Informed Consumers, Industry Backlash

Powerful businesses resist growing public criticism

When 1998 closes and reviewers examine the year’s highlights, they will undoubtedly write about the Texas cattlemen versus Oprah Winfrey and Howard Lyman (see page 26). For weeks newspapers ran banner headlines on the case, pitting the cattlemen against the immensely popular talk-show host and the lesser-known director of The HSUS’s Eating with Conscience program.

It was Mr. Lyman’s appearance on The Oprah Winfrey Show that precipitated this courtroom dust-up. He spoke of threats to consumers from mad cow disease, which had claimed the lives of more than twenty people in Britain. There, cow and sheep parts had been ground up and fed to other cows, and the animals had developed bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE), otherwise known as mad cow disease. Some of the people who ate infected animals developed the human variant of BSE, known as new variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease (nvCJD). Mr. Lyman warned that cattle feed in the United States at that time also contained ruminant parts and that nvCJD was a potential threat here as well.

After hearing Mr. Lyman make his case, Ms. Winfrey announced that she would not eat another burger. Soon after, cattle prices dropped, and well-heeled cattlemen attributed their losses to the declarations on The Oprah Winfrey Show. Among their claims, the cattlemen argued that Ms. Winfrey and Mr. Lyman had violated the state’s food-disparagement law, one of a series of state statutes promoted by the food industry that are designed to discourage debate about food safety.

Most readers know the result. A U.S. District Court judge dismissed the food-disparagement charge. Common-law business-disparagement charges remained. Then a twelve-person Amarillo jury settled those charges by unanimously finding the defendants not liable.

End of story? Hardly.

Days later the plaintiffs appealed, despite their defeat on what was arguably their home field in Amarillo, Texas, where one in four jobs is directly tied to the cattle industry. A separate group of cattlemen filed a similar action against Ms. Winfrey and Mr. Lyman. The enormous expenses and inconvenience that accompany litigation will continue to mount.

Left unresolved, for the moment at least, is the fate of Texas’s food-disparagement law, along with similar statutes in twelve other states. They loom as ever-present threats to critics of agribusiness. The HSUS will continue not only to fight the case brought against Mr. Lyman, but also to seize opportunities to dismantle the constitutionally questionable food-disparagement laws.

The issues at hand are of fundamental importance. The primary goal of the cattlemen is not to secure damages from Ms. Winfrey or Mr. Lyman. Rather, it is to send an ominous message to every media outlet and consumer activist: Don’t take on the beef industry.

The Winfrey-Lyman saga is an example of the inevitable backlash that occurs when movements for social change make progress and gain influence, as The HSUS’s campaigns have. Industries in power desperately try to hold on to their strength in the face of mounting public criticism and concern.

Examples are numerous. Corporate agribusiness, threatened by the stunning growth of the organic-food-products industry, collaborated with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to propose standards that would allow conventional agricultural producers to appropriate the organics label and thereby mislead consumers and harm organic producers (see page 3). In response, citizens have sent the USDA two hundred thousand letters—the greatest outpouring of citizen comment the agency has ever received—in opposition to this proposal.

The hunting lobby, reeling from a series of ballot initiatives restricting its practices, is also trying to blunt future challenges. Hunting groups are pushing for the passage of provisions in state constitutions to guarantee a right to hunt (in order to block future wildlife-protection initiatives) or to create a requirement that such initiatives obtain a super-majority (a two-thirds vote, for instance) in order to become law. Not confident that they can win the war of ideas in a free society, hunters and weapons manufacturers are seeking to rewrite the rules of democratic decision-making.

Ultimately, by educating voters and informing consumers, The HSUS will succeed in achieving its mission to protect animals and prevent cruelty and abuse. It is no surprise that industries that profit from harming animals are intent on thwarting our agenda. We will not sit idly by as they attempt to trample on our fundamental rights and perpetuate institutional harm to animals.
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FUR-FREE HOLIDAY

The majority of Americans know that it is a shame to wear fur. However, Macy’s, the best-known department store in the nation, ignores the inherent cruelty behind each fur coat it offers for sale. Millions of animals are raised in cages or caught in traps each year for the sake of those who put fashion before compassion. Macy’s West stores have closed their fur salons, but salons remain in many Macy’s East locations, including the flagship Herald Square store in Manhattan.

