a legendary battle with starlings. With the blessing of the city council, for the past thirteen years they have gunned down whatever hapless birds venture within range of their firearms. The wife of one gunner stands by, ready to collect the bodies of the dead and wounded.

“The Avian Peril” and Human Retaliation

Over the years, pest-control companies have produced a variety of advertising literature, some incredibly sensational, which uses the terrifying specter of disease-carrying birds to frighten citizens and munic-
principal officials into treating birds as a menace requiring drastic action. Birds have been condemned as carriers of more than a dozen infectious diseases ranging from tuberculosis to meningitis.

Medical evidence suggests that the disease threat is overstated. The risk that birds pose to humans is minimal. Starling and blackbird roosts can be a source of histoplasmosis, a fungal disease that causes a respiratory ailment resembling a cold. In most patients, the symptoms are so mild that the disease goes undetected and they recover without medical treatment. The other illnesses attributed to birds are so commonplace in nature or rare in humans that there is no reason for alarm over the wild bird’s role as a disease carrier. In many cases, livestock, poultry, companion animals, and even man himself are more important hosts for these diseases.

In a report for the city of Cincinnati, Dr. Charlotte Donnally, a professor at Northern Kentucky University, noted that “The vast majority of people are at little or no health risk from pigeons and probably have a greater chance of being struck by lightning than developing a serious disease because of pigeons.” But the specter of disease is a wonderful excuse for ridding residences and businesses of unwelcomed avian occupants.

While birds are not a health threat, they are a source of annoyance to many citizens. Birds offend their aesthetic sense by defacing buildings, statues, and automobiles with their droppings. Large amounts of foul-smelling, unsightly bird excrement may kill lawns and shrubbery. Birds can clog drains and block vents with feathers and nesting material. When birds congregate, they make their presence known with noisy vocalizations that can disturb the tranquility of a neighborhood.

Too often, these inconveniences precipitate an assault on bird life. So troublesome do people deem pigeons, starlings, and their kin that they have given rise to an entire industry with its own professional staff, tools, language, and literature. It is an industry that clings to the centuries-old notion that the systematic killing of birds is the solution to all manner of problems. In the seventeenth century, Puritans decreed under law that a bachelor could not obtain a marriage license until he had fulfilled his quota of killing six blackbirds. The extermination of birds is pursued as vigorously in 1985 as it was 350 years ago.

Man’s ability to inflict suffering on birds is bound only by his inventiveness. Wetting agents, compounds designed for use at sites where starlings and blackbirds congregate in roosts, are sprayed from aircraft during cold, wet weather. As the mist settles on the birds’ plumage, it destroys the natural insulation, causing body heat to escape and leaving the birds susceptible to chilling and death. Wetting agents are unmatched in speed and scope for inducing mass mortalities among birds. As many as 750,000 birds have been killed during a single application.

The effects of wetting agents have been likened to the impact of an oil spill on ducks. In the Spring 1975 issue of The HSUS News, HSUS field investigator Herb Martin provided an eye witness account of a bird-spraying operation at Ft. Campbell, Ky. Mr. Martin told of fallen birds writhing on the ground for as long as three hours. Meanwhile, workmen scurried around the field impaling dead and dying birds alike on the spiked tips of the poles with which they were armed.

Poisons are the mainstay in the arsenal of weapons used in the war on birds, with strychnine the most popular. This poison has been a long-term favorite of bird slayers. As early as 1640, strychnine was in Europe to kill birds. It has a well-deserved reputation as one of the cruelest poisons ever used by man. The American Veterinary Medical Association in its Report on Euthanasia condemned strychnine as

Buildings such as this one, with wide ledges and deep crevices for roosting, make urban pigeons feel welcome.
an agent that produces "excruciating pain" and "cannot be recommended for euthanasia of any animal."

Another of the common methods used to rid a site of pigeons or starlings is live trapping. Birds are caught in colony, or cumulative, traps—devices which can catch several birds in a single set. Usually, the exterminator removes the trap and birds to his truck, connects a hose to the truck exhaust, and pumps lung-searing, raw carbon monoxide gas into the trap. Some enterprising exterminators, however, do not gas the birds to death. Instead, they collect pocket money by selling live pigeons at fifty cents to a dollar each to gun clubs for use in pigeon shoots. In these "contests," the live pigeons are flung into the air while contestants shoot at the birds.

For The HSUS, it is not simply a question of by what means birds are executed but whether their killing is justified at all. Each species of pest bird occupies an important niche in the ecosystem. Tampering with natural checks and balances creates the risk of more serious problems. Starlings, for example, provide a natural form of insect control, consuming vast quantities of insects that are harmful to crops. They are credited with consuming more than two million tons yearly of grasshoppers, grubs, boll weevils, cutworms, and other insect pests. Pigeons are efficient scavengers that rid city streets of food scraps that might otherwise provide nourishment for colonies of rats.

The issue extends beyond the matter of weighing the beneficial activities of birds against the damage they cause. Execution is simply not a practical approach to coping with pest birds. The persistent use of poisons, firearms, and traps has a negligible impact on the number of birds in a community. Birds, like all animals, require food and shelter for their survival. As long as these basic needs are met in abundance, birds will continue to flock to a site.

Nature has its own system for regulating bird populations. Although as many as sixty percent of the starlings in the United States will die this year, the survivors will lay so many eggs that only one in ten needs to hatch to keep the population at its current size.

Nature is more efficient at producing birds than man is at destroying them. Poisons, traps, guns, and wetting agents simply fell a portion of the animals that would have died anyway from natural causes. The actions of exterminators have little, if any, impact on the number of pigeons or starlings in a town. An extermination operation may prompt an immediate decline in the number of birds, but this reduction is temporary.

The survivors will face less competition for food scraps or prime nest sites. As a result, a larger than average number of offspring will survive. This biological phenomenon is known as the Law of Inversity. It enables bird populations to rebound from any human assault, no matter how determined the undertaking.

The resiliency of bird populations was acknowledged in a 1976 environmental impact statement published by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Biologists for the Service designed a mathematical model that showed the futility of killing starlings. According to Fish and Wildlife Service estimates, if ten percent of starlings in a flock were killed, the flock would rebound to its original size in less than twelve months. If one out of every five birds were destroyed, the flock would need still less than twenty-four months to return to its normal size.

Pest-control experts persist in tout the virtues of poisons in dealing with pigeons. They continue to rely on the traditional method of dealing with a wildlife problem—killing off a substantial percentage of the population—even after it’s been demonstrated that killing isn’t a long-term solution.

Why? For many exterminators, bird control is a sideline, a way to make a few extra dollars when they are not inspecting homes for termites. They simply do not have the knowledge, skills, or equipment required to bring about any lasting reduction in the bird population. The only bird-control products they stock are poisons.

For some pest-control firms, there is, perhaps, a more sinister reason for their reliance on poisons. Pest control is, after all, a profit-making enterprise, and the eradication of birds is a lucrative business. Pest-
control officials must take special gratification from the realization that, without effective remedial measures, there will be a repeated demand for their services as bird populations quickly rebuild.

Fortunately, in recent years, urban wildlife biology has emerged as a specialized branch of zoology. Urban biologists preach a common-sense approach to bird control termed "integrated pest management," or bird-proofing. The goal of integrated pest management is to use the knowledge of bird behavior and natural history either to create a new, inhospitable environment or to alter the present environment so that it will support fewer animals. This objective can be achieved by physically excluding birds from nesting and roosting sites or conditioning them to avoid the area.

Much can be done to render a neighborhood less attractive to birds, such as thinning groves and pruning trees. There are also assorted paraphernalia that can be used to evict birds, such as netting, models of natural predators, pyrotechnics, screens, and recordings. There is even planned parenthood—a chemical contraceptive, Ornitrol, is licensed for use on pigeons. The drug, which is applied to a corn bait, causes temporary sterility when it is fed to birds.

No one of these bird-control techniques is a cure-all. The product of choice will vary according to the species and circumstance. Success or failure in remedying a problem is influenced not only by the approach selected but by the skills and timing of the user. Bird-proofing, however, is a proven technique for remedying conflicts between man and bird.

Municipal governments have begun to embrace the concept of integrated pest management. Kansas City was one of the first communities to recognize the need for a comprehensive plan of action. City officials focused their attention on reducing the harborage available to birds and produced dramatic results. In just two years, Kansas City reduced its pigeon population by sixty percent. The tough enforcement of municipal ordinances relating to architectural design and bird feeding combined with a public awareness campaign were the foundation of Kansas City's success story.

In August, 1983, the city of Cincinnati released a hallmark report on coping with urban pigeons. The HSUS received special acknowledgment in the report for assisting city officials in finding a practical alternative to poisoning pigeons. The cornerstone of the Cincinnati plan, drafted by Dr. Charlotte Donnally, is to involve residents in pigeon-proofing the business district. People are being asked not to over-feed birds and to maintain buildings in good repair in order to discourage nesting. These fundamental steps, Dr. Donnally maintains, are likely to provide a workable, long-term solution to the pigeon problem in Cincinnati.

Bird control is an animal-welfare issue for which the humane approach also happens to be the most practical, effective, and economical approach. This is a compelling case against poisoning, trapping, or shooting birds.

The HSUS has gained the respect of city governments as an authoritative source for guidance on bird control. Municipal officials are proving receptive to the concept of integrated pest management. In communities from Cincinnati to Denton, Tex., The HSUS is cooperating with city governments to develop enlightened plans for bird control. We are showing that urban birds and people can live in harmony.

Guy R. Hodge is director of data and information services for The HSUS and an expert in mediating disputes between pigeons and people.
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Whales Win in Court, Protesters Target JAL

In March, a federal district court judge ordered the United States Secretary of Commerce to impose sanctions required by U.S. law against the Japanese fishing industry, which has violated the International Whaling Commission's (IWC) ban on sperm whaling (see the Winter 1985 HSUS News). Judge Charles Richey decided in our favor a lawsuit filed in November in the names of The HSUS and twelve other animal-welfare organizations and, in so doing, gave the whales a much-needed chance for survival. That lawsuit asked that Japan be made to suffer the consequences of its disregard of IWC decisions—the loss of at least fifty percent of its fishing rights within U.S. waters—as spelled out in the Packwood-Magnuson Amendment to the Fisheries Conservation and Management Act. The Reagan administration had been trying to avoid imposing the sanctions required by that law on the Japanese government, preferring to give in to Japanese demands that their fishing rights not be affected by their whaling activities. The animal-welfare groups had no alternative but to sue the government to require it to enforce the law. Although Judge Richey's order may be postponed pending the outcome of an appeal by U.S. and Japanese intervenors, the decision gives the IWC whaling moratorium substantial chance for success.

The HSUS is putting additional pressure on the fishing industries of the intransigent whaling nations through an escalating public education campaign urging Americans not to buy fish products from Japan, Norway, and the USSR. A recent educational appeal sent to hundreds of thousands of people should alert Japan's minister of fisheries and the president of the U.S. branch of Nippon Suisan, Japan's second largest fisheries company and major backer of the whaling industry, to the potential loss of sales of Japanese fish products in the United States until Japan agrees to stop whaling.*

As another tactic to force whaling countries to abandon their bloody business, The HSUS has agreed to cosponsor the Boycott for the Whales Coalition, whose focus is promoting an international boycott of Japan Air Lines (JAL). Since the Japanese government is JAL's largest shareholder, our boycott of JAL will strongly reinforce our appeal to the Japanese government that its whaling must cease. The coalition sent a mailing to almost every travel agency in the United States to inform them of the boycott in January. Several agents have already returned their JAL charge plates to the airlines office and committed themselves not to book customers on JAL flights. More than 550 other agents have requested more information on the campaign.

