A New and Different Silent Spring

Violence blights society, but coalitions can offer help

A generation ago many people were drawn to working on behalf of animals and the environment by Rachel Carson’s Silent Spring. The book invoked the image of a world silenced and diminished by the poisoning of birds and by unspeakable acts of abuse and cruelty. Increasingly, these promises a different type of pesticides.

A New and Different Silent Spring

...many forms—animal cruelty, child abuse, spouse abuse, elderly neglect and abuse, workplace violence, and hate crimes. Just as violence in our society. Every day we hear stories of innocent victims, including those of both children and animals, silenced by unpeakable acts of abuse and cruelty. Increasingly, these...
Low Guyton, HSUS southeast regional program coordinator, center, leads a barnyard tour for schoolchildren (and others) in Dallas during National Farm Animals Awareness Week. The week took place nationally, with Lucy the pig, from Scott Fekety's Dallas, Texas, area, who successfully escaped from a slaughterhouse and was adopted into a permanent home, where she shares her kind disposition with special-needs children. The week received media coverage via television stations nationwide. Travel Partners will encourage patronage of those tourist attractions that are beneficial to animals. Travel Partners will share a new HSUS/HSI brochure, "Tips for the Compassionate Traveler," with their clients, and they will gather information through periodic mailings from us of specific events to promote or discourage. We want to stop the flow of tourist dollars to events that exploit animals. Further information about the Travel Partners initiative, including a list of participating agencies across the United States, can be found on the HSUS and WSPA Internet sites on the World Wide Web (www.hsus.org and www.way.net/wspa).

THE ANIMAL Damage Control (ADC) program, a part of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, is notorious for its decades-long campaign against western wildlife. In the name of livestock protection, tens of millions of badgers, bears, coyotes, foxes, mountain lions, prairie dogs, and wolves have been killed. Even today, predator-control agents use public funds to poison, trap, and shoot about one hundred thousand coyotes annually, often on public lands. The overall annual toll in animal lives is currently about one million. ADC opponents argue that the program's initials stand not for "animal damage control" but for "all the dead critters." Well aware of their program's negative public image, officials announced in August that the program would be known henceforth as Wildlife Services. The HSUS opposed this change, arguing that the name should not change until the program does. Until this program begins preferentially to use nonlethal means, and the factors that contribute to failed human-animal relationships. Data for the study were collected at twelve animal shelters across the United States through interviews with persons relinquishing animals. Interviewees also cited as reasons for surrendering animals the high cost of pet maintenance, personal problems, and in-pet homes. One is designed to gather information on the number and disposition of animals relinquished to animal shelters. The other is designed to identify characteristics of pet owners and the acquisition, ownership, and disposition of their pets. For copies of summary releases relating to studies being conducted by the NCPPSP, please contact Sally Fekety, HSUS Director of Animal Sheltering Issues, The HSUS, 2100 L St., NW, Washington, DC 20005.

THE SUMMERLEE Foundation, based in Dallas, Texas, has designated The HSUS as its primary beneficiary.
Lowreyton, HSUS southeast regional program coordinator center, leads a barnyard tour for schoolchildren (and others) in Dallas during National Farm Animals Awareness Week.

THE FIFTH ANNUAL National Farm Animals Awareness Week took place September 21-27, 1997. The HSUS released to the national media a series of animal profiles focusing on the lives of individual farm animals such as Lucy the pig, who made her television debut with Wil­lard Scott on the Today Show; and Emily the cow, who successfully escaped from a slaughterhouse and was adopted into a permanent home, where she shares her kind disposition with special-needs children. The week re­ceived media coverage via radio stations, newspapers, and magazines, and we created a one- and one-half-minute video that was distributed to more than one hundred television stations nationwide. Public-service announcements featuring James Cromwell (Farmer Hogget from Babe), below, and Bob Keeshan (Cap­tain Kangaroo) promoted the week. We also hosted farm tours in the Washington, D.C.; Lincoln, Nebraska; and Dallas, Texas, areas. These tours were given to elementary­school stu­dents, their teachers, and members of the media to give them the oppor­tunity to see how complex, intelli­gent, and social farm ani­mals are.

A BULL sinking to his knees in a bullring; dolphins swim­ming circles in a small, dirty tank; emaciated donkeys pulling carriage loads of tourists along dusty streets in the hot sun—these are the evils of animal-pro­tection organizations are full of letters of concern from un­suspecting travelers whose vo­cation have been ruined by such distressing sights.

A new team, Humane Society International (HSI) and the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA), seeks to raise the tourism in­dustry’s consciousness of ani­mal welfare. Travel Partners for Animal Welfare is a group of travel agencies and whole­salersthat have joined in part­nership with us to help their clients avoid inadvertent sup­port of events and industries that exploit animal suffering. Instead, Travel Partners will encourage patronage of those tourist attractions that are ben­eficial to ani­mals. Travel Partners will share a new HSUS/WSPA brochure, “Tips for the Compassionate Traveler,” with their clients, and they will gather information through periodic mailings from us of specific events to promote or discourage. We’re also considering the flow of tourist dollars to events that exploit animals.

Further information about the Travel Partners initiative, including a list of participating agencies across the United States, can be obtained by writing to the HSUS and WSPA Internet sites on the World Wide Web (www.hsus.org and www.way.net/wspa).

THE ANIMAL Damage Control (ADC) pro­gram, a part of the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Animal and Plant Health Inspec­tion Service, is notorious for its decades-long campaign against western wildlife. In the name of livestock protection, tens of millions of badgers, bears, coyotes, foxes, moun­tain lions, prairie dogs, and wolves have been killed. Even today, predator-control agents use public funds to poison, trap, and shoot about one hun­dred thousand coyotes annual­ly, often on public lands. The overall annual toll in animal lives is currently about one million.

ADC opponents argue that the pro­gram’s ini­tials stand not for “ani­mal damage control” but for “all the dead crit­ers.” Well today, we are aware of their program’s nega­tive public image, officials an­nounced in August that the program would be known henceforth as Wildlife Ser­vices. The HSUS opposed this change, reasoning that the name should not change until the program does. Until this pro­gram begins preferably to use nonlethal means of protecting livestock and agricultural resources from wildlife damage, its reputation will follow it—no matter what its name.

PEOPLE DON’T GET RID of their children when they move; but many people give up pets as their reason for sur­rendering their feline or canine family members to animal shelters. In fact, moving was one of the top reasons for re­linquishment identified in a recent study by the National Council on Pet Population Study and Policy (NCPSP).7 The NCPSP is a coalition of eleven national animal-related organizations, including The HSUS, created in 1993 to am­e­nise the dynamics of pet overpopul­ation and evaluate the effectiveness of programs and policies developed to combat its tragic conse­quences.

The NCPSP’s study pro­vides valuable insight into the types of animals relinquished to shelters, the characteristics of people who surrender ani­mals, and the factors that con­tribute to failed human-animal relationships. Data for the study were collected at twelve animal shelters across the United States through inter­views with persons relinquish­ing animals. Interviewees also cited as reasons for surrender landlords’ prohibitions against pets, an overabundance of ani­mals in their households, the high cost of pet mainte­nance, personal prob­lems, and inade­quate space in homes or yards.

The NCPSP has undertak­en two other studies. One is a long-term survey designed to gather information on the number and disposition of ani­mals relinquished to animal shelters. The other is designed to identify characteristics of pet owners and the acquisition, ownership, and disposition of their pets.

For copies of summary re­leases relating to studies being conducted by the NCPSP, please contact Sally Fekety, HSUS Director of Animal Sheltering Issues, The HSUS, 2100 L St., NW, Washington, DC 20037.

THE SUMMERLEE Fou­dation, based in Dallas, Texas, has designated The HSUS as

FIRST STRIKE AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The overwhelmingly pos­i­tive response to the 1997 HSUS symposium, “Making the Connection: Animal Cruelty and Human Violence,” from organiza­tions dealing with domestic violence has reaffirmed our commitment to working with social-service profes­sionals to create a coordi­nated community response to violence.

Such professionals are increasingly aware of the role that animals can play in the dynamics within abusive families. In a 1997 nationwide survey, re­s­earchers found that 85 per­cent of women’s shelter di­rectors report that women in their facilities described abuse of companion animals as part of their victimization. Surveys of women in shel­ters in Utah and Wisconsin found that 71-80 percent of the women with companion animals report threats or acts of violence toward their ani­mals. In Utah nearly 20 per­cent of the women report that they delayed leaving their abusers out of fear that their domestic animals would be harmed.

Through its First Strike™ campaign, The HSUS has produced a brochure for women who have companion animals and are seeking help in situations involving domestic violence. The brochure was developed with significant input from a group of animal-protec­tion and social-service pro­fessionals dealing with the issues of domestic violence and cruelty to animals in their communities. It was published in October as part of Domestic Violence Awareness Month and is being distributed to wo­men’s shelters across the country.
the distributor of the Annie Lee Roberts Emergency Rescue Fund. The primary purpose of the fund is to assist nonprofit organizations and municipal animal-care and -control agencies in the Southwest through direct financial support for the care of animals who are victims of natural or human-caused disasters.

Requests from outside the region will be considered during the grant year 1997–98. Submit applications to Dennis J. White, The HSUS, 3001 LBJ Freeway, Suite 224, Dallas, Texas 75234. For additional information call 972-488-2964.