We have requested that Macy’s stop selling fur and fur-trimmed apparel and accessories, declare the Macy’s Thanksgiving Day Parade a fur-free event, and join us in celebrating a fur-free holiday season.

Please write Macy’s President and CEO Harold Kahn (Macy’s East, Seventeenth Floor, 151 W 34th St., New York, NY 10001), asking that Macy’s take these actions. Please send us a copy of your letter by August 1, 1998.

WHEN THE HSUS began our investigation into the horse-slaughter industry in the late 1980s, there were twelve U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)-inspected horse slaughterhouses in the United States. Today only three plants remain. The number of horses slaughtered in such plants has dropped from nearly 350,000 in 1989 to 87,200 in 1997.

Horse owners, horse-industry groups, and The HSUS have pushed for better protections for horses at public auctions and in transit. In November a ballot initiative in California will allow voters to decide whether horse slaughter for human consumption should be banned outright. Our educational efforts and state legislative campaigns have resulted in lowering the number of horses available for transport. Congress enacted a law in 1996 directing the USDA to draft regulations that will improve the conditions under which any remaining horses are shipped for slaughter.

The demand for horsemeat in Europe has also dropped. Such encouraging signs show that someday we may see an end to the slaughter of horses for human consumption.

Gov. Parris Glendening, left, listens to the pro-animal policy recommendations of HSUS President Paul G. Irwin and humane-agency personnel during a visit to The HSUS’s Maryland office.

IN NOVEMBER Natural Biologics, of Albert Lea, Minnesota, opened a processing plant to extract estrogen from pregnant mares’ urine (PMU) in order to produce a cheaper alternative for the most commonly prescribed brand-name estrogen, Premarin®. Approximately twenty-two hundred mares are already in service in seven states, even though Natural Biologics does not yet have Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approval for the marketing of a generic alternative to Premarin.

The HSUS has long been concerned about the use of pregnant mares for drug production. Wyeth-Ayerst Laboratories, the manufacturer of Premarin, contracts with five hundred farmers in the prairie provinces of Canada to supply PMU. Many of these operations have been criticized for failing to provide adequate exercise for the mares and for flooding the market with surplus mares and foals, some of whom are destined for slaughter (see the Winter 1998 HSUS News). The expansion of the PMU industry into the United States could contribute to the suffering of thousands of mares and their foals.

The HSUS will monitor the FDA’s consideration of Natural Biologics’ application and oppose its approval.

Many alternative hormone replacement drugs are not derived from horse urine. Women should discuss treatment options with their physicians and decide whether a synthetic or plant-based estrogen is right for them. To obtain a free copy of Facts about Hormone Replacement Therapy, send a self-addressed stamped envelope to The HSUS, 2100 L St., NW, Washington DC 20037.
ON AUGUST 7, 1997, Melinda Wolfe of Arabi, Louisiana, found her eleven-year-old pet pig, Arnold, dying from seventy stab wounds to the head, back, and neck. The HSUS offered a $2,500 reward for information leading to the arrest and conviction of the person(s) responsible. In November tips from three informants led to the arrest of a suspect who later confessed to the crime. On April 28 Judge Melvyn Perez charged nineteen-year-old Nikolaos Lystras with a felony and sentenced him to eighteen months in jail, with other penalties. The HSUS thanks the brave young people who came forward to provide information in this case.

MORE THAN TWO hundred thousand consumers submitted comments to the USDA on its proposed rule on organic-food production before the comment period closed on April 30 (see the Spring 1998 HSUS News). The public overwhelmingly opposed provisions that would have allowed irradiation, sewage sludge, genetic engineering, and factory farming into organic-food production; rejected the proposed fees system that could hurt the ability of small farmers to participate in the program; rejected the move to prohibit "eco-" and other environment-friendly labels; and supported retention of the National Organic Standards Board's statutory authority.

Although the federal government has now stated that irradiation, sewage sludge, and genetic engineering will not be allowed in the organic program, there has been no mention of how the USDA plans to address the other problems plaguing its proposal, such as how to keep factory-farm methods out of organic farming.