To generate public awareness about the campaign, coalition member Greenpeace has staged demonstrations in front of JAL ticket offices in U.S. and European cities. This spring, HSUS Whale Campaign Coordinator Campbell Plowden will travel to eight U.S. cities to promote the JAL boycott. He will be giving presentations on the whale issue to local travel agents and the general public as well as organizing demonstrations at each city's JAL ticket offices.

The schedule for the HSUS JAL boycott demonstrations will be: Cleveland (April 3), Cincinnati (April 9), St. Louis (April 16), Chicago (April 23), Detroit (May 21), Houston (May 29), Dallas (June 6), Atlanta (June 11). (If you can help organize or attend one of these events, please contact Campbell Plowden at The HSUS in Washington, D.C.)

Japan isn't the only country apparently risking Packwood-Magnuson sanctions. By the end of February, the Soviets had caught more than their normal portion of the IWC southern hemisphere minke whale quota, placing them, technically, in violation of IWC agreements. Now that the U.S. federal court has overruled the U.S./Japan bilateral deal, it seems likely the Soviets will soon face a renewed loss of their permits to fish in U.S. waters.

In the conclusion of his ruling, Judge Richey eloquently stated that, by enacting laws that imposed sanctions on nations that jeopardize the effectiveness of the IWC, the U.S. Congress "wanted to send out a clear message to the world that the United States was committed to being in the vanguard of the fight to preserve the whale." We can only hope that the current administration will heed the essence of this statement and recommit U.S. government efforts toward attaining a speedy end to commercial whaling.

*American fishermen who have joint ventures with Japanese and Soviet fishermen will be lobbying, for obvious reasons, to divorce the fishing allocation given to a foreign nation from that country's whaling policy. The HSUS may need to work very hard in the coming months to keep the Packwood-Magnuson Amendment intact when the Fisheries Conservation and Management Act comes up for reauthorization.
The HSUS Seal Campaign—
A Busy Winter,
A Hopeful Spring

Throughout the winter, HSUS staff has continued hard at work on behalf of the North Pacific fur seal. Since the formal treaty which allows seal hunts to take place on American soil officially expired last October, The HSUS has been very busy trying to ensure that this treaty will not be re-ratified and extended another four years.

To alert the public that the government now has the fate of the fur seal treaty in its hands, a huge demonstration was held March 1 on the fifth National Day of the Seal. HSUS members, staff, and volunteers surrounded the U.S. Department of Commerce (which administers the treaty) with tens of thousands of petitions protesting the annual American seal hunt. The petitions, which have been collected by HSUS members for over a year, include more than 100,000 signatures of people who want the U.S. Senate to defeat the treaty this spring (see the Winter 1985 HSUS News). We also placed a large advertisement in the Washington Post on March 3, 1985, asking the Senate to consider the seals' welfare and vote against renewing the treaty.

At the demonstration, a letter from HSUS President John A. Hoyt was delivered personally to Commerce Secretary Malcolm Baldrige. In his letter Mr. Hoyt said, "The petitions were sent by concerned citizens across the United States as a way of expressing their opposition to the continued commercial destruction of seals. They are a vivid testimonial to the care and concern which the American public feels for these innocent creatures." He urged Sec. Baldrige to withdraw "support for re-ratification of the North Pacific Fur Seal Treaty, to oppose the commercial killing of seals, and to join with us in developing concrete programs which ensure the welfare of both the Aleuts and the seals."

Although the Commerce and State departments have held talks with the other signatory countries to this treaty—Japan, Canada, and the Soviet Union—and unofficially agreed to continue the annual hunt, it is the U.S. Senate which must vote to extend or end further U.S. participation in the American seal hunt. The vote on the North Pacific Fur Seal Convention is expected by late April.

Former Senator Paul Tsongas, a longtime friend of animal welfare on Capitol Hill, has been retained by The HSUS and Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals to lobby against the treaty. Because of Sen. Tsongas's major role in the passage of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, which serves to protect and preserve Alaska's lands and wildlife, he will be able to contribute a great deal towards our efforts to help save the fur seals clubbed in Alaska. When the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations does hold hearings on the fur seal treaty, Sen.
HSUS President John A. Hoyt (second from right) and Vice President Patricia Forkan receive an advance donation from Emotions President Ben Cohen and Director of Marketing Bill Brown in New York. Olympic gold medalist and "Snuggles the Seal" spokesman David Larson is at right.

Seal protesters, including HSUS Vice President John W. Grandy (in HSUS jacket at center), demonstrate in front of the Commerce Department building.

Tsongas's testimony against it will be crucial.

Of equal importance will be the role of Sen. Richard G. Lugar, new chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who replaced an important friend of the seals, Sen. Charles H. Percy. Since Sen. Lugar's role is key in defeating the fur seal treaty, The HSUS is urging all its members to contact him even if you have already contacted your own senator. Sen. Lugar can be reached at the Senate Office Building, Washington, DC, 20510 or by calling (202) 224-3121.

HSUS vice presidents Patricia Forkan and John Grandy and Director of Federal Legislation Martha Hamby have visited U.S. senators, delivering seal petitions and urging them to vote against the treaty. Along with the petitions, each senator received a "Snuggles the Seal" mascot, developed by Emotions, the gift division of Mattel, Inc., to represent the plight of all seals brutally clubbed to death every year.

To show its support for The HSUS's work on behalf of seals, Mattel will donate $1.00 for each "Snuggles the Seal" purchased to The HSUS if a portion of a hangtag attached to the item is returned to Emotions by the consumer. Mattel presented The HSUS with a $15,000 "advance" on the sale of "Snuggles the Seal" at a gala New York press conference held to launch the sale of "Snuggles the Seal" nationwide. Ben Cohen, president of Emotions, presented the check to HSUS President John A. Hoyt as "our opening contribution to this very special cause." In thanking Emotions for its support, Mr. Hoyt said, "This symbolic seal is a welcome addition to our efforts to awaken the conscience of the public to the inexcusable exploitation of these remarkable creatures."

Olympic gold medal winner David Larson helped launch the debut of "Snuggles the Seal" by expressing his concern for the seal slaughter. "It's an inhumane act, nothing more," he said. Other Olympians making guest appearances to promote "Snuggles the Seal" and the seal campaign include gymnast Julianne McNamara and water polo captain Terry Schroeder. Dan Fouts, the San Diego Chargers' all-pro quarterback, and actress Vicki Lawrence have made appearances in California for The HSUS to help win support for an end to the seal killings.

"Snuggles the Seal" is now available nationwide in fine gift and department stores. Emotions's support for the seals has been called "...an example of how major corporations are becoming more responsive to important issues in society," by HSUS Vice President Patricia Forkan.

Ms. Forkan is expected to represent The HSUS as an official member of the U.S. delegation to the Fur Seal Commission which meets the week of April 15 in Tokyo, Japan.

Thousands of HSUS members have given their support in this endeavor and contacted their senators, a number of whom have responded positively. Our campaign has gained substantial press coverage, public education, and the concern of a major corporation. The HSUS has never felt closer to a victory for the seals.

For information on the Pribilof seal issue, write to The HSUS, c/o Campaigns. We'll send you fact sheets, a Seal Day action packet, and a compilation of relevant articles. Look for prices in the 1985 Publications List inserted in this magazine. Also, check the inside back cover of this issue to see how you can order "Snuggles the Seal" if you are unable to purchase it in your community.—Stacy Wyman, Campaign Coordinator
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Does Humane Education Really Work?

by Bill DeRosa

NAAHE's Three-Year Study Yields Answers and More Questions

Schoolchildren dramatize their understanding of how animals use nonverbal communications to express their emotions.

In January, a long awaited document was delivered to the staff of the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE), the education division of The HSUS. This document, the final report on NAAHE's National Humane Education Evaluation Project, represents the culmination of three years of developing tests, overcoming political hurdles, coordinating teachers, and analyzing data—all for the purpose of evaluating NAAHE's materials and curriculum-based approach to humane education. Because the study was the first major attempt to look at the effects of humane education on large numbers of students, it also promised to offer insight and information of value to educators and animal-welfare personnel throughout the country. Happily, the report contained good news; although the specific findings were
mixed (and seemed to raise as many new questions as they provided answers), the overall results were positive and encouraging.

Why Evaluate?

Leaders of the animal-welfare movement have always believed in the importance of humane education. Only if young people were taught kindness toward and respect for animals and the environment, they felt, could any lasting benefit for animals be accomplished. Yet, there has been little effort to assess objectively the effectiveness of humane education as a practical approach to preventing cruelty. Does humane education work? What approaches and materials have the most positive impact on young people? Until recently, these questions had never been seriously addressed.

NAAHE was founded, in part, to help provide answers. Working on a national level to improve, expand, and promote humane education, NAAHE has always encouraged humane educators to make evaluation a regular part of their programming. By evaluating their own programs and becoming familiar with other evaluation studies such as NAAHE's project, humane educators can benefit in several ways. First, learning which approaches and materials have the most positive effect on children can help educators better make decisions about the goals they set for their programming and the methods they use to attain their goals. Second, educators will be much more successful in introducing humane education into the schools if they can present evidence from evaluation studies that their programs do, in fact, work. Finally, by conducting evaluations of their own and by consulting other research projects, humane educators will be better equipped to choose the approaches and materials most suited to their particular needs. It was NAAHE's hope that an evaluation of its curriculum materials and approach would provide a source of information that would help educators to make decisions about their programming and conduct evaluation activities of their own.

Getting the Project Started

NAAHE initiated, in 1982, a contract with the Wasatch Institute for Research and Evaluation (WIRE), consultants in educational research recommended by the National Institute of Education. Funding commitments for the first phase of the project were made by The HSUS, the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation, and the Utah State Office of Education. With assistance from NAAHE and Dr. Carol Browning of the HSUS board of directors, the WIRE staff, headed by Dr. Blaine Worthen and Project Director Frank Ascione, designed a study that would measure the impact of a curriculum-blended approach to humane education. The prototype material was NAAHE's People & Animals: A Humane Education Curriculum Guide. The guide, which consists of more than 400 activities, is divided into four books, each covering two grade levels ranging from preschool through grade six. Each activity within the guide is designed to teach a humane concept while teaching a skill or element of content in language arts, social studies, math, or science. Although the guide had been field-tested in 350 classrooms and was rated very highly among teachers, it had not yet been used in a project that evaluated its impact on students.

The study designed by WIRE focused on four objectives. First, researchers wanted to examine the impact of the curriculum-guide activities on children's attitudes and behavior toward animals. Next, they wanted to determine whether children responded differently based on certain variables such as age, sex, place of residence, prior experience with animals, teacher attitudes, parental attitudes, etc. They also planned to test for "transference," i.e., whether children who developed more humane attitudes and behaviors toward animals also became more humane in their feelings and actions toward other children.

The final objective of the project was to develop a series of reliable tests that could be used to measure the impact not only of People & Animals but of a variety of humane education programs as well. They hoped that, by developing versatile tests and making these available to other educators and animal-welfare groups, humane educators would be more willing to incorporate evaluation into their own programs.

Controversy in Utah

In the spring of 1982, Phase I of the project, the development of testing instruments, was begun, using teachers and students in the Logan and Weber County school systems in northern Utah. (WIRE is based at Utah State University in Logan.) The tests were completed in late summer, and plans were made to begin Phase II in Utah in the fall.