HSUS MEMBERS can now put their purchasing power to work to eliminate animal suffering with a new credit card offered exclusively through The HSUS and Travelers Bank. Each time a cardholder uses the new HSUS Platinum Visa card, Travelers Bank will donate a percentage of the change to The HSUS. This Visa card is the only credit card that supports the important animal-protection programs of The HSUS.

Features competitive pricing—no annual fee and a low introductory rate of 0 percent on purchases and just 6.9 per cent on both cash advances and balance transfers for the first six months the account is open. Other benefits are travel accident insurance, lost luggage insurance, and auto rental insurance.

There are three design motifs to choose from—dogs, cats, or the new “Animals...It's Their World Too!” design—or you can customize your HSUS Platinum Visa with a photo of your bird, cat, dog, hamster, horse, children, or family free of charge.

Show your support for The HSUS mission by signing up for the new HSUS Platinum Visa credit card today. To apply call toll free 1-800-HSUS-594.

CONSIDERED THE rarest of the great whales, North Atlantic right whales face an uncertain future: fewer than three hundred remain out of a population that once numbered in the thousands. Entanglement with commercial fishing gear and collisions with large ships are the leading causes of death, and the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) requires the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to reduce the rate of mortality to levels that do not threaten the population. Given how few right whales are left, the NMFS calculates that the total mortality for the population must be less than one individual per year if the population is to recover.

An HSUS consultant has been working with commercial fishermen and two government task forces charged with developing plans to reduce fishery-related deaths of right whales. Following the completion of the task-force process, the NMFS developed a plan for reducing whale deaths each year than the population can support. Shocked at this failure to protect right whales and frustrated with the slow progress in resolving the issue of vessel collisions, The HSUS organized a meeting in Washington, D.C., in early October to discuss with other conservation groups the threats to the whales and potential avenues of solution. The outcome of this meeting was a letter sent to the NMFS assistant administrator for fisheries, Rolland A. Schmitten, and signed by eighteen major conservation and animal-protection organizations. The letter denounced the NMFS plan as grossly inadequate to protect right whales from entanglement with commercial fishing gear and suggested alternate strategies. This letter should make clear to the NMFS that the environmental community will fight to ensure that the beleaguered right whale receives real protection under the MMPA.

The HSUS also is exploring the possibility of legal action to ensure that the NMFS acts decisively to protect right whales if its current plan fails to achieve the required mortality goal.

A white whale frolicks in the Bay of Fundi. Considered the rarest of the great whales, right whales face an uncertain future. Estimates are that fewer than three hundred remain.
HSUS SYMPOSIUM

Making the Connection
Linking cruelty to animals and other violence

This conference, which was well-received, observed a partnership at the end of the HSUS's symposium, "Making the Connection: Animal Cruelty and Human Violence," which was held in Washington, D.C., on September 9 and 10. More than three hundred participants from domestic violence intervention projects, animal welfare agencies, municipal departments of corrections, and animal protection organizations showcased their involvement in a variety of projects designed to link animal cruelty and human violence.

The Honorable Robert C. Smith, U.S. senator from New Hampshire, gave the keynote address, "Synergizing the Legal Response to Cruelty to Animals and Other Violence."

Wednesday evening's highlight was the presentation of the HSUS's Joseph Wood Krutch Medal to Scott McVay, executive director of the Corinne F. Dugan Foundation. Mr. McVay was among the first to appreciate the importance of linking animal cruelty and human violence.
Clockwise from left: Mr. Irwin cites his President's Report; attendees mingle prior to Wednesday's dinner; O. J. Ramsey, Esq., chairman of the HSUS Board of directors, left; and Mr. Hoyt applaud Mr. McVay; HSUS Great Lakes Regional Director Sandy Rowland; right; greets Peninsula (California) Humane Society's Kathy Sawyer; HSUS Vice President of Training Initiatives Randall Lockwood, Ph.D., and Mr. Irwin compare notes; panelist and school principal Marge Borchardt makes a point.
Is Fur Really “Back”?  
Industry hype falls far short of reality

You’ve seen it splash across the pages of fashion magazines, advertised in your local newspapers, and spotlighted on tabloid television. Once the pariah of the fashion world, fur is now being embraced by both fashion designers and the media. You might not even recognize it as something originally part of an animal. Fur has been transformed into day-glo-dyed fox “clubbies” (puffy-looking coats), baby blue Mongolian lamb jackets, sheared-mink boxer shorts, even fur processed to look like feathers, trimmed in exotic animal. Fur has been transformed into fashion. When The HSUS launched the “Share of Fur” campaign a decade ago, retail fur sales were at their peak, with nearly one million fur coats being sold annually. Fur coats were still the symbol of success and wealth they had become since the mid-1990s.

Faltering Fashion

When The HSUS launched the “Share of Fur” campaign a decade ago, retail fur sales were at their peak, with nearly one million fur coats being sold annually. Fur coats were still the symbol of success and wealth they had become since the mid-1990s.

A GIFT THAT’S FUR REAL

Don’t know what to do with that fur coat you have but don’t want to throw away? Give it back to the animals! Orphaned and injured wildlife are comforted by fur blankets while they are nursed back to health. Send your fur coats, hats, and other fur apparel to the Anti-Fur Campaign. The HSUS, 2100 L St., N.W., Washington, DC 20037, and we’ll send them to a wildlife rehabilitation.

The fur industry also has been actively courting the fashion press. The trade all but an anachronism. The number of community preparedness summit, held in October at the El Nifio Disaster Exercise sponsored by The American Red Cross, Army Corps of Engineers, and Walt Disney Company; and various state emergency-services officials.

The non-separatist message that every fur coat hurts! We will not allow the public to be duped by a dying industry, and we need your help. It takes anywhere from thirty to sixty minks to make a fur coat, but only one consumer to make a difference. Every time you refuse to purchase a fur or fur-trimmed fashion, you are helping to make our campaign a reality, and sending a message to those in fur coats need to hide their faces—Danielle Bayn, HSUS wildlife issues associate, Wildlife and Habitat Protection.

Kane, executive director of the American Humane Association; and Matt Corman, executive director of the Humane Society of the United States. The HSUS has pledged to make a difference. Every time you refuse to purchase a fur or fur-trimmed fashion, you are helping to make our campaign a reality, and sending a message to those in fur coats need to hide their faces—Danielle Bayn, HSUS wildlife issues associate, Wildlife and Habitat Protection.

The non-separatist message that every fur coat hurts! We will not allow the public to be duped by a dying industry, and we need your help. It takes anywhere from thirty to sixty minks to make a fur coat, but only one consumer to make a difference. Every time you refuse to purchase a fur or fur-trimmed fashion, you are helping to make our campaign a reality, and sending a message to those in fur coats need to hide their faces—Danielle Bayn, HSUS wildlife issues associate, Wildlife and Habitat Protection.

The non-separatist message that every fur coat hurts! We will not allow the public to be duped by a dying industry, and we need your help. It takes anywhere from thirty to sixty minks to make a fur coat, but only one consumer to make a difference. Every time you refuse to purchase a fur or fur-trimmed fashion, you are helping to make our campaign a reality, and sending a message to those in fur coats need to hide their faces—Danielle Bayn, HSUS wildlife issues associate, Wildlife and Habitat Protection.
Reflect for a moment...  
How can I help animals even when I no longer share their world?  

Through your bequest for animal protection to The Humane Society of the United States, you can provide for animals after you’re gone.  

Naming The HSUS in your will demonstrates your lasting commitment to animal protection and strengthens the society for this task. We will be happy to send you information about our animal-protection programs and material that will assist you in planning a will.  

Yes, I would like more information on The HSUS and will planning.  

Name  
City State Zip  
Mail this coupon in confidence to Murdaugh Stuart Madden, Vice President/Senior Counsel, The Humane Society of the United States, 2100 L St., NW, Washington, DC 20037.
A Life and Death on the Road
HSUS assists in the case of circus elephant

At approximately 7:00 p.m. on August 6, 1997, three Albuquerque, New Mexico, police officers on routine bicycle patrol noticed a truck with a long trailer swaying from side to side in a hotel parking lot. Curious, the officers approached the truck and asked a man near it what was inside. According to police reports, the man first said one elephant was inside, then admitted that other animals were inside the trailer. The officers climbed onto the truck to look through two small air vents, the only openings, on the front of the trailer. Hot air was blasting out of the trailer through the vents, and the officers could just make out some animals inside. (Police and others on the scene would later estimate the temperature inside to be 20-30°F hotter than the 86°F outside temperature that night.) Shortly after the officers climbed down, the driver returned to the truck, and the officers repeatedly asked him to open the trailer’s rear doors.

When he complied the officers discovered three elephants and eight llamas inside the poorly ventilated trailer, which belonged to the Texas-based King Royal Circus. Heather, one of two African elephants inside, was dead. The eight llamas were confined in a space eight feet square by six feet high at the front of the trailer. Heather’s body lay in the trailer’s rear doors.

The next week the city attorney of the Albuquerque Biological Park (whose board of directors had been meeting in the hotel while the truck was parked outside) told the officers the trailer was then towed to the grounds of the park, and the remaining animals were unloaded.