The HSUS had joined with others to rally support for the integrity of the organic label and to provide legal analysis on the rule. We will continue to pressure the USDA to create a national organic program that the public can support.

WHEN THE KING ROYAL Circus's elephant Heather died last year, the public got a rare view of the cruel and dangerous existence endured by a performing elephant (see the Winter 1998 HSUS News). On December 11, 1997, an administrative law judge granted the USDA the sanctions against the King Royal Circus it had requested at an October hearing. The circus lost its exhibitor's license and was disqualified permanently from obtaining a new license. It was prohibited from engaging in any activity as an exhibitor or dealer and from acting as a contractor to other licensed operations. The circus also was fined $200,000, the largest fine ever imposed in an animal-welfare case.

Such action by the USDA sends a clear message to the circus industry that inhumane treatment of animals is a serious violation of the Animal Welfare Act (AWA). The HSUS has supported the USDA in this case and applauds its action.

Elephants Donna and Irene and eight llamas were on the truck with Heather when she died. All are thriving at the Albuquerque Biological Park under the custody of the City of Albuquerque.

The King Royal Circus has appealed the decision of the administrative law judge and will be able to use its other animals to perform until the resolution of the appeal.
HSUS Northern Rockies Regional Director David L. Pauli leads Expo's daylong course on disaster management. Animal Care Expo '99 promises to give attendees more of the same kind of hands-on training when it convenes in Orlando, Florida, February 24-27.

ANIMAL CARE EXPO

Expo-nential Success
Attendees learn, network, and “kick back”

The HSUS's premier training program returned to the West Coast in February when San Diego played host to the seventh annual Animal Care Expo. For four days fourteen hundred animal-care and -control professionals and volunteers attended workshops, networked, and explored the exhibit hall. Actress and keynote speaker Gretchen Wyler accepted The HSUS's 1997 James Herriot Award in recognition of her leadership of the Ark Trust, Inc., whose Genesis Awards honor positive portrayals of animals in film, broadcast, and print media. Comedian Paula Poundstone bombarded an appreciative audience with jokes about her cats in a special performance that ended Expo on a high note.

Hundreds of Expo attendees immersed themselves in daylong courses on wildlife in shelters, shelter design and construction, stress reduction, animal behavior and effective adoptions, and disaster management.

A session on The HSUS's First Strike™ campaign provided attendees such as Susan B. Spackman, executive director of Chester County Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals in Pennsylvania, with information and inspiration. “We're going to work with more [of our local social service agencies] to help people see the link between domestic violence and animal abuse,” she said, neatly summing up the purpose of the nationwide effort.

Thirty-five workshops focused on management, field services, fund-raising, animal-control and -shelter policies, legislation and advocacy, and community outreach. The last was a favorite of humane educators like Lynne Park of the Kalamazoo Humane Society in Michigan. “Our mission is to become the educational resource for [our region],” said Ms. Park, a first-time attendee, “so I came here to learn more about my craft as an educator.”

The exhibit hall featured the latest products and services available to animal shelters. When attendees weren’t busy meeting manufacturers of animal-care and -control equipment, they were bidding on banks of shelter cages, cat enclosures, and veterinary scrubs offered through a silent auction. Dozens of people toured San Diego Animal Care and Control's facilities, capitalizing on one of many opportunities to meet others in their field.

“I'd like to come once a month,” said Penny Dearborn, animal-care volunteer with Stockton Animal Shelter Friends in California. “Most everybody at some time or another has been through one of the [shelter experiences] that I've been through.” She was one of many who assembled packets of educational materials provided by exhibitors and seminar instructors to encourage local politicians to improve conditions for animals in their communities.—Scott Kirkwood, editor, Animal Sheltering

Gretchen Wyler accepts the Herriot award from HSUS President Paul G. Irwin.
ANIMAL RESEARCH ISSUES

End Pain, Distress by 2020!
A new campaign has an ambitious goal

The Vogel Conflict-Drinking Test has a worthy purpose—to detect new therapeutic drugs that reduce anxiety in people. Unfortunately, like many experiments, it subjects animals to unnecessary levels of pain and distress. In the test, mice are deprived of water and then allowed to drink from a spigot that randomly delivers an electric shock. Not surprisingly, the mice become anxious. A drug is considered to have anti-anxiety potential if it enables the mice to drink more often or for longer durations despite the threat of a shock.