Unfortunately, unforeseen problems forced a temporary delay in beginning Phase II. In June, representatives of the Weber County Farm
Bureau, responding to a critique they had received from the American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF), approached officials of the Weber school district and requested that People & Animals be banned from the Weber schools. The critique distributed by the AFBF made inflammatory accusations, claiming that the curriculum guide was anti-agriculture, pro-vegetarian, and inconsistent with the tenets of Judeo-Christian tradition and therefore should not be used in schools. Although these charges were effectively repudiated, Weber County Farm Bureau representatives continued to insist that the guide presented a perspective contrary to their own and was, consequently, inappropriate for use in local schools.

School officials and the project directors attempted to mediate the situation by offering to place materials with the Farm Bureau's perspective in schools where the guide was to be used; allow a Farm Bureau representative to serve on the project-review committee; and poll parents in the district as to their willingness to have their children introduced to the topics in the curriculum guide. The first two offers were rejected, and although a preliminary poll of parents showed strong support for teaching the concepts represented in the guide, the Farm Bureau continued to demand that it be removed from the schools. As a result, the Weber district withdrew from the project. The Farm Bureau's pressure also affected the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) and, when combined with the impact of across-the-board budget cuts for the department, resulted in the USOE declining to commit funds to the project for Year II.

Fortunately, however, the suspension of the project resulting from the problems with the Farm Bureau was short-lived. New schools were recruited in California and Connecticut, and Phase II—testing and use of the curriculum guide—was begun in the fall of 1983. As it turned out, moving the study site from Utah to Connecticut and California increased the potential of the project by providing a more demographically diverse study sample.

**Designing the Study**

Perhaps the foremost concern in designing Phase II was to ensure that it be realistic. Many evaluations of educational techniques or materials take place under highly controlled conditions in which students are force-fed materials in intensive doses. It was hoped, however, to evaluate the NAAHE curriculum guide and approach to humane education under natural conditions—conditions in which teachers would be able to use the guides more or less as they wished. Under the WIRE plan, teachers were required to undertake only twenty activities from the guide over the entire 1983–84 school year. In research terminology, this constituted a "thin intervention" or "weak treatment," a factor which usually makes producing recognizable changes in knowledge, attitudes, and projected behavior difficult. But, since our objective was not to prove that our approach and materials work but to find out if they would have impact in a realistic school setting, it made sense to evaluate them as they might be applied during a typical school year by teachers with many other curriculum requirements to meet.

Participants in the study included over 1,800 kindergarten–through–sixth-grade students and their teachers, in seventy–seven classrooms in Connecticut and California. The group was ethnically diverse and distributed representatively among rural, suburban, and urban areas. Half of the classrooms in the study sample served in a control capacity. Students in these classes were tested in the fall and again in the spring, but they received no instruction from the curriculum guide between tests.

The other classes served in an experimental capacity. Students in these classrooms received instruction from the guides during the six months between pretesting and post–testing. Specifically, the tests were intended to measure four things: (1) children's knowledge about animals; (2) children's attitudes toward animals; (3) the level of humaneness expressed by children in their responses to situations involving treatment of animals; and (4) whether children's attitudes and behavior toward animals transferred or generalized, to humans. We also needed to survey teacher and parent attitudes and to record background information about the children's age, sex, ethnic background, socioeconomic status, place of residence, and prior contact with animals. Students in both control and experimental classes filled out questionnaires, and the students' teachers and parents received attitude surveys to complete.

**Results and Implications**

At this time, although most of the findings of the evaluation are in, we are still awaiting information about the relationship between students' demographic characteristics and their test scores. The results of the tests that measured the impact of People & Animals have been analyzed and are mixed. The findings show that instruction from the guide had the greatest effect on kindergarten and first grade children. Experimental group children at these grade levels displayed a greater understanding of concepts related to animals and their humane treatment and more positive attitudes toward animals than children in the control groups at these grade levels. At the higher grades,
When these sixth grade children learned through the curriculum-guide activities that homeless animals were being cared for by their local dog warden, they baked treats for the animals.

the differences in knowledge and attitudes between the experimental and control groups were not statistically significant. This means that, although, in most cases, the experimental group's scores were higher than the control group's, the probability that this was due to chance (as opposed to the effects of instruction from the guide) was higher than 5 in 100.

On the tests that measured humaneness (those which asked students to respond to a series of dilemmas related to the treatment of animals), there were no significant differences between experimental and control group scores at the kindergarten-through third-grade levels. In contrast, scores for fourth, fifth, and sixth grade experimental group students reflected greater humaneness than the scores of control group children in those grades.

On the various instruments used to measure transference of humane attitudes from animals to people, the experimental group children did not score significantly higher than the control group students at any grade level. However, on one transference measure, there was a trend, though not statistically significant, for experimental group children to make greater gains than control group children from pretest to post-test at both kindergarten and first grade levels.

There is good reason to be encouraged by the findings. True, the use of the curriculum guide did not produce statistically significant results on every test at every grade level. But, we should remember that the twenty activities from the guide taught by the experimental group teachers constituted a very thin intervention. There have been many evaluation studies in which curriculum materials used every day for an entire school year failed to show significant changes in student performance. In this context, it is encouraging that the curriculum guide activities and approach had such a significant effect on knowledge and attitudes at the kindergarten and first grade levels, and a lesser, but nonetheless positive, impact at some of the grade levels beyond. Moreover, it appears from the data that there is a trend toward an increase in positive test results as the time spent by teachers on each activity increases.

It is important to remember that the NAAHE project represents the first time that a curriculum-blended approach to humane education has been evaluated. Pioneer research projects such as this can only point to trends; the why must be looked at in future studies. Many possible questions for future research have been raised by the study. Are young children more receptive to humane education than children in higher grades? Are early-childhood teachers better equipped for or more accustomed to teaching styles that promote prosocial or humane behavior? Would more intensive use of activities result in greater improvement among students? Are the activities at upper levels of the curriculum guide in some way less appropriate for the developmental level of the students than those at the lower levels?

NAAHE plans to continue its work to determine the most effective humane education methods and strategies. Although this project is only a first step, it provides us with the largest body of information to date on children's knowledge of and attitudes toward animals and humane education's impact on them. We believe that the implications of the project for humane educators and researchers will be far reaching.

For a more detailed summary of the methodology and findings of NAAHE's evaluation project, contact Bill DeRosa, NAAHE, Box 362, East Haddam, CT 06423.

People and Animals was the prototype material used to evaluate a curriculum-blended approach to humane education.

Bill DeRosa is research associate for NAAHE.
Walking through the kennel, the laboratory technician was oblivious to the din of barking dogs. He stopped at cage number 165, where a playful German shepherd was engaged in poking its forepaw through the grating of the metal door. The animal’s powerful tail was thumping loudly against the cage walls, adding to the clamor in the room.

"Come on, buddy. It’s your turn," said the technician, as he lifted the healthy-looking animal out of the cage. "Let’s get this over with."

For the technician, who had spent seven years conducting product-safety tests, the sequence of events to follow would be routine. For the shepherd, however, the terror and torture of the next half hour would serve as a precursor of what was to come.

The technician carried the dog down a long hallway into a sterile-looking laboratory, where he strapped the animal neatly to an operating table. The dog gagged as a long rubber tube was forced down its throat and into its stomach. A funnel was connected to the tube, and a premeasured quantity of concentrated industrial cleaner was drained slowly into the dog’s body.

No pain relievers were given. (Although this account is a dramatization, according to the paperwork submitted to the government on the actual case depicted, the use of medication might have “interfered” with the evaluation of the test.) For the next few days, while the corrosive chemical was eating through...
the lining of the dog’s stomach, the animal would remain fully conscious. Death would be a welcome relief for this miserable creature.

Force-feeding toxic or corrosive substances to dogs is not an enormous part of the product-safety testing industry, but it is representative of a vast enterprise that painfully and often needlessly destroys millions of animals each year. It is an industry founded and maintained on suffering and death. Product-safety testing laboratories are among the largest individual consumers of laboratory animals in the United States.

Even though 38,000 animals die each day in this country in such tests, the general public remains uninformed about the use of animals in toxicity testing. Those who are aware of this activity experience troubling, conflicting emotions—distress that animals are sacrificed and acceptance of the myth that animal testing is the only means for estimating the safety of products. The public also assumes that both industry and government are constantly striving to develop improved testing methods and that they are automatically implemented. Unfortunately, these assumptions are not altogether correct.

Although a variety of toxicity tests are conducted on animals ranging from dogs, guinea pigs, and primates to rats, mice, and rabbits, two widely performed tests are particularly brutal and unnecessary. Both the Draize Eye-Irritancy and the Classical LD50 (lethal-dose fifty percent) tests have been singled out by the animal-welfare community for immediate elimination. Despite certain measures taken by both industry and federal regulatory agencies to reduce the number of tests performed, they remain in use.

Rabbits are the victim of choice for the Draize rabbit-blinding test, primarily because they are relatively cheap, easy to handle, and have eyes large enough for convenient observation. Six to nine albino rabbits are used for each test. An animal is physically restrained (either by hand or in stocks), while a single, large dose of the test substance is placed in the lower lid of one eye. Test chemicals include cosmetics, toiletries, household products, drugs, pesticides, and environmentally hazardous materials (i.e., shampoos, soaps, hydrochloric acid, drain cleaner, formaldehyde, industrial solvents, etc.). The animal’s untreated eye is used as a control, or standard, against which the scientist compares the damage done by the substance.

The Draize experimental animals are generally immobilized in stocks for the duration of the experiment, which may last up to nine days. Such confinement prevents the rabbits from rubbing or scratching their damaged eyes to alleviate the pain. Once the procedure has been completed, Draize rabbits are either recycled into other toxicity tests (e.g., skin-irritancy tests) or killed. The eventual endpoint in all toxicity testing is death.

The Classical LD50 test, a slightly more complex experiment, requires a special set of needles or stomach tubes to force-feed animals without puncturing their throat or stomachs. After the procedure, subjects are returned to their cages where they either die from the administered substance or are killed at the end of fourteen days. Bleeding from the eyes, nose, or mouth, inability to breathe, convulsions, tremors, paralysis, and coma commonly afflict these animals.

Only the LC50 (lethal concentration fifty percent for inhalation toxicity) utilizes complex machinery to effect the torture of test subjects. The apparatus used here consists of a network of chambers, tubes, and fans that completely encloses animals in their cages. This is done to ensure a continuous flow and resultant exposure to noxious fumes and gasses.

If you have ever had a foreign object or substance in your eye, eaten something that made you violently ill, or breathed noxious gas, you have some idea of what millions of animals are experiencing in these brutal tests.

One would think that there must be some critical human health concern that justifies the annual slaughter of millions of laboratory animals. That is not the case.

Even industry toxicologists have publicly admitted that such wasteful tests as the LD50 are outdated and unnecessary. Comprehensive studies have shown that the results of Draize tests may vary not only among laboratories but also among animals in the same laboratories!

Why, then, do industries continue to conduct inaccurate, essentially
useless, extremely inhumane, product-safety tests when often they aren’t even required to do so by law or regulation?

Tradition.
“‘The perpetual obstacle to human advancement is custom,’” wrote eighteenth century philosopher John Stuart Mill and, indeed, custom plays a major role in the continuation of gruesome toxicity tests. Anchored firmly in tradition, these tests have become little more than a bad habit, having long outgrown the purpose for which they were initially developed. Over the years, they have been incorporated into product-safety checklists, regulatory handbooks, data sheets, and guidelines, and, today, remain a routine procedure carried out by a very conservative industry.