Heather’s body was removed from the trailer the next day. A team of veterinarians determined that she had died of a salmonella infection, or salmonellosis, most likely caused by raw fruit or vegetables that were outside the trailer. Donna soon began showing signs of salmonellosis; she was judged by the staff at the park to be seriously underweight. The park staff began medical treatment and implemented an appropriate diet with nutritional supplements for her and the other animals.

On August 7 the HSUS received a call from a witness who had been on the scene in Albuquerque the night before. Richard W. Swan Jr., HSUS vice president, Investigative Services, and Kitty Block, Esq., HSUS legal counsel, Investigative Services, then traveled to Albuquerque to meet with several key individuals connected with the investigation into Heather’s death and the prosecution of the circus employees in charge of the animals’ transport.

The next day the city attorney of Albuquerque fought to keep temporary custody of the elephants from the trailer’s owner and vehicle and won. According to court documents, twenty-two counts of animal cruelty were filed against the driver of the truck and his assistant, the man discovered with the truck. Until the city’s credit card, the animals will remain at the park in the custody of the city by order of the court.

Also on August 7, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) began its own investigation into the circumstances surrounding Heather’s death. During the city’s custody hearing, the USDA announced its decision to suspend King Royal’s license to perform with wild animals for twenty-one days. While under suspension King Royal, on tour in Wisconsin, was prohibited from including any wild animal in its performances.

Immediately after the suspension took effect, an HSUS undercover investigator traveled to Wisconsin to observe the circus’s activities. Our investigator’s videotape shows King Royal flagrantly disregarding the USDA suspension order, performing with two elephants, two zebras, a boxing kangaroo, a giraffe, and a pygmy hippopotamus. Our documentation and testimony has been made available to the USDA, the city of Pahrump, Nevada, and New Mexico officials for further action as their separate cases against King Royal develop.

The King Royal Circus’s activities were documented for much of their tour, some of its animals or acts to other shows and may use animals whom it rents from other operators in its own performances. It appears from USDA records that King Royal normally has seven elephants. According to USDA investigators, Heather, Donna, and Irene, along with the llamas, had been performing in July in Las Vegas, Nevada, with the Jordan Circus. The other four elephants were observed performing in Wisconsin with King Royal itself.

When the job in Las Vegas had ended, King Royal moved the animals to Pahrump, Nevada, according to testimony by the handlers. From there they were scheduled to travel to Colorado for another performance. While in Pahrump King Royal had begun to exhibit signs of intestinal distress. USDA investigators discovered that she had not been seen by a veterinarian there and that her handlers had not talked directly with the circus’s consulting veterinarian in Texas. Instead they had contacted the circus owner, who called the consulting veterinarian and then spoke with the handlers again. Despite her signs of illness, Heather’s handlers had loaded her and the other animals into a truck and headed for Colorado. Heather’s diarrhea had continued, and the circus owner, who had been instructed by the circus owner to head for home in Texas. When the truck arrived in Albuquerque on the evening of August 6, Heather was dead.

The USDA has pursued the investigation of Heather’s death in an aggressive and effective manner, resulting in well-documented, serious charges against King Royal. Richard H. Farinato, HSUS director, Captive Wildlife Protection, and Ms. Block were present at an administrative hearing October 6-9, in Albuquerque, to provide public support for the animal-protection side of the case. Officials at the hearing presented a compelling case of chronic abuse and inhumane treatment of animals by King Royal employees through the testimony of nineteen witnesses, including USDA inspectors and investigators, and Albuquerque police, animal-control officers, and park staff.

According to testimony by park staff and USDA officials, the condition of Donna and Irene—and of Heather’s body—demonstrated a lack of proper care over a long period of time. Their skin and foot care, critical to the health of captive elephants, had apparently been ignored or carried out incorrectly. Body condition and diagnostic tests showed poor nutrition, especially in Donna, which had further compromised the animals’ general health.

In the opinion of veterinarians called as witnesses by the USDA, a lack of proper veterinary care for these animals was obvious. When an elephant shows signs of serious or chronic diarrhea, it is widely recognized that immediate medical intervention is critical. Diarrhea in elephants is often a sign of salmonellosis, which can kill an elephant rapidly and requires aggressive treatment—not a long journey in an overheat ed trailer.

Ron DeHaven, D.V.M., acting USDA deputy administrator for Regulatory Enforcement and Animal Care, testified that the actions of King Royal resulted in extreme animal suffering and that the nature of the circus’s chronic violations of the Animal Welfare Act made Heather’s case particularly abusive. He called for a permanent revocation of King Royal’s license to exhibit wild animals—thus urging the strongest step the USDA could take to stop King Royal from causing further harm to animals in its care.

At this time Donna, Irene, and the llamas are receiving the excellent care they deserve at the Albuquerque Biological Park. The city of Albuquerque is moving forward with its cruelty case against the handlers. The USDA awaits the decision of the administrative law judge before revoking King Royal’s license to operate. There is much more to come in this case. The HSUS will continue to monitor its progress and do all that we can to protect those animals still on the road, until a life on the road no longer threatens them.
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The King Royal Circus’s activities were documented for much of their tour, some of its animals or acts to other shows and may use animals whom it rents from other operators in its own performances. It appears from USDA records that King Royal normally has seven elephants. According to USDA investigators, Heather, Donna, and Irene, along with the llamas, had been performing in July in Las Vegas, Nevada, with the Jordan Circus. The other four elephants were observed performing in Wisconsin with King Royal itself.

When the job in Las Vegas had ended, King Royal moved the animals to Pahrump, Nevada, according to testimony by the handlers. From there they were scheduled to travel to Colorado for another performance. While in Pahrump King Royal had begun to exhibit signs of intestinal distress. USDA investigators discovered that she had not been seen by a veterinarian there and that her handlers had not talked directly with the circus’s consulting veterinarian in Texas. Instead they had contacted the circus owner, who called the consulting veterinarian and then spoke with the handlers again. Despite her signs of illness, Heather’s handlers had loaded her and the other animals into a truck and headed for Colorado. Heather’s diarrhea had continued, and the driver was instructed by the circus owner to head for home in Texas. When the truck arrived in Albuquerque on the evening of August 6, Heather was dead.

The USDA has pursued the investigation of Heather’s death in an aggressive and effective manner, resulting in well-documented, serious charges against King Royal. Richard H. Farinato, HSUS director, Captive Wildlife Protection, and Ms. Block were present at an administrative hearing October 6-9, in Albuquerque, to provide public support for the animal-protection side of the case. Officials at the hearing presented a compelling case of chronic abuse and inhumane treatment of animals by King Royal employees through the testimony of nineteen witnesses, including USDA inspectors and investigators, and Albuquerque police, animal-control officers, and park staff.

According to testimony by park staff and USDA officials, the condition of Donna and Irene—and of Heather’s body—demonstrated a lack of proper care over a long period of time. Their skin and foot care, critical to the health of captive elephants, had apparently been ignored or carried out incorrectly. Body condition and diagnostic tests showed poor nutrition, especially in Donna, which had further compromised the animals’ general health.
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At this time Donna, Irene, and the llamas are receiving the excellent care they deserve at the Albuquerque Biological Park. The city of Albuquerque is moving forward with its cruelty case against the handlers. The USDA awaits the decision of the administrative law judge before revoking King Royal’s license to operate. There is much more to come in this case. The HSUS will continue to monitor its progress and do all that we can to protect those animals still on the road, until a life on the road no longer threatens them.
SEEING FEAR

HORSES HAVE THE LARGEST EYES OF ANY LAND ANIMAL. THOSE WHO BUY AND TRAIN HORSES OFTEN LOOK FOR WHAT THEY CALL A "KIND EYE" WHEN MAKING THEIR CHOICES, BUT IT IS, MORE ACCURATELY, AN EXPRESSION OF INTEREST AND ALERTNESS, WITHOUT FEAR.

I, ON THE OTHER HAND, AM TROUBLED BY RECENT MEMORIES OF YOUNG HORSES WHO WERE VERY, VERY AFRAID. THEIR EYES WERE OPENED SO WIDE THAT THE WHITE REMAIN NORMALLY HIDDEN FROM VIEW WAS VISIBLE. THE YOUNGSTERS WHIMPERED AND HUDDLED TOGETHER, TREMBLING, CRANIMINTED ONTO THE SALE FLOOR AT A CROWDED AND NOISY LIVESTOCK AUCTION IN CANADA. THE BIDDING HAD BEGUN.

I HAD GONE TO CANADA HOPING TO REVIEW DISPARITIES AMONG THE STATEMENTS OF A GIANT PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANY, A TRUST ASSOCIATION, AND ITS OPPONENTS. A ISSUE OF THE PRELIMINARY OF MORE THAN 50,000 PREGNANT MARES USED AS THE PRODUCTION OF THE ESTROGEN-REPLACEMENT DRUG, PRENARIN, AND THOSE MARES' FOALS.

FOR YEARS THERE HAVE BEEN ALLEGATIONS THAT THE MARES ARE ABUSED DURING THE SIX-MONTH SEASON EVERY YEAR THAT THEIR ESTROGEN-RICH URINE IS COLLECTED. HARNESSSED IN NARROW STALLS, UNABLE TO TURN AROUND, PREGNANT MARES HAVE BEEN FOUND DEPRIVED OF EXERCISE, ADEQUATE WATER, AND VETERINARY CARE WHILE TERRORIZED BY CHAINS SO SHORT THEY COULD NOT EVEN LIE DOWN COMFORTABLY.