In an alternative test, mice are given access to a brightly lit enclosure. They would normally spend little time in such an area, so any drug that causes them to take longer or more frequent forays into the “open field” is considered to have anti-anxiety potential. The mice are spared the electric shock of the conflict-drinking test and allowed to decide for themselves when to enter the open field.

The HSUS has launched a campaign with 2020 as the target year for eliminating the pain and distress endured by any animals still used in biomedical research and testing. Animal protectionists, sympathetic scientists, and others would then be free to concentrate on eliminating the use of animals in laboratories altogether or at least in procedures that would result in injury or death.

Surveys indicate that the public is seriously concerned about the pain and distress experienced by laboratory animals, and current laws, regulations, and guidelines that affect the conduct of animal research emphasize the need to minimize such suffering.

Scientists and laboratory personnel actively support this concern, but they sometimes have been slow to translate that support into action. For example, only in the past decade has the use of painkillers in laboratory rodents become accepted practice, and animal distress that is not the result of pain still is not assessed or quantified. As a result, anxiety, depression, and fear are largely overlooked by research institutions, and surprisingly little is known about animals’ pain and distress.

Satisfactory methods to gauge levels of distress in the common laboratory animal species are not available. For the most part, laboratory workers rely on anecdotal observations or on relatively insensitive measures—such as an animal’s weight loss—to ascertain whether an animal is experiencing pain and distress.

The scientific community needs to identify what procedures cause either pain or distress, and to what degree, so that the most urgent cases can be addressed first.

We plan to convene a gathering of experts who will produce a technical report on what is currently known about pain and distress in laboratory animals. The report will address current definitions of “pain” and “distress”; their recognition, assessment, and alleviation; the capacity of common laboratory animal species for experiencing pain and distress; and procedures that cause significant pain and distress and how to replace them with more humane methods.

Twenty million vertebrates are used annually in U.S. biomedical research, testing, and education. We believe that, if animals are to be used, they should be subjected to the least pain and distress possible in procedures consistent with the aim of the research.

We have sent letters to the institutional animal care and use committees (IACUCs) of several hundred research institutions to encourage their adoption of the campaign’s 2020 goal. The oversight of these federally mandated committees includes reviewing all proposals that use animals in biomedical research, testing, and education. The committees are in a position to reject or call for modifications in research proposals if insufficient attention has been paid to pain and distress experienced by the animals involved and if possible alternatives to painful procedures have been overlooked. We will promote an
exchange of information and policies among IACUCs so that new ideas and "best practices" can be disseminated quickly. The HSUS will also focus on specific practices and research techniques (such as toxicity testing) where we believe that immediate changes are possible.

We will encourage the federal agencies that oversee animal research to implement policies and guidelines that foster the campaign's goal. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) enforces the Animal Welfare Act, and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) oversees implementation of the Public Health Service policy on animal research through its Office of Protection from Research Risks (OPRR). We are already working with the USDA on modifying its pain-and-distress classification system to provide a more accurate system for tracking pain and distress in research facilities. NIH/OPRR recently took the positive step of sending a letter to all NIH-funded institutions encouraging the use of nonanimal alternatives in the production of monoclonal antibodies. (This common process is painful to animals.)

We will also encourage private and government sources to fund carefully designed research on pain and distress. While The HSUS would not encourage research that harms animals for the sake of studying pain and distress, we would like to see IACUCs authorize the inclusion of questions about pain and distress in experiments that are already planned and approved.

The campaign is the latest example of The HSUS's long-standing support of alternative methods of biomedical research and testing. Alternative methods, also known as the Three Rs, are those procedures that can replace or reduce animal use, or refine animal use so that the animals experience less suffering. This campaign clearly emphasizes refinement, but in some cases, pain and distress will be eliminated by replacing procedures with a nonanimal alternative.

Despite our concerns about IACUCs and their potential conflicts of interest, IACUCs have played a significant role in addressing concerns about pain and distress. Nevertheless, we believe that the goal of eliminating significant animal pain and distress, while ambitious, is not beyond the ingenuity and skills of the scientists, veterinarians, and technicians who use and care for laboratory animals.