International laws.
At the international level, some governments, such as Japan, still rigidly require tests such as the Classical LD50. Even if U.S. companies were no longer required to carry out these tests, manufacturers planning to market their products in some foreign countries would continue to conduct them. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), an agency which establishes recommended guidelines for international trade, still includes the Classical LD50 and Draize tests in its guidelines for premarket testing of products. Because the member nations of the OECD have made no serious effort to delete these requirements, testing continues unabated. If the OECD took a position against the LD50 and Draize tests, their use worldwide would quickly cease.

Bureaucracy.
At the national level, typical bureaucratic inertia obstructs the desperately needed changes in regulatory policies. For years, agencies such as the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Food and Drug Administration have ignored the growing consensus that the Draize and LD50 tests should be eliminated in favor of more suitable alternatives. As far as the Draize test is concerned, increasing efforts to reduce the number of animals and tests required; making the tests more humane by pre-screening potentially toxic chemicals with cell cultures instead of animals; and using local anesthetics at the start of each test represent the only significant progress made in recent years. Unfortunately, only the Consumer Product Safety Commission has taken even these limited steps.

As a result of mounting pressure from the animal-welfare community, all three agencies recently announced they would no longer require results of the Classical LD50 test as substantiation of product safety. Although they promoted available alternative methods to be used in place of this brutal test, these agencies did not state that they would refuse to accept LD50 data, nor did they directly instruct companies to stop conducting such tests. In actuality, federal regulatory agencies are doing little to discourage the use of animals in product-safety testing.

Legal protection.
Oftentimes, manufacturers claim to be conducting animal tests in the name of consumer safety. In reality, their concern lies more in protecting themselves from product-liability suits. Cosmetic companies are a superb example of this. Although they are not required by any law or regulation to conduct animal testing, they continue to poison, blind, and gas countless animals each year. (It is interesting to note, however, that in one such product-liability suit conducted in Ohio, a court ruled that the Food and Drug Administration could not use Draize test results as evidence of a product’s safety. The results, the court determined, could not be extrapolated to humans.) The only acceptable excuse for doing any product-safety testing should be to protect the consuming public. The Classical LD50 test is extremely wasteful of animal life. It incorporates huge numbers of animals to produce statistically precise but biologically meaningless figures. Such statistics may even be dangerously misleading—often the levels deemed safe for one particular substance are invalidated when that compound is combined with another of the esti-
mated 60,000 chemicals currently in use.

Ethically, neither the Draize nor the Classical LD50 tests is defensible. Death by poisoning (LD50) involves intense suffering while proving to be of little-to-no value in evaluating safety or medical diagnosis and treatment. Interviews with personnel who have conducted Draize tests clearly indicate that pain is a normal consequence of the procedure, with animals not uncommonly screaming out when the test substance is placed in the eye.

Perhaps the strongest ethical argument against both the Classical LD50 and Draize tests is the viable alternatives that provide finer discrimination and, thus, increased protection for the public, are either readily available or could easily be developed.

Currently available alternatives, requiring significantly fewer or no animals, could save time and money while providing the information needed to protect human safety.

One such alternative, the Approximate Lethal Dose (ALD), requires 4 to 10 animals, as opposed to the 60 to 200 routinely used in the Classical LD50. A recent modification substitutes the initial appearance of toxic signs, rather than death, as the endpoint. Thus, at the first indication of distress or suffering, the animal is humanely euthanized.

Another option is the “limit” test. Here, a single small group of animals is given one dose of a test substance. If no ill effects are seen, no further testing is required. This is especially useful for basically non-poisonous substances, such as food additives.

All of these alternatives share one major drawback. Since animals are still killed to assess human safety risks, these can only be considered interim steps toward the complete replacement of animals in product-safety tests. Research into non-animals to the LD50 should focus on computer models, which can be used to predict the toxicity of substances on the basis of previously studied chemicals. Tissue cultures and lower invertebrate systems can also be used to determine the potential toxicity of test substances.

An equally wide variety of alternatives are now being considered to refine and replace the Draize test.
by Dr. Michael W. Fox

Understanding the Psychology Of Exploitation

I want to explore something very personal to me, something that all of us in the animal-welfare and -rights movement share. It is the knowledge of the suffering of animals under man’s inhumane dominion. This knowledge is our bond and our burden. Every time I give a lecture or a media interview on some animal-welfare topic, I relive that same suffering. Such pain is a large part of our burden of empathy. No matter how objective, dispassionate, and detached we try to be in order to distance ourselves from what we know and feel about others’ suffering, we cannot escape this burden.

Try as we might, however, we cannot successfully separate objective facts and documented evidence of animal cruelty and abuse, even when presented dispassionately, from our own subjective feelings, values, and moral outrage over the injustice we see in man’s inhumane dominion over the animal kingdom.

Certainly, it is understandable to identify our own feelings of oppression, injustice, and helplessness with the plight of animals. There is nothing wrong with that, provided our rage and anxiety do not impair our objectivity and effectiveness. Uncontrolled, such emotions can cause “burnout” in ourselves and overwhelm and alienate others who are not informed or of like mind. On the other hand, if we become dispassionate, desensitized, or cynical to opposing points of view, we are less likely to influence public opinion and arouse the concern of the uncommitted or uninformed members of society.

Being too zealous or too cynical, then, both have potential pitfalls. But let us return to the burden of empathy for animal suffering and how it affects us. Once we acknowledge this great burden of empathy resulting from our personal identification with the plight of animals, we may understand why, to avoid a similar burden, those who cause animals to suffer and who push them toward extinction do not allow themselves to identify with those animals’ fate. They proclaim such identification as sentimental and anthropomorphic, often arguing that animals can’t really feel or suffer. They fortify their defenses by insisting that animals were created primarily for man’s exclusive use. Such rationalizations may help animal exploiters escape from the heavy burden of empathy carried by animal protectors and from facing the responsibility for their exploiting activities. When these exploiters call upon economic necessity, or medical knowledge, or other supposedly sacrosanct tenets of modern society to defend their activities, they do so simply to shore up their own positions and maintain their facade of denial. Ironically, such people eventually reach the point where they become what they think animals are—and they neither feel nor suffer.

Feeling and fact are connected, and it is from this connection that most values arise. What we know only has value in terms of how we feel once we have certain specific facts, and conversely, our preexisting feelings influence how such knowledge is accepted, valued, and put into use. If we had no feelings about how animals are exploited and Nature is perverted, then we would feel no internal pressure to bring about societal changes in the status and treatment of animals.

What is this internal pressure, the driving motivation, behind the ani-
mal–rights movement? It is quite different, I believe, from the sanctimoniously patronizing Victorian animal–welfare movement that condoned animal exploitation if it was done “humanely” and accepted animal suffering as “unavoidable” and “necessary” when there were no alternative means to satisfying our needs. We feel more than just moral outrage and a sense of injustice in the face of the prevailing attitude toward animals, which admits no moral or ethical question over our presumed right to exploit animals primarily for our own ends. Although those who condone this attitude contend that it evolves naturally from their God-given right and power of dominion, the real polarization here is between respect—or reverence—for all life (including the environment) and a more human-centered world view that has religious sanction and economic justification. This human-centered world view is seen by many as becoming a threat to all life on earth—including every individual’s health and future well-being.

The animal–rights movement is driven by more than morality and justice. It has as a concern planetary and species’ survival. Disregard for animals’ rights and for the sacredness of all life is inevitably linked with mankind’s poisoning and destruction of the earth’s ecology. To regard human life as of greater value (and, thus, more sacred) than nonhuman life is part of the human–centered, and ultimately self-destructive, world view. It is this concept that the animal–rights movement is challenging and endeavoring to change, not only for the sake of animals and Nature, but for every human being’s sake as well. Little wonder, then, that the movement is becoming stronger as this connection between the fate of the earth and of all life on this planet, including each person’s, is recognized. We will have to help those who claim that “we put animals before people” to make this enlightened connection.

As the late Indira Gandhi said, “Everything is interdependent. Man, Animal, and Environment, whatever the economical or political context, everything is related. Whatever happens now to animals will eventually happen to man. The conservation of our inheritance deserves the same natural care as our economical development.”

Today, a host of symptoms, from institutionalized animal suffering, species extinction, and the industrialization and destruction of Nature to economic, ecologic, environmental, social, and public-health problems, affects humanity. Mankind would do better to treat the primary cause of this diseased state and not these superficial symptoms. This cause is, finally, a lack of concern for the sacredness of life, for the sanctity and dignity of Nature and all living things.

It is, therefore, enlightened self-interest to strike a balance between unconditional reverence for all life and the unremitting exploitation of all life that is the hallmark of our utilitarian civilization. The holocaust of the animal kingdom is but one of the symptoms of our imbalance with the rest of creation and, before we can see how this is related to our own fate, we must first begin to empathize with the suffering of animals under man’s dominion. Without this empathetic connection, this extension of our circle of compassion beyond concern for our own kin, race, nation, and species, the holocaust of the animal kingdom will continue, and “whatever happens now to animals will eventually happen to man.”

As Albert Schweitzer advised, “Until we extend our circle of compassion to include every living creature, we cannot enjoy world peace.”

Dr. Michael W. Fox is scientific director of The HSUS.
The HSUS Wildlife

by Nancy Blaney and Ann Church

"Hello, HSUS?...
"...A bar in our town is advertising an appearance by Bruce the Wrestling Bear. Isn’t it cruel to make an animal do something like that?"
"...They just shot someone’s pet lion after it ate its owner. Do you know of any laws on exotic pet regulation?"
"...My family and I want to tell you about a mangey bear we saw chained in a tiny cage at a roadside zoo."
"...Help! Our animal-control department just confiscated a pet monkey. Now what do we do?"
"...I want a wolf as a pet."

The HSUS receives phone calls like these regarding wild and exotic* animals in captivity every week. They come from every state and from private citizens, public officials, and media representatives.

The HSUS Captive Wildlife Protection Department spends a great amount of time either trying to dissuade individuals from inviting disaster by buying a wild pet or trying to deal with the consequences after the fact. Local humane organizations and distraught owners call on us for help in placing illegal or unwanted wild pets. More and more frequently, we provide local governments with assistance in developing restrictions on such ownership; sadly, they often do not address the problem until after tragedy has struck. Fortunately, others seem to be learning from these unhappy experiences—more communities are taking steps to enact controls before problems arise.

* "Wild" refers to all species of animals not traditionally considered domesticated. "Exotic" refers to all species of animals not naturally occurring historically in any ecosystem in the U.S. In this article, the term "wild" is used to refer to both indigeneous and nonindigenous (exotic) animals. Where nonindigenous animals are specifically referred to, the term "exotic" is used.

with the many problems caused by wild animals in domestication has led us to the conclusion that preventing these problems is more humane than trying to solve them.

We have also worked for years to end the abuse endured by many animals in substandard zoos and circuses and in other traveling shows. We have had to rely primarily upon the Animal Welfare Act to protect animals used in public displays; however, the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s enforcement of the law, with some notable exceptions, has been totally unsatisfactory and has not provided the relief possible under the law. At other times, we have been able to utilize a local anti-cruelty statute or state health code to correct a situation or we have been able to use the media to stimulate public demands for action.

On the whole, though, the problems associated with keeping wild and exotic animals outside professional zoological institutions have proved to be particularly hard to solve through available remedies. We decided a uniform model law was needed that would incorporate responsibility for all matters related to wild and exotic pets, substandard exhibits, and traveling animal acts. Once we determined that a model law could prove useful, we decided that a state law controlling privately owned wildlife, whether owned for personal or commercial purposes, would be more effective than community-by-community solutions.