THE WORLD SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION OF ANIMALS, AMONG OTHERS, DOCUMENTED SUCH SERIOUS PROBLEMS IN 1995 DURING TOURS OF PREGNANT MARE URINE (PMU) PRODUCTION FARMS (SEE THE WINTER 1995-96 HSUS NEWS). SINCE THEN THE MANUFACTURER OF PRENARIN, WYETH-Ayerst Laboratories, HAS CLAIMED THAT MANY PROBLEMS HAVE BEEN CORRECTED AND THAT COMPANY INSPECTIONS OF PMU FARMS HAVE INCREASED, BUT WYETH-AYERST HAS REFUSED TO ALLOW THE HSUS ACCESS TO PMU FARMS TO INDEPENDENTLY VARY CONDITIONS.

THE FATE OF THE FOALS ALSO HAS BEEN DIRTY CONDUCT. WYETH-AYERST AND PMU FARMERS HAVE DENIED ALLEGATIONS BY ANIMAL-ProTECTION ADVOCATES THAT...
Agriculture Yearbook, horses, and the remainder, approximately profit group organized to represent PMU percent to 81 percent. province that year were slaughtered—near­ for several months before being killed.) Thus the 1994 Yearbook data show that two-thirds of all PMU foals born in the province that year were slaughtered—near­ly identical to the figure the government reported for 1993. Many PMU foals could not have been offered for sale, even at 500—were located to another purpose. Many were dead before the farm sales and auctions ever occurred. A research study published by the Canadian Veterinary Journal reported that 22 percent of foals born on PMU farms in western Manitoba between April 18 and May 31, 1994, had died. Extrapolating these findings to the entire province, almost 6,000 PMU foals may have died within the first six weeks of life alone. The study cited comparable figures for foal mortality on farms managed to produce riding horses as ranging from 3 percent to 12 percent, as­erting that such foals “were assigned a higher value, so that more resources were spent on individual foals.” Sadly, PMU foals, only a by-product of the drug indus­try, are usually worth far less than the ur­ine their mothers produce. The Journal article listed the principal causes of death for PMU foals as starvation and/or exposure. Under conditions said to be typical of the PMU industry, mares were removed from the collection barns in early April after several months of near total im­mobility. They were then turned out in fenced paddocks to deliver their foals, of­ten in subzero temperatures, without bene­fit of any shelter. Most of the foals that did die were dead within days. Such deaths are ta­tually inexcusable and entirely preventable. If the 1994 Yearbook statistics are prop­erly adjusted to exclude foals who had already died on the farm from the total made available for sale, then the proportion of all surviving PMU foals sent to feedlots and slaughterhouses would increase from 66 percent to 81 percent.

The North American Equine Rescue Information Council (NAERIC), a non­profit group organized to represent PMU farmers, provides vastly different esti­mates. According to information posted on NAERIC’s World Wide Web site, fewer than one-third of the foals born on all PMU farms go to the international meat market. The Web site states that 24 percent are re­tained as future PMU replacement stock, 20 percent are sold for recreational purposes, 15 percent go to ranches and rodeos, and 9 percent are sold as show horses. NAERIC points to data from its survey of member PMU farmers throughout Canada and North Dakota to confirm its assertions. The only similarity between its claims and the official Manitoba government records is that both conveniently neglect to men­tion the thousands of foals who apparently die on PMU farms before any dispersal sales can be held. As a representative of PMU farmers, NAERIC has a clear interest in countering criticism of its industry. That interest aside, NAERIC’s statements are also based on the claim that nearly one-quarter of the foals are retained for replacement stock, are incon­sistent. NAERIC maintains that the average PMU mare is in production for twelve years. If so it should be necessary to keep less than 10 percent of the female foals as future replacement mares and probably not less than 1 percent as breeding stallions. Manitoba’s agriculture officials, on the other hand, are arguably more objective. (Unfortunately, the agriculture depart­ments in Alberta and Saskatchewan, where PMU farms also exist, either don’t collect or don’t make available comparable data on PMU farms.) They support their esti­mates with inspection reports of livestock auctions, health records, and other forms of public documentation. The NAERIC surve­ncy data used to substantiate its position are not so credible, since they are generat­ed by NAERIC itself.

The HSUS sent me to Canada in early September, when PMU farmers sell their surplus foals at public auctions and farm sales, to gather information independent of either government or trade group sources. I attended two of the largest auctions, held in Virden and Winnipeg, Manitoba, where approximately 1,700 foals were offered for sale. Large crowds attended these sales, but preferential seating in the front row was given to individuals representing cer­tain feedlots and slaughterhouses.

Often foals were sold in lots of up to 60, with the auctioneers announcing the num­ber of foals in the group and the average weight of the animals before the bidding began. As a result people who might have been willing to provide a home for a single foal or two were locked out of the general bidding. The auctioneers often referred to the foals as “meat horses,” making it all too clear what their eventual fate would be. Foals were quarter horses, Belgians, Percherons, Appaloosas, Thoroughbreds, paints, standardbreds, and crossbreeds of all kinds. They were also very young, aver­aging only three to five months of age, though some appeared to be even younger. (Although equine veterinarians generally agree that the best time to wean a foal is at eleven months of age, PMU foals are weaned much younger. Because they have an eleven-month gestation, PMU mares must wait one year after weaning eight to ten days after foaling and returned to the urine collec­tion barns.) From my own observations and the con­sensus of several others attending the sales, at least 70 percent of the foals at these auc­tions were purchased for slaughter. Be­cause an overpopulation of horses exists in North America, thousands of surplus foals cannot find ready buyers. In this sparsely populated part of Canada, where the win­ters are harsh and the summers are short, relatively few people keep horses strictly for recreational riding. Most PMU foals are unregistered, even if purebred, and they are not as desirable or valuable as are “pu­nished” horses in the eyes of many horse­back riders. It was no surprise then that, with a local demand, many of the foals are dis­posed of as surplus horses usually are—by being sold to slaughter buyers.

We can take some comfort in knowing that improvements have been made by the meat industry in British Columbia, veteri­narians, and industry representatives drafted a voluntary code of practice that set mini­mum standards that farmers must meet to maintain their contracts with Wyeth-Ayer­st. After the farm inspection tours of 1995, PROGRESSIVE and the drug company pledged to evaluate them. Tom Hughes of the Cana­dian Farm Animal Care Trust has followed the situation closely, and he remembers a time when conditions for these PMU horses were much worse. Eventually, additional improvements were im­plemented and the drug company pledged to undertake more frequent compliance checks. Yet some serious problems remain—notably the long-term confine­ment without adequate exercise of PMU mares and the killing of surplus foals.

The HSUS Scientific Advisory Council sent a mailing to nearly 50,000 obstetri­cians and gynecologists last May that de­scribed the many alternative estrogen­replacement drugs available that are not derived from horse urine. It outlined a number of alternative approaches to treat­ ing menopausal symptoms and estrogen defi­ciency. Doctors requested thousands of additional brochures to share with their pa­tients and colleagues, spreading the word that alternative therapies to Premarin are available to every woman. A few people at the auctions attended by me were surprised to learn that some of the horses in the eyes of many horse­back riders who prefer to ride their own “purebred” horses in the eyes of many horse­back riders who prefer to ride their own
By Danny Seo

Earth 2000 brought significant advances to the environmental and animal-protection movements. Coordinating successful corporate boycott campaigns and launching award-winning educational initiatives, Mr. Seo earned the titleAmerica's Most Influential Teen" in 1996 from a leading public-relations trade publication. Mr. Seo has appeared in more than five hundred media outlets, including Family Circle, Newsweek, the Wall Street Journal, and the National Enquirer, which described him as "out to save more animals than Noah." He is the recipient of numerous awards, including the Reverence for Life Award from the Albert Schweitzer Institute for the Humanities, and he was named Who Cares magazine's 1991 "Young Visionary of the Year.

Now twenty, Mr. Seo travels the United States, speaking at national conferences and colleges, and serves as a youth-issues, public-relations, and fund-raising consultant to political and advocacy organizations. His first book, Generation React: Activism for Begin-ners, was published in September.

The question I am asked most often is, "How do you do it all?" All of us are so busy, I know, yet I often wonder why. What is it about now that is so different from even twenty years ago, when it wasn't so difficult to find time to volunteer at a bake sale, attend school board meetings, or work to protect a nearby forest from being developed? What, or who, is to blame for making communication a real chore? But today it was easy.

When I was president of Earth 2000, activism meant attending every local government meeting, editing the newsletter, attracting new membership, doing media interviews, running campaigns, raising funds, and speaking at conferences and colleges, week in and week out. It wasn't strenuous work; on the contrary, it was easy.

When my parents were growing up in South Korea, they were considered lucky even to have a telephone and, many years later, a television. Communication for them often meant writing a letter, hand addressing an envelope, and walking to an out-of-the-way post office to mail it. A week later the recipient would finally get the message. Communication was a real chore. But today with e-mail capabilities, fax machines, the Internet, laptop computers, word processors, and sophisticated electronic organizers, communication has become instantaneous.