Some animal activists may argue that animal research should simply be eliminated forthwith. However, we prefer to focus on more clearly achievable goals.

Approximately twenty million vertebrate animals are used annually in biomedical research, testing, and education in the United States. This number is declining. Like most scientists, we would like to see the day when animals are no longer used in harmful research. However, we believe the most urgent public priority is eliminating pain and distress among laboratory animals.—Martin L. Stephens, Ph.D., HSUS vice president, Animal Research Issues

Wild horses are driven into a corral on the range. They will be either adopted or administered immunopharmaceutical vaccine and released. The HSUS and its partners plan more immunopharmaceutical field projects for late 1998 and 1999.

WILDLIFE

Hope for Wild Horses?
Problems with BLM program run deep

For the past three years, the press accounts have been grim. The federal Bureau of Land Management (BLM), they report, which manages wild horses and burros on public lands, has allowed wild horses to die of thirst and starvation. BLM records for thirty-two thousand adopted horses in the Adopt-a-Horse program have been lost. Thousands of wild horses have been sold to slaughter.

Since the passage of the Wild Free-Roaming Horse & Burro Protection Act in 1971, the BLM has struggled to fulfill its mandate to keep public lands healthy while balancing the interests of wild horses, other wildlife, and livestock. Powerful ranchers, who pay nominal fees to graze their livestock on public lands, pres-
sure local BLM employees to keep livestock numbers high and use their clout in Congress to block serious reform.

The Adopt-a-Horse program has been the BLM's principal tool for managing wild horses. BLM employees and contractors drive them into corrals erected on the open range. Some are later returned to the range, and others are trucked to holding facilities for adoption by private individuals. The program must attract an adequate number of adopters but still screen and educate applicants to ensure that they are able to provide the horses with humane care.

Since 1992 The HSUS has been working with the BLM to slow the growth rates of western wild-horse herds. Immunooncontraception, which can be administered to mares quickly and cheaply by hand injection, has the potential to reduce the need for roundups and the number of horses entering the adoption pipeline.

The BLM, The HSUS, and the research team of Jay F. Kirkpatrick, Ph.D.; John Turner, Ph.D.; and Irwin Liu, Ph.D., D.V.M., began three new field projects in 1997–98, in Oregon and Nevada. Their goals were to test new versions of a one-shot, one-year vaccine and to demonstrate that population control can be achieved with immunooncontraception.

HSUS Senior Scientist Allen Rutberg, Ph.D., has been appointed to the BLM's Wild Horse and Burro Advisory Board, which has been asked to provide recommendations to BLM director Pat Shea on a wide range of issues. Mr. Shea appears committed to action.

The HSUS is committed to helping the new, reform-minded BLM directorship to change fundamentally the structure and culture of the BLM wild-horse program, restore the public rangelands, secure a fair share of the land's resources for wild horses and burros, and ensure a decent life for animals who must be removed from the range.

Write The Honorable Pat Shea, Director, Bureau of Land Management, 1849 C St., NW, Washington, DC 20240. Tell him that the first priority of the BLM wild-horse program should be to protect the health of the wild-horse herds and the land on which they depend.

Boys in Cameroon show off an orphaned infant lowland gorilla. Cities offer large markets for pet apes, who can be purchased typically for $100. If these victims of the bushmeat trade survive, they are poor candidates for reintroduction to the wild.

HUMANE SOCIETY INTERNATIONAL

Africa’s Bushmeat Trade
Development fuels demand for food

Virtually half of all primate species are threatened with extinction. Although humans are the only primates not dwindling in numbers, our actions—particularly our destruction of habitat—pose the major threat to all other primates, such as chimpanzees and gorillas. In some areas, however, unregulated hunting of primates for commercial use poses an even greater threat than does habitat destruction.