We set about drafting a model law that would address the many concerns identified (see sidebar) without being so restrictive it would never be enacted or be too costly or too unwieldy to implement. This, we quickly learned, was a formidable challenge. Although we could draw, in part, on some state and local laws that seemed to work particularly well, an entirely new system was needed to protect wild animals in captivity.

The project took three years to complete. We scrutinized our proposals repeatedly, looking for inconsistencies, oversights, and loopholes. We worked closely with our General Counsel’s Office to ensure that definitions were as precise as possible; that language was understandable and appropriate to our intent; and
that, overall, the model bill would achieve the goal for which it was designed, i.e., to keep wild and exotic animals from falling into the hands of persons incapable of caring for them properly. We believe we have succeeded.

The HSUS bill is comprehensive; it is intended to protect captive wildlife. It will affect both the private ownership of wild animals as pets and the treatment of such animals in exhibits and traveling shows.

The Bill
Quite simply, the bill establishes a permit system restricting the possession of wild and exotic animals to those with legitimate reasons for having them. Accredited members of the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums, wildlife rehabilitators, and state agencies involved in work with wild animals are presumed to have such a legitimate reason and may receive a permit as long as they meet the minimum-care standards adopted by the enforcement agency. Persons who have owned a wild animal for a specified period prior to enactment of the law may also receive permits under the same conditions. We recommend that the minimum-care standards be at least as strict as those established under the federal Animal Welfare Act; however, we encourage adoption of more stringent regulations.

Any other person requesting a permit must not only comply with the minimum-care standards but must also prove, among other things, that he or she intends to pursue a conservation program that will significantly improve the health and welfare of the species in question and that he or she possesses the necessary skills and resources to implement such a program. Under no circumstances will a permit be issued to keep a wild animal as a personal pet.

We took this approach because some private owners, most notably amateur agriculturists, have contributed to the conservation of certain species. These individual successes are few and far between, however, and the private ownership of wild and exotic animals generally results in more suffering and abuse than benefits to the animals. Consequently, we have placed on each potential owner the burden of demonstrating his or her qualifications to own such an animal. The demands of the system should eliminate those who want to keep such animals for purely commercial reasons or because they want a "conversation piece."

The bill also prohibits sponsoring, attending, or training an animal to perform in acts that force the animal to engage in behaviors that are not part of its natural behavioral repertoire. This provision is aimed at such acts as hoop-jumping lions, boxing kangaroos, wrestling bears, and rollerskating elephants. Since many animals suffer a great deal of torment in the name of amusement, this prohibition should bring an end to their misery.

Another section of the bill requires persons planning to bring wild animals into a state to notify the proper authorities, file an itinerary, and obtain a permit in advance. This requirement would not apply to shipments by airlines or accredited zoos or to persons who will be in the state for a period of forty-eight hours or less. It does apply, however, to any person coming into the state with a wild animal for any kind of display or performance. This provision is designed to alert officials to the presence of a potential problem. We are familiar with a number of cases of abductions and escapes in which, suddenly, state and local authorities were faced with an emergency for which they were unprepared.

This model legislation has two key features. First, the definition of "wild" animal includes all animals except those specifically exempted, such as domestic dogs, cats, and livestock, and a few other common companion animals, such as captive-bred rabbits, hamsters, fish, parakeets, and certain other birds. We believe that specifying what is exempted, rather than what is covered, minimizes chances for unintended loopholes and provides for amending the law to address unanticipated situations.

Second, an important aspect of this bill is its flexibility. Although we think it best if the bill is adopted in its entirety, we recognize that each state has unique circumstances and constraints it must take into account. For instance, one state may need to make special arrangements for the use of wild animals in motion picture production, while another may need to consider the existence of a unique kind of wildlife-education facility. Each state will be able to modify the bill so that it suits its particular needs. Furthermore, while these problems can, we feel, be handled most efficiently at the state level, we, nonetheless, continue to support local efforts in this regard. The model bill can easily be used at that level as well.

Getting Involved
If you want to work for passage of legislation to protect animals from miserable lives in captivity, we suggest taking the following steps.

1. Obtain a copy of the HSUS
model law and supporting materials.

2. Find out if your state, county, or city already has laws governing the possession of wild and exotic animals. (Most communities address this issue in some way in their wildlife laws and regulations. If you cannot find any reference to it there, check the codes pertaining to human health and safety, the environment, and animal control.) Libraries usually maintain copies of state and local laws; you can also request copies from the governor's office or your city or county council. Ask for information from your local law enforcement officials but don't be surprised if they are unaware of any wild animal restrictions.

3. Analyze existing law(s). Are they well written? Are there too many loopholes? Do they protect animals in all captive situations? Many times, existing laws regarding captive wild animals were enacted for reasons other than the welfare of the animals. Many states and localities do not ban wild animal ownership but do require permits.

4. If there are relevant laws currently on the books, are they effective? If not, why not? Does one specific agency have responsibility for enforcement? Is sufficient funding available? Is the agency committed to the purpose of the law? Do citizens have the right to bring lawsuits on behalf of an animal? If regulations are needed to implement the law, have they, in fact, been promulgated?

5. Contact local humane organizations and your HSUS regional office to discuss the issue. They can probably provide you with background information and suggest key people with whom you should talk. Perhaps a humane group itself has plans to propose such legislation and has started some of the groundwork. Even if it has not been seriously involved with this issue, it will probably encourage you to proceed with your efforts. Many local shelters have to deal with wild animals only when an owner wants to dump an unwanted pet with them; this may be enough to make your shelter welcome your plans.

6. Organize a coalition to work on getting legislation passed at the state level. The coalition should be composed of humane societies and individual activists, but it should also include others whose involvement with wild animals in captivity may not be based on a concern for their welfare. For example, law enforcement officers are often burdened with capturing lost wild animals or dealing with other problems that arise due to these animals' presence in a community. Environmental, agricultural, and conservation groups should be concerned with the negative impact some wild animal species can have on the environment. The broader your coalition is, the greater your chances for success.

7. Decide on exactly what kind of bill you want to introduce after you have done an honest assessment of your coalition's capabilities, counted your votes in the legislature, compiled information on the issue in general and the problems in your state specifically, and determined exactly who
The Problem

There are four compelling reasons to prohibit the private ownership of wild and exotic animals except under strictly controlled circumstances.

Animal suffering starts at the source of supply. More than 125 million animals are imported into the United States each year for commercial purposes. Because of careless capture methods, poor transportation conditions, and unprofessional handling, ten animals may die for each live one that is finally sold. Although animals captive-bred for the private trade are spared this abuse, all wild animals have needs that are beyond the capabilities of an owner to handle. Throughout its life, the animal generally receives an improper diet, inadequate exercise, and insufficient veterinary care. “Performing” animals undergo additional physical and psychological stress in the name of “entertainment.” When, finally, the owner tires of his or her “pet” or no longer finds it financially lucrative, the animal’s lot will only worsen.

Environmental problems accompany the wild animal trade, a cause of the decimation of many wild populations and the devastation of sensitive ecosystems. Furthermore, abandonments and escapes of these privately owned wild animals pose serious environmental threats. The introduced species competes with resident species for the limited resources of the area and may wreak havoc on local plant life. These alien animals may also bring in diseases to which native animals have no resistance.

Human health and safety are jeopardized every time a nonprofessional brings a wild animal into a community. The HSUS can document numerous cases of injuries and deaths caused by such animals. The fault lies not with the animal but with the individual who placed it in an inappropriate situation. These animals also carry a variety of diseases that are transmissible to humans, and captive breeding does not eliminate this danger.

Community concerns are really individual concerns on a larger scale. Even the potential for escapes, injuries, or other problems costs the community both in its sense of well-being and in financial terms. Without effective controls, more money will wind up being spent on emergencies than would have been spent on enforcement.

in your state will be affected. You can introduce our bill as is, or propose it as an amendment to an already existing, but weak, law.

8. Find a state legislator willing to introduce the bill and actively work for its passage. (Determine if you will need a separate sponsor in each chamber.) The legislators best able to obtain passage of a bill will usually be individuals with a record of legislative victories, who are respected by their colleagues and are members of the committees with jurisdiction over the bill or members of the leadership. Brief your potential sponsors on the bill fully and be willing to supply them with any information they may want in the future. Take their advice on how best to obtain the bill’s passage.

9. Work with members of the press to educate them on the problem of wild animals in captivity and on the need for the legislation. Make them aware of any past or present local problems.

10. Lobby all the legislators for your bill, especially those on the committees with jurisdiction over it. Be prepared to tell them who in their districts it will affect and why it is needed; address the question of costs, etc. It is best for them to be lobbied by individuals who are also their constituents. (Information in the HSUS model bill packet will be useful at this time.)

11. Talk with someone in the governor’s office to ascertain his or her position. Try to gain his or her active support.

The Opposition

This type of legislation is controversial, so be prepared for opposition from several sources. The pet industry lobbies against almost all bills to regulate wild animals. The trade in wild animals is very lucrative for segments of the industry and they view any restriction as a threat to their profit. The industry’s lobbying arm has been trying to alarm its members ever since it learned we were working on a model bill. The lobbyists are well aware that wild animal ownership is a major problem.

Other opponents may include those individuals who already possess wild animals as pets and want to have that same opportunity in the future. The HSUS model bill would allow most of these people to continue to keep their present animals because there is no better alternative. Others who oppose the bill will include those businesses and individuals who gain financially from possessing wild animals. Do your best to ascertain who these people are before the bill is introduced.

Do not be surprised that some bill opponents perceive themselves to be the true animal lovers. Be prepared—with the HSUS material—to educate them that trade in wild animals is detrimental to the majority of animals and that for the few that have good homes, thousands were greatly mistreated and/or killed.

Conclusion

It may seem unfortunate that men and wild animals cannot easily coexist in close quarters. However, condemning a wild animal to a way of life that only man enjoys is not kindness but mistreatment.

Nancy Blaney is assistant to the director of captive wildlife protection and Ann Church is coordinator of state legislation for The HSUS.
RABIES: An Age-Old Disease Finds New Life

Second Part of a Two-Part Series

by Guy R. Hodge

The Trapping Controversy

Journalist Ted Williams recently wrote, "One thing rabies is and always has been is a dandy excuse. Until very recently, it assisted mightily in the elimination of obnoxious dogs. Until even more recently, rabies provided a pretext to do in predators for the benefit of livestock." The specter of rabid animals, mouths frothing and teeth bared, also is invoked in defense of the use of steel-jaw leghold traps. Trappers would like us to believe that they are doing the public a favor by plying their craft. They maintain that the public health is safeguarded because trappers remove from the wild furbearing animals that are potential carriers of rabies.

Trapping has long been a common method of rabies control. But it hardly seems reasonable to expect commercial animal-trapping to control rabies when it is conducted on a sustainable-yield basis to create static populations that provide an annual "harvest" of furbearers. The vector species cited by the Centers for Disease Control account for only fourteen percent of the trappers' catch. In other words, most traps are set for muskrat, beaver, and other species that are not even carriers of rabies! But trappers continue to ascribe the powers of witchcraft to their steel traps, insisting that, without these devices, our children would fall prey to rabid animals that would overrun city streets.