When a local retail corporation wanted to explore the possibility of considering fur coats as an effort to "upgrade the merchandise in its stores," I wanted to tell everyone I knew to write a letter to the chief executive officer (CEO) and complain. Thirty years ago the only effective form of communication was to use "snail mail," the U.S. Postal Service. But with modern technology, I was able to send faxes and e-mails to post information on the World Wide Web within a matter of minutes. With really very little time devoted to the cause, I generated hundreds of letters to the CEO and convinced the corporation to abandon its plans.

I remain active in a variety of political and social causes. By checking out a few of my favorite Web sites, I can see what issues are in need of my immediate attention (see sidebar for site addresses). For example, if The HSUS is involved in a pressing campaign that needs letters sent immediately to President Bill Clinton, I know I can quickly e-mail a comment to the White House right then and there—no stamps or stationery needed.

With the price of personal computers decreasing and free Internet access at local libraries increasing, I think each of us can make a big impact by embracing technology. (Novice computer users can read up on the subject or investigate the free computer classes offered by many community colleges and libraries.) The Internet makes a myriad of information available at your fingertips, and you can use that information to teach your children or grandchildren about animals and how to protect them or to send a quick e-mail to your elected officials or a letter to the editor of an on-line newspaper. The Internet enables each of us to do his/her part in just minutes a day.

My latest project is the Earth 2000 Foundation, which will give minigrants to young people who have ideas to help the environment or animals. It is my goal to encourage youths to become critical thinkers so that they can analyze problems and develop practical solutions. In discussions about the foundation, I am frequently asked, "How will you let students know about it?" Without saying a word, I pick up my laptop computer and smile. It's not so difficult to find time to volunteer at a bake sale, attend school board meetings, or work to protect a nearby forest from being developed! What, or who, is to blame for making communication a real chore? But today it was easy.
quality of life as paramount. The problem is that, given the reality of pet overpopulation and irresponsible pet ownership, preserving life and preventing suffering are often mutually exclusive activities. "We need to explain [pet overpopulation]," says Kathy Sartore, executive director of the Peninsula Humane Society in San Mateo, California. "You build a shelter with 200 cages. Today you take in 50 homeless animals. Thirteen go home. The other 40 go into cages. Tomorrow you take in 50, but only 15 get to go home. When the shelter is full, the kids always suggest building more cages— which we do— but then those cages are quickly filled. The kids seem to get the concept, but many adults seem to forget the dynamics of pet overpopulation; the inflow of unwanted animals is an ongoing phenomenon."

Shelters approach this problem in many different ways, both focusing on the immediate needs of animals in their care and reaching out to the public in an attempt to reduce the number of animals who might need their care in the future. The outreach methods—advocating spaying and neutering, offering companion animal behavior training and counseling, promoting responsible pet ownership—generally are embraced by limited- and open-admission shelters alike. It's the ways shelters handle—or neglect to handle—the current surplus of animals within their communities that draw the loudest, most passionate voices. Humanely putting to death adoptable animals is by far the most common, controversial, and misunderstood of these ways. Shelter workers who euthanize animals despite the need for euthanasia. They are the ones who decades ago first brought the issue of euthanasia to the surface, forcing the public to see how indiscriminate breeding and irresponsible pet ownership resulted in the humane, but tragic deaths of millions of discarded animals. They fought for the adoption of more humane, methods of destruction. Ironically, these same individuals, those most demoralized and disillusioned by euthanasia, today find themselves having to defend euthanasia to well-meaning animal advocates, who often portray euthanasia, rather
than the problems necessitating euthanasia, as the evil.

Open-admission shelter workers consider euthanasia more humane and responsible than turning away even one animal in need of shelter or letting animals suffer as strays on the streets, neglected pets chained in backyards, or unadopted companions kept by facilities indefinitely in stainless-steel cages. 'I can live with the fact that sometimes the kindest thing I can do for an unwanted animal is to quietly, and with love, put her to sleep,' explains a shelter worker in Tennessee. 'But I cannot live with the fact that I had the power to prevent that animal from suffering yet turned her away.'

Limited-admission shelters, on the other hand, generally believe that no animal should be euthanized unless that animal is suffering physically and that even a less-than-ideal life is better than no chance of life at all. 'We need to question whether killing animals for population control is compassionate,' says Bonnie Brown, president of the limited-admission Neponset Valley Humane Society in Canton, Massachusetts. 'Is it truly for the benefit of animals or for the convenience of people? If we asked the animals, I'm pretty sure they would prefer to take their chance at life.'

Many limited-admission shelters contend that euthanasia has become unnecessary because plenty of homes for animals exist in the community and that it's just a matter of being more creative about finding those homes and preventing the adoption of shelter animals. Until those homes are found, the argument goes, animals can be kept in the sheltering facility or in foster homes.

Have these "no kill" shelters really found the magic answer that has eluded animal protectionists for decades? If the answer to the tragedy of companion-animal euthanasia is simply to stop euthanatizing-then why aren't more shelters stopping?

The reality is that in most communities, the number of companion animals being born, abandoned, and surrendered to shelters far exceeds--often by thousands--the number of responsible homes available to them. Certainly every shelter must do all it can to promote responsible pet ownership and to find new, lifelong homes for the animals in its care. Unfortunately, however, increasing adoptions alone can't end the need for euthanasia in a town. For those who choose to try to save animals' lives comes at the expense of those very lives: a shelter that dramatically increases its adoptions or foster-care placements without also strengthening the way it screens caregivers, following up on the animals' placements, and ensuring that all animals are sterilized could unintentionally be endangering those animals and adding to the pet overpopulation problem.

The HSUS believes that keeping old, sick, aggressive, or otherwise unwanted animals caged in the shelter for months, years, or lifetimes to avoid euthanasia is not in the animals' best interests—and would not be even if every shelter had unlimited space and resources. The HSUS is strongly opposed to the long-term, institutional housing of companion animals because it may deprive animals of adequate human attention. Every dog, cat, and other companion animal deserves—ultimately and ultimately—affection and care. The HSUS believes that keeping unwanted animals caged in the shelter for months, years, or lifetimes to avoid euthanasia is not in the animals' best interests—and would not be even if every shelter had unlimited space and resources.

The HSUS believes that keeping old, sick, aggressive, or otherwise unwanted animals caged in the shelter for months, years, or lifetimes to avoid euthanasia is not in the animals' best interests—and would not be even if every shelter had unlimited space and resources. The HSUS is strongly opposed to the long-term, institutional housing of companion animals because it may deprive animals of adequate human attention. Every dog, cat, and other companion animal deserves—ultimately and ultimately—affection and care. The HSUS believes that keeping unwanted animals caged in the shelter for months, years, or lifetimes to avoid euthanasia is not in the animals' best interests—and would not be even if every shelter had unlimited space and resources.

The HSUS believes that keeping old, sick, aggressive, or otherwise unwanted animals caged in the shelter for months, years, or lifetimes to avoid euthanasia is not in the animals' best interests—and would not be even if every shelter had unlimited space and resources. The HSUS is strongly opposed to the long-term, institutional housing of companion animals because it may deprive animals of adequate human attention. Every dog, cat, and other companion animal deserves—ultimately and ultimately—affection and care. The HSUS believes that keeping unwanted animals caged in the shelter for months, years, or lifetimes to avoid euthanasia is not in the animals' best interests—and would not be even if every shelter had unlimited space and resources. The HSUS is strongly opposed to the long-term, institutional housing of companion animals because it may deprive animals of adequate human attention. Every dog, cat, and other companion animal deserves—ultimately and ultimately—affection and care. The HSUS believes that keeping unwanted animals caged in the shelter for months, years, or lifetimes to avoid euthanasia is not in the animals' best interests—and would not be even if every shelter had unlimited space and resources. The HSUS is strongly opposed to the long-term, institutional housing of companion animals because it may deprive animals of adequate human attention.

Because we consider quality of life paramount, The HSUS believes euthanasia, not indefinite confinement or indiscriminate placement, to be the most humane disposition for those unwanted animals for whom responsible homes cannot be found. However, we believe that limited-admission shelters should not euthanize animals that are sick, aggressive, or otherwise unadapted companions. Limited-admission shelters and shelterless "rescue groups" with responsible adoption and caretaking policies can play a helpful role in a community by helping homeless companion animals find good homes. In fact, many limited-admission shelters are able to designate significant portions of their budgets to public education and spay/neuter programs and are instrumental in reducing pet overpopulation in their communities.

For limited- and open-admission shelters, the first step toward working together must be for each to acknowledge the role played by the other in sheltering, protecting, and placing unwanted animals. A limited-admission shelter may find homes for many animals, but because it does not euthanatize animals, it generally accepts those most easily adopted—typically young, healthy, docile animals. It must turn animals away once space and resources are absorbed by the current population of shelter animals. That's why every community must have an open-admission shelter that accepts all animals in need, regardless of their temperament, health status, origin, age, or breed.

A community with half a dozen limited-admission shelters or "rescue groups" may be doing an admirable job helping many animals, but unless there's a shelter nearby that takes in all animals, animals will suffer. Last summer in Geauga County, Ohio, trappers were hired to shoot cats during the threat of a rabies outbreak because the only shelter in the area was a limited-admission shelter that did not take in stray or feral cats.

Limited-admission shelter proponents rightly argue that few cases are severe and contend that the availability of shelters that don't euthanatize prevents rather than encourages animal abandonment and abuse. They believe that people are less likely to abandon an unwanted animal and more likely to take him to the shelter if they know a shelter will not euthanize the animal—even if they have to wait for space at the shelter to open up.

But some share a different view. "It didn't occur to me to question what happened to the pets we couldn't take in," says Gayle Miller, a former volunteer for a limited-admission shelter. "Then one afternoon I saw a kitten on the side of the road. I knew the kitten was trying to revive a kitten—probably the victim of a car accident. The previous evening at the shelter to open up.

Many limited-admission shelters agree with The HSUS that they can supplement but cannot supplant the community's open-admission shelter. They agree that because

Time ticks away for shelter cats. Because we consider quality of life paramount, The HSUS believes euthanasia to be the most humane end for animals for whom responsible homes cannot be found.

"I can live with the fact that I had the power to prevent that animal from suffering yet turned her away."

 limited-admission shelters, the first step toward working together must be for each to acknowledge the role played by the other in sheltering, protecting, and placing unwanted animals. A limited-admission shelter may find homes for many animals, but because it does not euthanatize animals, it generally accepts those most easily adopted—typically young, healthy, docile animals. It must turn animals away once space and resources are absorbed by the current population of shelter animals. That's why every community must have an open-admission shelter that accepts all animals in need, regardless of their temperament, health status, origin, age, or breed. A community with half a dozen limited-admission shelters or "rescue groups" may be doing an admirable job helping many animals, but unless there's a shelter nearby that takes in all animals, animals will suffer. Last summer in Geauga County, Ohio, trappers were hired to shoot cats during the threat of a rabies outbreak because the only shelter in the area was a limited-admission shelter that did not take in stray or feral cats.

Limited-admission shelter proponents rightly argue that few cases are severe and contend that the availability of shelters that don't euthanatize prevents rather than encourages animal abandonment and abuse. They believe that people are less likely to abandon an unwanted animal and more likely to take him to the shelter if they know a shelter will not euthanize the animal—even if they have to wait for space at the shelter to open up.

But some share a different view. "It didn't occur to me to question what happened to the pets we couldn't take in," says Gayle Miller, a former volunteer for a limited-admission shelter. "Then one afternoon I saw a kitten on the side of the road. I knew the kitten was trying to revive a second, dead, kitten, probably the victim of a car accident. The previous evening at the shelter to open up.

Many limited-admission shelters agree with The HSUS that they can supplement but cannot supplant the community's open-admission shelter. They agree that because
the number of animals who need homes exceeds the number of homes available, a responsibly operated, open-admission shelter is a must. They also say that providing an alternate place for some people to bring their animals eases the burden on the open-admission shelter and helps a significant number of people and animals in the community.

Limited-admission shelters can help animals, people, and local open-admission shelters. But before open-admission and limited-admission shelters can cooperate, they must first be honest with each other and the public. Often the most common criticism expressed over the “no kill” debate is not about how humane organizations treat animals but about how they treat each other. “It’s the old ’I care more than the next person’ argument,” says Robert D. Rohde, executive director of the open-admission shelter Denver Dumb Friends League in Colorado. “The fact is that all of us care. I think some people forget that we all formed to prevent suffering and that no one wants to take the lives of these animals.”

This fact gets glossed over, and sometimes even trampled, in many organizations’ promotional materials. “Think of your own family pet alone and waiting in the local pound . . . waiting for his three days to be up. Your gift can stop so much of the needless killing in your home town.” This was the final fund-raising punch in a solicitation sent out nationwide by a self-proclaimed “no kill” organization on the East Coast. It’s a prime example of the “They don’t help animals, we do” claims that anger open-admission shelters, divide the animal-protection community, and confuse the public.

The HSUS believes that a limited-admission organization’s fund-raising solicitations should acknowledge that the shelter’s ability to choose not to euthanize homeless animals depends in part on the existence of animal shelters that don’t have that choice. Moreover, The HSUS considers it unethical for a limited-admission shelter to advertise that it does not kill animals without also acknowledging publicly that the shelter does not accept every animal brought to it.

A shelter dog awaits a new family; adoption counselors such as this one (inset) try to make matches that will last an animal’s lifetime, whether they work for a limited-admission or an open-admission shelter.
Communities can take the first step toward reducing the need for euthanasia by making sure shelters receive the resources and support necessary to carry out their role as caretakers of animals nobody wants.

Euthanasia, or the killing of companion animals, is a tragic effect of both the Texas Humane Society/SPCA of Austin and Travis County has noticed the ice melting in its once-tense relationship with Austin Travis County Animal Services. "There's plenty to do for everyone," says Ma. Medicina. "We are now starting to get [adoption] referrals from them. And we in turn refer people to them. A new group just opened a low-cost spay/neuter clinic, and we refer people to the clinic. [We all] are trying to build a community relationship."

It's clear that cooperative relationships like these and increased spay/neuter promotion, animal control legislation, humane education, and changes in demographics and family lifestyles have helped to decrease pet over-population and the need for euthanasia. But have these efforts truly helped some communities reduce the unwanted pet population to the point that euthanasia is no longer necessary in that community? Some believe so. Others believe they are close. Still others believe that, while they will be able to reduce euthanasia, they will never be able to end it completely.

The San Francisco SPCA (SFSPCA) claims it is on the verge of creating the first "no kill" city in the country. Bolstered by the efforts of a strong, proactive, government animal-control agency (the San Francisco Animal Care and Control department, or SFACC), the SFSPCA has received national attention for its "adoption pact," a high-volume adoption strategy that promises to end the euthanasia of "adoptable" animals—animals the SFSPCA defines as healthy or treatable. The Associated Press wire service recently ran a sizable story on the SFSPCA's goals, discussing the organization's 1994 agreement pledging to take any "adoptable" animal who couldn't find a home.

Unfortunately, as they praise the "no kill" goal of the SFSPCA and encourage other shelters to adopt a similar program, supporters and the media fail to credit the community demographics, vast financial and human resources, long-term planning, outreach, and collaboration with SFACC that have brought the SFSPCA to this point. They also fail to report that, in the fiscal years 1993-97, before and after the "adoption pact," the SFACC still had to euthanize thousands of animals annually. Obviously San Francisco is not a "no kill city."

Because the public sees only a sketch instead of the full picture, some humane agencies and shelters are feeling pressured by their supporters to focus their energies on stopping euthanasia today and solving the problems necessitating euthanasia tomorrow. Thankfully, many agencies are taking a different approach. Some shelters frame their goals not in terms of ending euthanasia but in terms of increasing placements and decreasing admissions. They focus on increasing responsible adoptions; decreasing the numbers of surrendered animals; increasing hours of operation; providing pet-behavior counseling for owners; and encouraging animal-friendly legislation.

The euthanasia of healthy, unwanted companion animals is an undisputable tragedy, and no one feels the anguish of that tragedy more deeply than the humane workers who must carry out that dreadful task. They should not carry that burden alone, however. "The whole community, not just the shelter and its caring staff, bears the responsibility for euthanasia of unwanted animals," says Martha C. Armstrong, HSUS vice president, Companion Animals. "To help its community understand this, one shelter reports how many unwanted animals the community generates instead of stating how many animals the shelter euthanizes."

You can take the first step toward reducing the need for euthanasia in your own community by making sure any local open-admission and limited-admission shelters receive the resources and support necessary to carry out their important role as caretakers of those companion animals nobody wants. By joining your town's animal behaviorists, humane workers, pet owners, trainers, veterinarians, and other animal advocates and working to stem the tidal wave of unwanted animals pouring onto your city's streets, and into shelters, you can help curtail euthanasia—responsibly.
In the summer of 1996, HSUS/HSI was asked to participate in a conference on animal welfare and animal issues in Taiwan. The conference was developed by Liang Chou Hsia, Ph.D., professor of animal production at Ping Tung University of Science and Technology, and sponsored by the university and several animal-protection groups. Our topic was stray-dog control, a problem in Taiwan so widely acknowledged that even travel books address it.

Even so, I was stunned by the number of stray dogs I saw upon my arrival in Taiwan for the conference. Dogs were on the streets, in parking lots, and in trash bins. They were on park benches, in front of stores, waiting at traffic lights. I lost count of all the strays I saw just between the airport and the conference center.

Taiwan is a very small island, with more than 20 million people and one of the highest population densities in the world. Its economy is strong but nonetheless very youthful. Rising from the ashes of World War II, the Taiwanese economy is fueled primarily by foreign trade. Formerly known for producing cheap toys, Taiwan is now a leader in the production of high-tech, quality electronics and computers. With the booming economy has come personal wealth; the average yearly income is more than $13,000 per person.

Unfortunately, there is little or no control on the breeding or ownership of companion animals. Approximately 2 million dogs in Taiwan are owned—and almost as many (1.3–1.5 million) are strays. There are few bona fide animal shelters in Taiwan, and there is no clear-cut authority or responsibility for controlling strays. Citizens are very reluctant to cooperate with any government entity in the control of stray and unwanted animals.

The HSUS first became aware of Taiwan's problem with strays when the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA) sponsored a workshop on animal handling and control there in 1995. We wrote a letter of support at that time to the Taipei municipal government, hoping it would embrace the training and reform of Taiwan's animal-control practices that included capturing dogs with piano wire loops and slinging them into trucks for delivery to pounds or collection sites.