What is all the more remarkable is that trapping not only does not check rabies but may actually promote the spread of the disease. Some wild animal species, including the raccoon, do not always contract rabies when exposed to the virus. Instead, they develop serum-neutralizing antibodies that provide them with a form of natural immunity.
These animals may serve as a natural barrier to the spread of rabies. At the height of an outbreak, as many as fifty percent of the surviving raccoons will be immune to the disease. It is these healthy, immune animals that are attracted to traps. Thus, trapping may actually fuel rabies outbreaks by creating voids in the population. A study conducted in Virginia during the mid-Atlantic outbreaks exposes the folly of trapping as a technique of rabies control: municipalities in that state conducted intensive trapping programs, hiring professional trappers and offering traps on free loan to citizens. Yet, among raccoons clinically diagnosed as rabid, only nine percent had been caught in traps while twenty-two percent had been discovered on roadsides after being struck by automobiles.

**Rabies Control**

Scientists are on the track of an oral rabies vaccine that will allow the mass immunization of wild animals. The vaccine is administered in food baits spread in the woods. At present, researchers in Europe and Canada are focusing their attention on an oral vaccine for foxes. The results are encouraging and may result in the production of a vaccine as soon as 1990.

For the present, the Centers for Disease Control recommend creating a buffer between the rabies virus and the general public. Public health officers are working to minimize contact between infected animal hosts and man. They are striving to discourage people from handling or harboring high-risk animals and to discourage contact between companion pets and wildlife.

The vaccination of both dogs and cats may be the single most important step that we can take to minimize contact between humans and animals that are potential carriers of the disease. Wildlife-proofing our homes is another basic method of avoiding contact between infected host animals and man. All animals require food and shelter for their survival. By sealing attics and basements and properly disposing of garbage, people can render their homes uninviting to wildlife such as raccoons.

Americans own an estimated 1.7 million exotic pets, including raccoons, skunks, and domestic ferrets. There is a cottage industry of commercial dealers who sell these animals as pets. Unfortunately, there is little that can be done to minimize the risk of infection in pet wild animals. No rabies vaccines are licensed for their inoculation. Moreover, scientists do not know whether any vaccine produces immunity in wild animals, whether the natural onset or clinical course of rabies may be masked or modified by vaccination, or whether a live vaccine can produce rabies in pet skunks or raccoons. Thus, the American Veterinary Medical Association and The Humane Society of the United States have joined with health associations in recommending the enactment of laws prohibiting the distribution or ownership of wild animals as pets.

Rabies will not soon disappear despite advances in animal vaccines. Fear of rabies should not force us to lead sheltered lives or abandon parks. Far more people die from drowning in lakes than from rabies. It is a matter of the public's perception of the risks. While Washingtonians are fearful of the squirrels camping in their backyards, they don't hesitate to vacation in Texas despite the fact that the disease is more prevalent in the Lone Star State. People are simply going to have to realize that rabies is endemic in the United States, as it is throughout much of the world. We must learn to live with raccoons. Leave wild animals alone, vaccinate pets, and don't invite raccoons or skunks to become houseguests.

**First Aid for Victims**

Immediate and thorough cleansing of the bite wound or scratch with soap and warm water is the first step in treating a suspected exposure to rabies. As much as ninety percent of the virus may be destroyed during washing.

Contact the victim's personal physician or community health department and follow their instructions. These medical authorities will make a decision as to whether or not to treat the victim for rabies exposure. Of course, if the victim has sustained a severe wound, then promptly obtain medical attention.

If at all possible, the attacking animal should be captured and confined. Notify the local health department or animal-control agency of the incident.

---

**Tips on Living With Rabies**

- Vaccinate both dogs and cats against rabies.
- Do not keep skunks, raccoons, ferrets, or other wild animals as pets.
- Do not approach wild animals, particularly those that seem unusually friendly, and never feed a wild animal from your hand.
- Do not feed dogs or cats out-of-doors—it attracts uninvited dinner guests.
- Do not toss tablescraps in the yard for squirrels—you may attract raccoons or skunks.
- Barricade entryways into the home, including chimneys, furnace ducts, ventilator louvers, and eaves.
- Use a metal garbage can with a tight-fitting lid.
- Prune tree branches that overhang the roof.
- Promptly notify the animal shelter about any wild animal that acts sick or unusually friendly.
- Instruct your children to tell an adult immediately if they are scratched or bitten by an animal.

Guy R. Hodge is director of data and information services for The HSUS.
So that all will know the position of the Pro-Pets coalition on this issue, the following policy statement has been adopted by all member organizations:

"The goal of the National Coalition to Protect Our Pets is to seek legislation which will prohibit, with criminal penalties, the use and/or procurement of public and private shelter animals or other pets for all scientific purposes including, but not limited to, research, experimentation, testing, teaching, and demonstration, except in the course of diagnosis or treatment necessary for the well-being of the animal. The coalition will not advocate or condone as an alternative the use of any other source, type, or species of animal. In implementing this policy, the National Coalition to Protect Our Pets will focus its arguments on the facts that:

1. Making animals available for such purposes is contrary to the purpose and proper function of a public or private shelter.

2. Making animals available for such purposes aggravates the problems of animal control and protection."

In two very important ways, this coalition has "preempted the possible." First, it has served notice on the research establishment that animals in the shelters and pounds across our nation are on our turf and, therefore, may not be further violated, even for presumed meaningful purposes and ends. If the medical research community had hoped to make this issue a cause célèbre, it has indeed been thoroughly preempted.

Secondly, it has established an objective, the achievement of which is quite possible, primarily because it has refused to remain divided over an issue of such great importance. It has often been said, especially by those we oppose, that if ever the "sleeping giant" of animal-protection organizations banded together, it would become a formidable foe. In spite of those who hope for and foster that division, both within and without, let it be known that this coalition has now become a reality and is committed to remain such for a long time to come.

---

**Pro-Pets Coalition Sponsoring Organizations**

- The American Anti-Vivisection Society
- American Humane Association
- The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
- Animal Protection Institute
- Fund for Animals
- The Humane Society of the United States
- International Society for Animal Rights
- Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
- Michigan Humane Society
- The National Anti-Vivisection Society
- New England Anti-Vivisection Society

*Director Michael Giannelli, Ph.D.*

The Pro-Pets coalition will be expanded to include other animal-welfare/rights organizations as members. For further information, interested organizations should write: Dr. Michael Giannelli, Director, Pro-Pets, 3123 Cahuenga Blvd. West, Los Angeles, CA 90068.
Institute Activities Include Publications, Research, Speaking Events

The Institute for the Study of Animal Problems has been very encouraged by HSUS members' interest in the just published, new annual textbook, Advances in Animal Welfare Science. Already several excellent articles and proposed topics have been submitted for our 1985-1986 edition, an indication that the science and philosophy of animal welfare are becoming recognized disciplines.

Research associate Linda Mickley has completed the first phase of an in-depth study of the connection between the destruction of tropical rain forests in Central and South America so that cattle can be raised for the U.S. fast-food hamburger market and the extinction of unique plant and animal species in the region.

The Institute's director, Dr. Michael Fox, has completed a detailed study of the husbandry, behavioral needs, and welfare of laboratory animals. Entitled Laboratory Animal Husbandry: Ethology, Welfare and Experimental Variables, it will be published later this year by the State University of New York Press.

In December, Dr. Fox gave the first C.S. Lewis memorial lecture at Moravian College in Bethlehem, Penn., on animal rights and welfare and spoke to staff and researchers at the National Zoo, Washington, D.C., with particular emphasis on the management and conservation of captive and wild animals. In February, he gave the leading address at the annual conference of the American Veterinary Holistic Medical Association in Las Vegas, showing how the rights and welfare of farm, laboratory, and companion animals are intimately related to their physical and psychological health and to the ethical practice of veterinary preventive medicine.

NAAHE Announces A New Director

In February, Kathy Savesky resigned as director of the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE) to accept the position of director, division of humane services, with the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. In accepting Ms. Savesky's resignation, HSUS President John A. Hoyt said to her, "It is with great regret that I accept your resignation. We shall always be grateful for your excellent leadership in this significant field of endeavor and the manner in which you have inspired others to become effective educators."

Patty Finch, humane educator and project director from Reno, Nev., has been appointed the new director of NAAHE. Ms. Finch is perhaps best known to HSUS members for her humane education workshop on teaching controversial animal topics at the secondary level, which she presented at the HSUS annual conference last year in San Diego. Ms. Finch brings to NAAHE a strong teaching background, including a master's degree in education, as well as expertise in the animal-welfare movement on local, state, and national levels. She has substantial experience in administering multi-state programs, including Project Equity, a program designed to introduce sex equality in schools.

Over the past few years, Ms. Finch has demonstrated her skills and her commitment to animals in pioneering efforts to establish humane education programming in various communities. Working with other educators and humane society representatives, she formed HEART—Humane Educators Assisting Reno Teachers—and developed a pet grief hotline to aid pet owners in coming to terms with decisions about euthanasia and the loss of beloved companion animals. An active member of the Western Humane Educators Association, she has presented numerous teacher in-service workshops. She has also designed and written many teaching activities for the classroom and is a regular contributor to Humane Education, NAAHE's magazine for educators.

We welcome Patty Finch to the HSUS staff and wish her success in her directorship of our educational programs. HSUS members can contact her at NAAHE, Box 362, East Haddam, CT 06423.

Former NAAHE director Kathy Savesky (right) and new director Patty Finch (third from right) posed with workshop leaders at last year's NAAHE symposium in San Diego.
No to Feed Drugs

One of the many unacceptable practices associated with factory farming is the routine addition of antibiotics to food animal feed to counteract diseases caused by overcrowding. Our concern over the increased use of these antibiotics has spurred The HSUS to support a petition filed with Secretary of Health and Human Services Margaret Heckler calling for the suspension of new animal-drug applications. The petition, filed by the National Resources Defense Council, Inc., (NRDC) applies only to applications for the subtherapeutic use (dosages lower than those used to treat actual disease) of penicillin and tetracyclines in animal feeds. The HSUS joined the NRDC in its request that the secretary remove from the market subtherapeutic use of penicillin and tetracyclines in animal feeds on the basis of scientific data showing an imminent hazard to public health.

During the hearings held by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in late January, animal-drug producing companies, farming and ranching organizations, and animal-welfare groups presented testimony consistent with their positions on the ban. All testimony will be compiled by the FDA and, along with its evaluation of the petition, given to Mrs. Heckler by April 1.

In its testimony, The HSUS stated that the subtherapeutic use of penicillin and tetracycline in animal feeds encourages the growth of organisms resistant to these drugs that are so important in the treatment of human illnesses. People who ingest animal tissue containing these organisms can develop resistance to the antibiotics.

The drug industry and meat producers claim that they need penicillin and tetracycline to raise food animals efficiently in modern factory farming systems. Overcrowding and unnatural conditions cause stress-related diseases in the animals. To offset the stress, animals are fed antibiotics which suppress or mask their true condition. The HSUS believes that the solution lies in removing the animals from the stressful environment not in administering routinely potent drugs.

Drugs in animal feed have also come to Capitol Hill’s attention. In late January, Rep. Jim Weaver introduced H.R. 616, calling for the responsible and effective use of antibiotics in farm animal husbandry. The HSUS and Mr. Weaver hope that congressional action on this issue will motivate the FDA and Sec. Heckler to take quick action in calling for a ban on the subtherapeutic use of penicillin and tetracycline in animal feed.

Please write your congressman and ask him/her to cosponsor H.R. 616. Also, write Sec. Margaret Heckler, Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC 20201 and ask her to ban the subtherapeutic use of penicillin and tetracycline in animal feeds.

AWA Enforcement Axed?


When the AWA was passed in 1966 and amended in 1970 and 1976, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) was given responsibility for enforcing the law, which requires that animals kept in research and testing laboratories, zoos, circuses, puppy mills, and aquariums be given adequate food, water, care, and housing.