Unfortunately, the humane animal-handling equipment demonstrated by WSPA at the workshop and donated to Taiwan's animal workers afterward rusted in pounds when we were approached to help with the same problem a year later. We had to address the Taiwanese resistance to embracing equipment and instructions from Western-
Liang Chou Hsia, Ph.D., second from left, and other conference attendees are forced to maintain a respectful distance from the stray dog pound in Taipei. Inset: Another puppy is added to the shelter population. Animal advocates agree that public pressure must be exerted on the Tai-pei government before any lasting reform will take place.

Based animal-protection organizations.

Stray-dog control falls under the purview of Taiwan’s Environmental Protection Administration (EPA), and the responsibility for housing strays varies from place to place. During the 1996 conference, the Taiwanese government was reviewing draft legislation that would have reformed the treatment and control of companion animals—a move that, from what I could see, is badly needed.

The housing of strays and the methods of disposing of unwanted animals in Tai- wan were among the worst and most inhumane I have ever witnessed. EPA’s view of stray animals and of its responsibilities toward them is the same as its view of other “garbage” on the street—except this garbage can bite! Even if EPA workers share their homes with dogs (and most Taiwanese have pets), they perceive the dog on the street very differently from the dog who sleeps with the children.

Religious and cultural issues also affect EPA workers’ attitudes toward strays. Some of the workers believe in reincarnataion or that suffering in life will guarantee a wonderful place in eternity, so they are reluctant to interfere in a animal’s life, and by alleviating his suffering now, guarantee his future torment.

One example of the horrible conditions I found was the shelter in Taipei County, which had been demolished by a typhoon but was still being used as a makeshift pound. An Akita who had assumed the position of dominant, or “alpha,” dog challenged each new dog entering the communal pen. Teeth bared, hackles raised, the Akita looked quite menacing, although he rarely displayed these behaviors to humans. The worker cared for the animals explained that the dog actually was quite friendly to the other dogs once he had established dominance. Although much larger than the Akiina, a female rotweiler was quite submissive. Her breed was barely recognizable because of the mange that covered her body and obliterated her fur. Disease had also ravaged her eyes, and she was forced to find her food by sound and smell. In trying to discuss the suffering of such animals with the government officials who took us to this pound, I discovered that language was not the only barrier. Chinese has no term for euthanasia; it is a concept that is incomprehensible to most Taiwanese.

At other pounds up to fifty dogs fought with one another in large runs. In some instances pound dogs died from starvation or disease. Other animals were disposed of with chloroform (a proven human carcinogen) or were electrocuted or drowned.

Dr. Hsia was distraught over what we all witnessed. He had struggled for years to convince government agricultural representatives and farmers to implement humane methods and policies of farm animal husbandry. Yet the treatment of companion animals in his country was abysmal.

Dr. Hsia asked me if HSUS/HSI would help him help his country deal with the stray-dog problem in a more humane and comprehensive manner.

Returning to the United States, I stopped in Hawaii to conduct workshops for the staff of the Hawaiian Humane Society (HHS). HHS is a culturally and ethnically diverse group of animal-protection professionals serving a similarly diverse community. The staff has been very successful in addressing animal issues in its community and is anxious to help other communities as well.

In discussion with HHS, a strategy to address Taiwan’s problems emerged. We thought that if the Taiwanese could see a well-run, humane animal shelter staffed by a largely Asian-American staff, serving a community with a large Asian-American population who share many of the Taiwanese cultural beliefs and customs, perhaps they would be persuaded to work toward solving Taiwan’s stray-dog problem. Pamela Burks, president of HHS, and Rebecca Rhoades, DVM, operations director, agreed to work with HSUS/HSI to develop a plan for training and assisting Taiwanese animal-care and control workers.

HSUS/HSI and HHS sent instructions on how to design a shelter and information on euthanasia, including drugs, legal requirements, and methods of administration, to Dr. Hsia to be translated and disseminated to local appointed parties. A Taiwanese animal-protection group called Life Conservationists Association and WSPA began documenting inhumane housing and animal-disposal practices. Segments of videotapes were released in Taiwan to prompt the legislators to hold in Taiwan in March 1997 to convince the government to reform animal control. HSI/HSI and HHS insisted that government agencies charged with animal control participate in meetings to lay the groundwork for a comprehensive training program for all Taiwanese animal-control workers. Our first meeting was scheduled to take place in April 1997 in Honolulu.

Then hoof-and-mouth disease struck, the swine population of Taiwan. Disgust was heaped upon the Council on Agriculture, threatening chaos in the country’s agricultural export market. Stray-dog issues were placed on the back burner for what we feared would be an indefinite period.

The health crisis created by the hoof-and-mouth epizootic spawned fears among local Taiwanese governments that a rabies epidemic could develop among the stray-dog population. We appealed to the president of Taiwan to work with us on an agreement rather than without us. On short-term, humane, stopgap measures such as stray-dog roundup and inhumane killing.

We finally heard from government officials in June 1997 that our training-program meeting was back on track. Two representatives of the Taiwanese government—one from the Council on Agriculture and one from EPA—accompanied Dr. Hsia to Honolulu in June.

During two days of training, HSUS Northern Rockies Regional Director Dave Pauli demonstrated humane capturing and handling of fractious dogs using control poles and humane box traps. Dr. Rhoades and her staff demonstrated how to perform health exams and how to use sodium pentobarbital for euthanasia. We agreed to bring fifteen to twenty veterinarians and animal workers from Tai- wanese pounds to Honolulu for an intensive training program in all aspects of animal care and control.

Reorganization of animal control in Taiwan is progressing. A model facility has been built in Ping Tung, a southern Taiwan province, under the direction of Dr. Hsia. The Council on Agriculture plans to construct 24–26 modern animal shelters to replace the 173 pounds and drop-off cages currently in existence. Efforts are under way to obtain the appropriate permits to allow the importation of the correct, euthanasia-strength sodium pentobarbital. More than six hundred school teachers were trained in humane education in WSPA workshops with staff from the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

A long road lies ahead. Animals are still suffering on the streets and in pounds. But we are at least, a few miles into our journey toward a more humane life for dogs in Taiwan—Martha C. Armstrong, vice president, Companion Animals, HSI.

“Out of the difficulties WSPA encountered in on-site training programs in Taiwan was trying to teach proper euthanasia techniques without euthanasia-strength sodium pentobarbital. The only sodium pentobarbital currently available in Taiwan is surgic-strength, which is totally inappropriate for euthanasia because of its relatively high cost and the amount of time needed for its effectiveness.

Stray dogs scrounge for an existence on a levy in Taipei. Many EPA workers fear stray dogs, considering them no better than garbage that can bite.
PROGRESS IN NILGIRI

It has taken the India Project for Animals and Nature (IPAN), a full year to gain the trust of the tribal peoples in the Nilgiri Hills of southern India (see the Spring 1997 HSUS News). These peoples have no veterinary services available to them for their countless dogs or for their cattle, goats, and sheep. Their economy depends on their livestock. When IPAN staff first came into their communities to treat their animals for various ailments and injuries, vaccinated seven hundred dogs against rabies, neutered scores of dogs, and set up an animal-adoption program. As we went from village to village, we were especially gratified to be greeted by dogs whom we have treated previously. We have also been gratified to see the increase in attitude in various communities where we work. Initially, people seemed indifferent to animal suffering; ignoring very sick and injured animals on the streets. We would always stop and help treat these animals, and a large crowd of curious onlookers, especially children, would gather as a result. Through our compassionate interventions, we were engaging in humane education and, in the process, gaining the respect of these community leaders. Instead of waiting past animals in need of veterinary care because nothing could be done, people began to notice and to care, calling us to stop and treat a stray that they had seen or restrained us for. More and more people began coming to the sanctuary with animals we used to treat, including a hare injured by a jeep and a pair of orphaned wild boar piglets.

We also have seen a dramatic change in the behavior of our local staff, who in a matter of months became gentle and confident animal handlers, unashamed about displaying affection and concern.

Where no humanitarian resources are available, people lose hope and stop caring because there is no point in caring. Why empathize with animals and experience their suffering when nothing can be done to help them? Such extinction of compassion can be reversed when people witness compassionate and appropriate veterinary care undertaken to alleviate or prevent animal suffering. Community support in Nilgiri Hills is now so solid that the Masinagudi Panchayat Union, the local municipal authority, is working with us to develop a veterinary hospital in the community. I have been named the honorary veterinary and animal-welfare advisor to the Panchayat.

We have experienced local veterinarians, K. Sugaman, BVM, working with us, and we are making progress finding legitimate non-governmental organizations to expand IPAN for the benefit of indigenous peoples, their animals, and the rich diversity of local wildlife that is in urgent need of protection. However, this will continue to be a difficult task because IPAN is viewed as a threat by powerful groups and individuals who have attempted to discredit our work.

Nonetheless, we remain encouraged by the people’s response, and we believe the guests of honor at a village celebration on Independence Day. As the people talked about India’s second independence—freedom from corruption—freedom from suffering for all beings could be visible on the horizon—Michael W. Fox, D.Sc., Ph.D., B.Vet.Med., M.R.C.V.S., with dog, is surrounded by Nilgiri Hills villagers. Many now welcome the assistance rendered by IPAN director Deanna Krantz (inset, with piglets).
Migratory Birds: Threatened Flights

By Susan Harwood

Migratory waterfowl are being threatened in an unprecedented variety and magnitude of ways. Although The HSUS is mounting an active defense against a number of proposals that would exploit the nation's waterfowl, our efforts are complicated by the fact that the proposals originate largely from the agency charged with the birds' protection, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), which takes its cues from the Clinton administration's Department of
Migratory birds historically have enjoyed more protection than has any other class of wildlife species in the United States—at least on paper.

In response to a trade in bird feathers that threatened the existence of a number of species, President Theodore Roosevelt established the first national wildlife refuge, Florida’s Pelican Island, in 1903.

Fifteen years later Congress passed the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), which prohibits the killing or harassment of migratory birds or the possession of their feathers except as permitted by the federal government. The focus of these efforts was, and today largely remains, protection of migratory waterfowl—ducks, geese, swans, and others.

As a result of the concern that prompted the establishment of the national wildlife refuge system and passage of the MBTA, migratory waterfowl populations to some extent have been buffered from the threats faced by so many species—habitat loss, habitat degradation, unregulated hunting, and public and official apathy.

Besides basic regulations dictating when and in what numbers migratory birds can be hunted, perhaps nothing protects them from population declines more than the MBTA’s regulations governing baiting. Baiting typically consists of dumping millet into farm fields to attract doves; scattering corn or soybeans in shallow waters to lure ducks from the skies; or mowing seed-bearing grasses shortly before hunting season opens to attract ducks. Many migratory birds are notoriously easy to bait. In recognition of this vulnerability, the regulations adopted under the MBTA prohibit hunting migratory birds with the aid of baiting.

Although the current baiting regulations have worked well for twenty-four years, a string of recent convictions for baiting has prompted a few politically well-connected hunters to demand that the regulations be relaxed. As a result Rep. Don Young of Alaska has introduced H.R. 741, the Migratory Bird Treaty Reform Act, a bill that would ease the MBTA’s baiting restrictions.

An ad hoc baiting committee formed by the International Association of State Wildlife Agencies and composed largely of
THE MBTA permit system. Aquaculturists have proposed encouraging the destruction of millions of snow geese by recreational hunters in an effort to reduce a population that is purportedly damaging its own nesting habitat in the Canadian tundra. The proposal will likely concentrate on encouraging recreational hunters to kill more snow goose by allowing them to bait habitat and employ electronic calls to lure these wary animals out of the skies. The HSUS believes that if snow geese are too numerous, the population will decline on its own. We are concerned that hunters, once permitted to use bait and electronic calls for this species, may be reluctant to give up such measures and may demand that they be permitted to use them in hunting other waterfowl.

We urge you to contact the FWS and ask it to resist changes to enforcement and implementation of the MBTA that will weaken protection of migratory birds (The Honorable Jamie Clark, Director, U.S. FWS, Department of the Interior, 1849 C St., NW, Washington, DC 20240). Please express your opposition to increased recreational killing of ducks, geese, and other waterfowl and to the snow-goose slaughter planned to begin in 1998.

Susan Hagedo is HSUS wildlife issues specialist, Wildlife and Habitat Protection.

**VISION FOR A MODEL FOREST**

In cooperation with the U.S.-China Environmental Fund, HSUS/EarthKind (USA) plans to create the international Friendship Forest (IFF) at the Great Wall in the Peoples Republic of China, which has been designated a World Heritage Site by the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. The IFF is a model national park program. It balances tourism development with the restoration and conservation of natural ecosystems and, using China’s first interpretative trail system, educates visitors to the most famous and popular section of the Great Wall.

Situated in a dramatic valley that rises along the northwestern edge of the Badaling section of the Great Wall, the IFF will be a peaceful retreat where various animal and bird species can be reestablished. Historically, Badaling has been one of China’s most important strategic passes and has been designated a World Heritage Site.

Paul G. Green, president of The HSUS, inaugurated the project. The IFF integrates the trail system, with educational signs explaining the wildlife environment, and history of the Great Wall at Badaling, will serve as the first education center.
A GLOBAL WARNING?

In October Jan A. Hartke, Jr., executive director of EarthKind, USA, attended the White House conference on climate change, “The Challenge of Global Warming,” held in Washington, D.C. The conference illustrated the current state of knowledge on global climate change. The facts are disturbing. By burning coal, oil, and gas, the world’s population is adding six billion tons of carbon each year to the atmosphere. The buildup of gases such as carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide traps solar heat and produces a greenhouse effect. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which reevaluates the work of more than two thousand of the world’s leading climate scientists, has estimated that global average air temperature will increase between 2.0 and 5.2°F in the next one hundred years. Its best guess is that Earth will warm by 3°F by 2100. (To put this in perspective, the difference in temperature from the last Ice Age to the present is only 4°F.)

The world community is facing a serious risk of mass species extinctions caused by global warming. Scientists have already warned that animals and plants are being forced into the climate caused by extinction faster than at any time in the last 65 million years, principally due to habitat loss. Global warming could be a harbinger how to the animal kingdom of catastrophe. It still somewhat undefined, proportions.

Coral reefs grow in warm waters, but many are in waters whose temperatures are already near the upper limits of the reefs' temperature tolerance. If temperatures increase further, coral polyps may expel the one-celled plants that live within the polyps and prevent the coral from bleaching and dying. Coral reefs evolve the world could perish as a result.

As average temperatures increase, polar ice caps and continental ice packs could melt and raise the sea level everywhere. Rising sea levels would inundate coastlines. According to a study by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, greenhouse warming of Earth in the next one hundred years could melt ice up to 80 percent of the coastal breeding and nesting grounds of birds, fish, and other species. The Atlantic and Gulf Coasts of the United States. Most of the country's most vulnerable wetlands are in the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts of the United States. Some of the country's most vulnerable wetlands are in the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts of the United States. Some of the country's most vulnerable wetlands are in the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts of the United States.
JOIN THE HSUS ON A JOURNEY OF AWARENESS

For travel that educates, inspires and enriches your spirit, join us for a humane experience, true Ecotours designed with a sensitive approach to wildlife and regard for nature.

EAST AFRICA TENTED SAFARI - MARCH 11-25, 1998
Experience the romance of a private tented safari in the wildlife sanctuaries of Kenya and Tanzania, including the legendary Serengeti. See the snows of Kilimanjaro loom over the great elephant herds at Amboseli National Park, where you visit the research camp of the world’s foremost expert on pachyderms, Cynthia Moss. Savor the panorama of Africa’s Eden for animals, the Ngorongoro crater, and spend three glorious nights in a luxurious tented camp in Kenya’s Maasai Mara Reserve. Your mobile tented camp in the Serengeti is a moveable feast, positioned near the great wildebeest migration. $5995.

KENYA CLASSIC SAFARI - JULY 10-21, 1998
Stay in Africa’s famous Ark lodge, appropriately surrounded by animals that you can observe from the comfort of the veranda. See the unique wildlife in Samburu country, and the chimpanzees protected in a program founded by Jane Goodall. Witness the grand spectacle of the great migration of millions of wildebeest in the Maasai Mara Reserve, and enjoy the elegance of one of Nairobi’s most spectacular hotels. $4,195.

CANADIAN BEAR COUNTRY - OCTOBER, 1998
Explore the wildlife sanctuary of Churchill, during the only time of the year polar bears migrate to this area along Hudson Bay. From your Tundra Buggy, explore Manitoba’s diverse flora and fauna: 200 species of birds, 500 species of plants and 44 mammal species, including herds of caribou and Arctic fox. This is the land of Big Bears and Bright Lights: the Aurora Boreals are more intense here than anywhere else on earth.

All Journeys of Awareness Tours feature outstanding guides and wildlife experts and are accompanied by an HSUS representative.

Please send me information regarding The HSUS Journey of Awareness to:

[ ] East Africa  [ ] Kenya  [ ] Manitoba, Canada  [ ] Other

Name: ________________________________
Address: ________________________________
City/State/Zip: ________________________________

Send to: Park East Tours
1841 Broadway, Ste 714, New York NY 10023
Or call 1 800 223-6078, ext. 606

Brown wiregrass invades Louisiana wetlands as the waters change from fresh to brackish. Such vulnerable areas could be destroyed by salt-water intrusion from rising seas if polar ice caps and continental ice packs melt.
You’ve Made Good Decisions...

You've come to a time in your life when you can take pride in knowing you've done things the right way. You've saved. You've invested wisely. It hasn't always been easy. But now you can express your commitment to animal protection while also ensuring yourself a lifelong income.

Make one more good decision. Let The HSUS tell you about our Charitable Gift Annuity program. An HSUS Charitable Gift Annuity can pay you an income of up to 12 percent per year. To learn more, please complete the coupon below and mail it to Robert Brennan, Director of Planned Giving, The HSUS, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.

Yes, I want to learn how I can make another good decision. Please send me a complimentary, confidential overview of the benefits of an HSUS Charitable Gift Annuity.

Name ____________________________ Date of birth ______

Address ____________________________

City ____________________________ State ______ Zip ______ Phone number ____________

Best time of day to call ____________

THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES, WASHINGTON, DC 20037

Due to state law requirements, charitable gift annuities through The HSUS are not currently available to residents of Alabama, Arkansas, California, Hawaii, Iowa, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, or Wisconsin.