However, unless the house and senate appropriations committees intervene and restore funding, APHIS inspections will cease altogether when the fiscal year ends on October 1, 1985.

According to administration briefing documents, “States, industry, and humane groups should take responsibility for the humane treatment of animals... APHIS will discontinue all inspections... There will be no federal investigations of complaints or alleged violations and cooperative efforts with other government agencies will cease.”

While The HSUS is intrigued at the thought of humane societies being allowed to enforce higher standards of care, animal-welfare groups have no legal authority to perform inspections now the responsibility of APHIS.

In reality, then, what the administration proposes is to cut off all inspections, since those facilities holding animals are not, in most cases, required to allow anyone else into their facilities.

The APHIS budget for inspections has always been meager, at best. It reached its all-time high funding level of $4,865,000 in fiscal year 1982.

However, for the last three years, the administration has proposed major funding cuts. Each time, Congress has restored the money through the appropriations process.

You can help preserve APHIS funding by writing the house and senate chairmen of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture to protest the elimination of funding and ask them to give adequate funding to enforce the Animal Welfare Act. They are: The Honorable Jamie L. Whitten, Chairman, Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, 2362 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515; The Honorable Thad Cochran, Chairman, Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, SD-140, Washington, DC 20510.
ESA Reauthorization

The Endangered Species Act (ESA), one of the world’s most important wildlife-conservation laws, expires in October and must be reauthorized by Congress. Passed in essentially its present form in 1973, the ESA has as its goal the preservation and restoration of endangered and threatened species and their habitats. Many of the world’s wildlife and plant species have declined alarmingly or become extinct in recent years as the result of habitat destruction, hunting, trapping, collecting, and pollution.

The ESA makes it illegal to kill, collect, or injure animals and plants listed as endangered (in danger of extinction), with generally similar protections for animals and plants listed as threatened (declining but not in imminent danger of extinction). The act also contains provisions designed to protect habitat critical to endangered species and helps protect animals and plants around the world by implementing the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, a treaty that restricts trade in endangered and threatened species.

The HSUS has joined the Endangered Species Act Reauthorization Coalition (ESARC), a group of animal-welfare and conservation organizations, to work for the reauthorization of a strong ESA. Increased funding for the act’s programs, both domestic and international, is desperately needed to ensure that the ESA fulfills its goals. We also want increased protection for plants and for candidate species (those in danger but not yet listed by the ESA as formally “endangered” or “threatened”).

The HSUS’s efforts and those of the ESARC will be directed at key congressional subcommittees. Hearings are expected to be held in both the Senate and the House in mid-May. During the summer, the Senate and the House must reconcile any differences between their versions and pass a single bill. President Reagan then must sign the bill by early October if the ESA is to remain in force.

Please write or call your senators and representative asking them to vote for a strong Endangered Species Act.

Horse Roundups Begin

Federally funded roundups to rid the western range of wild horses and burros have begun in Nevada and will soon follow in several other western states, as well.

In August of 1984, Congress appropriated $16,739,000 to round up and remove 17,142 horses and burros from public lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). The HSUS joined other animal-welfare organizations to fight this wasteful appropriation, which was originated in the Senate by Senator James A. McClure of Idaho, chairman of the interior appropriations subcommittee.

Sen. McClure claimed the money was necessary because wild horses and burros had overpopulated the public lands and were destroying the rangeland.

For years, the livestock industry, which has many friends in Congress, has been pushing for removal of massive numbers of these wild animals in order to give more room for privately-owned sheep and cattle to graze.

Until this congressional appropriation last August, the industry strategy had been to push for passage of legislation to give the BLM sale authority—the right to sell rounded-up, unadopted horses at auction, where the highest bidders are slaughterhouses providing horsemeat for pet food.

Sen. McClure was unable to bring such a bill to the senate floor for a final vote because the wild horse issue is so emotionally charged.

The alternative McClure appropriations bill barely passed out of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, which Sen. McClure chairs. But, pass it did.

Now, with the McClure appropriation in the current BLM budget and more than 17,000 animals scheduled for forced removal, the public’s response in adopting these thousands of horses and burros will not keep up with supply. When this happens, the livestock industry, the BLM, and their congressional friends will point to the great cost to the taxpayer for feed and housing the rounded-up animals. This will make legislation giving BLM sale authority seem attractive to those who do not look closely.

Through BLM statements to Congress, we know the agency expects to sell at least 7,000 wild horses and burros before October 1.

In effect, the BLM is cautioning Congress that, unless sale authority is passed, another large appropriation must be made to keep these thousands of horses in holding pens.

You can help stop the wrongs being perpetrated on these animals. Write your senators and congressman expressing your opposition to use of taxpayer money to fund senseless roundups. Ask for an unbiased population study to gather scientific data and urge that any congressional action be held off until real figures are available. Remind your members of Congress that the cattle industry, the real enemy of wild horses, is already heavily subsidized and that thousands of horses and burros should not have to die just to satisfy it.

Any member of the Senate may be reached c/o The U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510.
Any representative may be reached c/o The House of Representatives, Washington, DC 20515.
**Gulf States**

**New, Expanded Office Opens**
A new Gulf States Regional Office has opened at 6262 Weber Road, Suite 305, Corpus Christi, TX 78413. The new facility will allow the regional office staff to offer increased educational program assistance to the gulf states. Eight different two-day training sessions are offered free of charge to humane society and animal-control personnel on an appointment basis. The sessions cover how to form a humane society; starting humane education and community-awareness programs; investigation and prosecution of cruelty cases; legislation; evaluation of euthanasia methods; animal-shelter design; formulating a spay/neuter program; and fund-raising.

To arrange for a session, write the regional office or call (512) 853-3142.

**Regional Workshop Success**
On March 15 and 16, the Gulf States office was the host for a very successful two-day workshop in Wichita Falls, Tex. Approximately 110 participants heard a panel which included HSUS President John Hoyt, Secretary of the Board of Directors Amy Freeman Lee, and Director of Laboratory Animal Welfare John McArdle debate scientists on the subject of animal experimentation. Taking humane concerns to college students, using computers in shelters, and forming state legislative networks were other popular workshop presentations.

**Decompression Halt**
After years of urging the Houston, Tex., animal-control facility to discontinue the use of the decompression chamber, regional director Bill Meade reports that these efforts have finally met with success.

Decompression remains the euthanasia method of choice at a few shelters in the region, however. Mr. Meade urges everyone to demand that his or her local facility make a change if this inhumane procedure is still being used.

---

**Great Lakes**

**Date Change**
The Ann Arbor, Mich., session of the HSUS Animal Control Academy will take place from May 13 to 24, 1985. This is a change from the dates announced in the last issue of the *News*.

For information on the academy, contact regional director Sandy Rowland (735 Haskins St., Bowling Green, OH 43402).

**New Year, New Efforts**
With the new legislative session in full swing, the Great Lakes Regional Office is busily providing background information, mailing to its members, acting as an expert witness, and presenting testimony before legislative bodies on a number of issues.

Strengthening and revising the anti-cruelty statute is on the agenda in the state of Indiana. The Great Lakes office is also working to stymie an open hunting and trapping season on coyote there.

In Ohio, the main issues are repeal of the pound seizure law; changing the state statute to allow for differential licensing for dogs; and setting standards for shelters, pet shops, and boarding kennels.

The Michigan Federation of Humane Societies and the Michigan Humane Society are working to secure passage of legislation which would prohibit the release of pound animals and mandate spaying and neutering for all animals released from pounds in that state.

West Virginians seek to stop bunchers from securing animals from pounds and shelters in their state.

The Great Lakes Regional Office thanks all those who have helped in bringing these issues before the legislatures.

---

**West Coast**

**Knudsen Case Update**
On January 30 and 31, West Coast Regional Director Char Drennon attended a hearing in federal court in Sacramento, Cal., to determine whether animal dealer Henry Knudsen had violated the Animal Welfare Act (AWA) in the operation of his kennels (see the Winter 1985 *HSUS News*).

Thirty-seven dead animals had been found on his property and sixty-nine dogs and cats were reportedly "in emaciated condition due to neglect." Although Mr. Knudsen had surrendered his United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) dealer license several days after his arrest on cruelty charges last year, he could have reapplied for a new license at any time had charges of AWA violations not been brought against him. In the midst of the hearing proceedings,
West Coast (continued)

the USDA and Mr. Knudsen agreed to a consent order that provides that Mr. Knudsen’s license as a dealer is permanently suspended and that he shall not engage in any activities regulated by the AWA, whether or not a license would be required. He was assessed a civil penalty of $124,000, of which all but $10,000 was suspended conditionally upon compliance with the terms of the order. Should he engage in any activities covered by the AWA, Mr. Knudsen would then owe the additional $114,000 in fines.

On February 5, 1985, a judge set April 4, 1985, as the date of Mr. Knudsen’s criminal trial on four counts of animal cruelty. On February 21, 1985, the San Joaquin district attorney’s office filed a civil case against Mr. Knudsen, asking for $60,000 in fines and $15,000 in charges for cleaning up his kennel and housing the animals. It also moved to freeze the escrow on his property subject to the suit.

...and in Nevada

Because we had evidence that Mr. Knudsen had sold animals to universities, including the University of Nevada at Reno, The HSUS sent a press release to Nevada newspapers alerting them to the possibility of animals from the Knudsen kennel having already been sold to research facilities in that state. As a result, the Humane Society of Southern Nevada and Nevada Humane Society of Reno introduced state legislation, S.B. 21, to make pound seizure illegal and to stop animal dealers such as Mr. Knudsen from selling to research facilities in Nevada.

Dr. John McArdle, HSUS director of laboratory animal welfare, testified in support of the bill in Carson City on February 13, 1985, before the Senate Natural Resources Committee.

Coalition Challenges
Auctions

In January, a newly-formed coalition made up of representatives from Fund for Animals, Animal Protection Institute, Humane Educators’ Council, and The HSUS met with representatives of the livestock industry to discuss animal abuse in transportation and auction markets. The Coalition for Livestock Protection requested the meeting to determine what steps the industry would be willing to take to prevent abuses. Armed with documentation from a recently completed HSUS investigation (see the Fall 1984 HSUS News), the coalition suggested that self-imposed improvements by the industry were long overdue. In response, representatives of the California Farm Bureau, California Cattleman’s Association, and the Stockton Livestock Market asked the coalition to submit guidelines that could be implemented in California.

The coalition has proposed thirty-one guidelines for review and response by the Independent Livestock Markets of California. According to west coast investigator Eric Sakach, a member of the coalition who helped to draft the guidelines, “These minimum standards are entirely reasonable and practical and would prevent a tremendous amount of animal suffering while reducing losses for producers.” The coalition believes a positive response from auction managers could eliminate the necessity for legislation.

The West Coast Regional Office also brought a new HSUS service to the attention of livestock-auction operators. They may now request an on-site evaluation which will aid them in voluntarily improving conditions and handling practices at their facilities.

Western Humane Educators Meet

HSUS West Coast staff members Judi Kukulka and Char Drennon attended the spring seminar of the Western Humane Educators’ Association (WHEA) at the Santa Barbara (Cal.) Humane Society on February 16 and 17, 1985. Susan Howey, the society’s education director, acted as host for the two-day session.

WHEA’s next meeting will be held in Los Angeles in September. Anyone wanting more information on this organization should contact the West Coast Regional Office.

Academy Comes to Oregon

The HSUS Animal Control Academy, co-hosted by the Humane Society of the Willamette Valley, will be held from July 15 to 26, 1985, at Willamette University in Salem, Ore.

For additional information on the academy, contact the West Coast Regional Office (1713 J Street, Suite 305, Sacramento, CA 95814).
Setback for Crane Beach

Last year at this time, The HSUS joined with other animal-welfare groups to stop a proposed deer hunt on the Richard T. Crane Memorial Reservation in Ipswich, Mass. (see the Spring 1984 HSUS News). At that time, we joined a deer advisory committee set up by The Trustees of Reservations, the group that owns the Crane property. In the fall, we attended two meetings of the committee to discuss a report on the deer, prepared by Dr. Aaron Moen of Cornell University, and to recommend a course of action to the Crane trustees.

Although The HSUS found serious flaws in the report, we agreed with its basic conclusion that the number of deer on the reservation was a problem. We did not agree with Dr. Moen’s recommendation that a massive reduction program be undertaken to kill thirty to forty-five percent of the deer population each year until the total population was lowered by eighty-five percent. The HSUS recommended that the trustees allow the population to self-regulate, humanely euthanatizing any animals that were in distress from disease or food shortages. The recommendation was based on our analysis that the population would stabilize at a lower level if left alone, since animals respond with lower reproduction to situations where food is scarce. The Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and Friends of Animals, two other members of the advisory committee, made similar recommendations to the trustees.

In January, the trustees announced that they would use a marksman to kill distressed deer this winter. They also announced that they would allow a public hunt this fall and every succeeding fall. In allowing this hunt, the trustees have clearly not lived up to their responsibility for intelligent and humane stewardship of the deer under their protection. They have ignored a range of other solutions to the problem suggested to them by The HSUS and other advisory group members.

All three animal-welfare organizations remain opposed to a public hunt. We will continue to work against it and for humane treatment of the deer. If you’d like to help, please write Mr. Frederick Winthrop, Director, The Trustees of Reservations, 224 Adams St., Milton, MA 02188 and express your opposition to a public hunt and your support for The HSUS’s humane alternative.

“Taming” Project Wild

Project WILD is now a target of animal-welfare groups in both Illinois and Wisconsin. Project WILD has been opposed by some of the nation’s largest and most powerful humane groups, including The HSUS (see the Winter 1985 HSUS News). The material in the Project WILD curriculum guides is so flawed as to be a detriment to the educational process and should be recalled, according to a joint statement and analysis produced by the humane groups.

Unfortunately, the project already is making its way into classrooms in Illinois and Wisconsin. However, it is not too late to turn back the tide—residents of these states can write to Gov. James Thompson or Gov. Anthony Earl and ask that Project WILD be stopped or that its biases, inaccuracies, and omissions be corrected.

Contact the North Central Regional Office (2015 175th Street, Lansing, IL 60438) for additional information about Project WILD.

Thanks in large part to the response of HSUS members, dog-fighting is now a felony in Virginia. Although the state House of Delegates had originally weakened the language in Delegate Phoebe Orebaugh’s bill, so much support had been expressed by Virginians for the stronger penalties that, by the time the bill reached the Senate, the crime’s felony statute had been reinstated. Congratulations are due to everyone who worked for this important victory.
Activists endure wet weather during the Great Swamp protest.

**Mid-Atlantic**

**We’ve Moved**

The Mid-Atlantic Regional Office has moved. Its new address is P.O. Box 147, Convent Station, NJ 07961. The new telephone number is (201) 377-7111.

**Great Swamp Protested**

In an attempt to rally public sentiment against what they term “the inhumane killing of helpless animals,” anti-hunting activists trekked to the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge in Morris and Somerset counties, N.J., in December to protest against the annual deer hunt there.

While the number of demonstrators has decreased in recent years, protest organizers said the spirits of the 1984 contingent were buoyed by a lawsuit filed against federal wildlife officials by The HSUS.

The suit asks the court to ban sport hunting privileges in all national wildlife refuges.

“Even though our group has dropped from about 100 to 35 demonstrators, the lawsuit gives us all hope that we may someday not have to continue to plead for the lives of these helpless animals,” said Mrs. Nina Austenberg, who has been associated with Great Swamp protests since they began more than a decade ago.

Other protesters included representatives from Animals Need You and Fund for Animals. Symbolic protests against the hunt were observed by The Humane Society of Bergen County, Mobilization for Animals—Bergen Chapter, New Jersey Shore Animal Center, Associated Humane Societies, Animals Need You, The Somerset County Humane Society, and Animals in Distress.

**N.Y. Reviews WILD**

Representatives of People for Animal Rights, The Society for Animal Welfare, Fund for Animals, Wildlife Alive, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, and The HSUS met recently with New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Commissioner Henry Williams to discuss Project WILD, the wildlife education curriculum introduced in many public school systems across the country (see the Winter 1985 HSUS News). After meeting with the animal activists, Mr. Williams abruptly canceled a series of wildlife workshops scheduled on Project WILD.

Animal welfarists object to the material, which strongly promotes hunting and trapping as appropriate “management tools” for dealing with wildlife.

After listening to examples from the Project WILD text, Mr. Williams agreed that there was a need to reevaluate the presenta-

**Hope for Oil-spilled Birds**

Recent oil spills in Long Island, N.Y., and Wayne, N.J., reminded Mid-Atlantic members of the misery and death such man-made disasters inflict on wildlife. HSUS board member Gisela Karlan and field investigator Paul Miller took part in an all-night wildlife rescue mission, undertaken by the Wildlife Rehabilitation Fund, Wildlife Preserves, Inc., and the Turtle Back Zoo, that captured and rehabilitated a number of oil-saturated ducks after the Wayne spill.

Training in handling affected wildlife is offered from time to time in the region. Anyone wishing to become a part of the oil-spill response team should contact the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office.
Huron Valley Spay/Neuter Clinic Ruling

The determination by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) that the Humane Society of Huron Valley's (HSHV) spay/neuter clinic is a charitable activity and that, therefore, income from that clinic is not taxable as business income (see the Winter 1985 HSUS News) was so potentially far-reaching, it merits more detailed explanation. In deciding this case, the IRS went further than it had ever gone previously in recognizing the principle that providing veterinary services to animals is inherently charitable.

The IRS placed significance on the fact that the HSHV staff provides medical care to stray and abused animals in addition to performing spay/neuter operations. It seemed to be impressed with the dramatic reduction in the number of stray or abandoned animals (from 20,000 to 9,000) the humane society had had to shelter annually during the six-year period the clinic had been in operation. This demonstrated effectiveness of the clinic in animal-population control is important because the IRS had previously held that preventing the birth of unwanted animals and their eventual suffering prevents cruelty to animals and is, therefore, charitable.

Of central interest was the IRS's discussion of the extent to which providing medical care to animals comports with the legal doctrines of what is "charitable" and, for that reason, exempt from taxation. For the first time, the IRS broke away from the notion that charitable veterinary services must be limited to treating stray, abused, or abandoned animals or the animals of indigent owners. The decision seemed to recognize that responding to any animal's medical needs, regardless of whether that animal has a human being responsible for it or is able or willing to pay for services, is inherently charitable:

The prevention, treatment, or cure of diseases or injuries of animals through the operation of a veterinary hospital is a charitable purpose under the general heading "Relief of Animals," and is an exempt function under section 501 (c) (3). Obviously, the provision of veterinary services to prevent sickness in animals or to treat sick or injured animals furthers a charitable purpose. However, there is nothing to indicate that this charitable purpose is limited to treatment of animals whose owners are unwilling or unable to pay for such treatment. The implication is that whenever animals receive needed medical treatment, the community benefits. By providing low cost spay and neutering services to animals, HSHV is providing a veterinary service that furthers the charitable purpose of prevention of cruelty to animals [emphasis added].

The IRS concluded that, because HSHV's spay/neuter clinic prevents cruelty to animals and furthers the society's charitable purposes, income from the clinic is charitable rather than commercial in nature and is not taxable. As encouraging as this decision may seem, it has two limiting features. The decision was in the form of a Technical Advice Memorandum which applies only to HSHV and, technically speaking, has no precedential value in cases involving other societies. Also, in spite of the sweeping language quoted above, the decision is limited by the fact that HSHV primarily operates a spay/neuter clinic, not a full-service veterinary hospital.

Grand Teton Elk Suit

The HSUS was part of a lawsuit in October to stop the annual elk hunt in Grand Teton National Park.

Filing the suit with the Animal Protection Institute and the Animal Legal Defense Fund, The HSUS charged that holding a hunt violates both the Grand Teton National Park Act and the National Environmental Policy Act. We asked for a preliminary injunction to stop this year's hunt and a halt to any hunting until requirements of those acts can be met.

The judge refused our request. A trial will now be held to determine if such hunts are legal.

Refuge Hunting Attacked

In November, The HSUS mounted a major attack on hunting in national wildlife refuges. Of the 424 refuges in the National Wildlife Refuge System, more than half are now open to hunting, and more than 400,000 animals are killed or wounded on refuges each year.

The HSUS filed a lawsuit that charges that a number of federal laws have been violated in the administration of hunting programs on refuges. The Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), which administers the refuges, has violated these statutes by failing to prove that hunting programs are compatible with the purposes for which the refuges were established, as required by the Refuge System Administration and Recreation Acts. The FWS has also illegally delegated authority to the states to oversee hunting on refuges, since refuges are federal property and, by law, must be administered by the federal government. We charge that the FWS did not take the proper actions to protect endangered species on refuges with hunting programs nor has it adequately revealed the full impact of opening refuges to hunting.

The Law Notes are compiled by HSUS General Counsel Murdaugh Stuart Madden and Associate Counsel Roger Kindler.
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Meet the Seal Who's Going to Help Save the Seals!

His name is Snuggles The Seal™ and he is a fluffy white friend of the baby seals so highly prized for their valuable fur.

One look and you'll know why anyone would love to receive this adorable 9" gift. Dressed in ski cap and sweater, Snuggles The Seal is made of one of the softest and cuddliest kind of plush material. Meticulously crafted by Emotions, a Division of Mattel, Inc., the world's largest single toy manufacturer.

For every Snuggles The Seal sold, Emotions will donate $1.00 in the consumer's name to the Humane Society of the United States to support their effort to save the seals (please see hang tag for details).

Share your feelings with...

Emotions
A Division of Mattel, Inc.

TO GET YOUR VERY OWN SNUGGLES THE SEAL™ plush toy just complete the coupon below.

Mail this coupon today to:
Unique Products Gift Redemption Center
P.O. Box 5015 Ronkonkoma, NY 11779

Enclosed is my:  □ Check  □ Money Order in the amount of ________
Make check or money order payable to "UNIQUE PRODUCTS."

□ Yes I want to help Snuggles the Seal™ save the seals.
Send me _______ (Qty) @ $20.00 each, plus $1.95 per toy to cover postage and handling. New York residents add applicable tax.

NAME ________________________________
ADDRESS ________________________________
CITY ___________ STATE ______ ZIP __________

Please allow 6-8 weeks for delivery. Offer valid only in U.S.A.
Offer void where prohibited. Offer valid until Dec. 31, 1985 or while supplies last.
How can those who are sensitive to animal exploitation individually and collectively change their way of living to lessen animal suffering in modern society? At this year's HSUS annual conference, we will explore alternatives and options available now and look to the future for advances in what we eat, what we wear, and what we buy.

Also offered will be a full-day seminar on companion animal issues, led by HSUS Vice President Phyllis Wright, to be held on Wednesday, October 16, immediately preceding the conference. Meet us in mid-America—plan to attend the HSUS annual conference this year.