Bushmeat, or wild-animal meat, has been part of the traditional diet of many forest-dwelling African people. As Africa has become urbanized, however, bushmeat has become a valuable commodity. Commercial bushmeat hunters, who use shotguns and snares that can kill many more animals in much less time than the traditional spears and nets, are bringing the lucrative bushmeat to growing mar-
kets in villages and cities.
These hunters also benefit from logging operations in the region. Cameroon, the Congos, Gabon, Ghana, Ivory Coast, and Liberia are the major producers of tropical timber in an African timber industry dominated by European logging companies. As British, French, German, Italian, and other international logging companies plow into the African forests, they not only destroy and fragment wildlife habitats, but they also expedite the bushmeat trade. Logging roads are used by bushmeat hunters to gain access to the deep forest and to transport the bushmeat out of the forest to markets, often with logging trucks. Hunters also sell bushmeat at logging settlements, the camps where loggers and their families live while working for the logging companies.

Commercial hunters converge on new logging operations and build hunting camps along roadways. There they display fresh kills and sell them to logging truck drivers, who transport the meat to market. Logging company officials say they can do nothing to stop the drivers from transporting bushmeat on their vehicles because the extra money and meat are too enticing. In fact, very few companies have tried to implement rules that would stop loggers from accepting meat from hunters. Those companies that have prohibited their workers from aiding hunters rarely enforce their rules.

Not only do logging companies facilitate commercial hunting and delivery of bushmeat to market, they also create a need for bushmeat by failing to provide food for their workers. As a result loggers turn to bushmeat for subsistence. With as many as four thousand residents, a single logging settlement can consume huge amounts of bushmeat. The World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA), of which The HSUS is a member, reports that in the Republic of Congo, logging companies have held bimonthly hunts and provided local men with weapons and ammunition for providing fresh meat to loggers. Despite national laws against hunting protected species such as gorillas, chimpanzees, and bonobos, logging companies and commercial hunters foster the (continued on page 10)
The Honored Twenty-Eight
Recognizing environmental achievement

O
n Earth Day, April 22, 1998, Renew America proved why it has been called the "positive face of the environmental movement" by Paul G. Irwin, president of The HSUS and of EarthVoice's Renew America. Twenty-eight projects were honored by the sixty member organizations of the National Awards Council for Environmental Sustainability in a ceremony held at the Smithsonian Institution's Museum of American History in Washington, D.C. Descriptions of the environmental achievements of the winners and of other projects that can be replicated will be added to the Environmental Success Index, which contains over fourteen hundred examples of the creative ways people across the country are solving environmental problems.

This year's winners include WhaleNet, an Internet project developed by Wheelock College in Boston that enables students to apply math and science skills to activities that incorporate real-life marine mammal observation; Gilbert, Arizona, for its Groundwater Recharge Facility, which serves as an urban wildlife habitat; and the Ballona Dunes Restoration and Education Program, which has restored the last wetlands in Los Angeles in the hope that they will serve as habitat for a variety of endangered species, including the El Segundo blue butterfly and silver legless lizard.

A highlight of the ceremony was the announcement by Marty Spitzer, executive director of the President's Council for Sustainable Development, that the Council will join with Renew America to present National Awards for Environmental Sustainability at next spring's National Summit on Sustainability, to be held in Detroit.

Another highlight was a video teleconference, "Global Warming: Local Solutions," that linked 225 sites across the country. Led by Carol Browner, the administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and cochair of the upcoming National Summit on Sustainability, the teleconference explored how individuals and communities can use design, technology, and policy to address global warming.

The awards ceremony was cohosted by the Lemelson Center for the Study of Invention and Innovation, located at the Museum of American History. Renew America is especially honored that Dana Reeve—actress, singer, and wife of actor Christopher Reeve—has lent her personal support to these worthy environmental projects.

Paul G. Irwin joins Carol Browner during the National Awards for Environmental Sustainability ceremony in Washington, D.C., in April.
illegal meat trade.

Forest elephants, giant pangolins (anteater-like animals), duikers (small antelopes), leopards, dwarf crocodiles, and golden cats are also killed for the bushmeat trade. Although ape meat constitutes only a small percentage of the bushmeat trade, the trade decimates a large percentage of the threatened primate populations. WSPA estimates that several thousand lowland gorillas are killed annually; one study projected an annual slaughter of eight hundred gorillas in eastern Cameroon alone.

Male lowland gorillas are particularly desired by hunters because their large body mass brings hunters more money at the market. Usually, these protective silverbacks are the only group members killed, but their loss is particularly devastating, since it can isolate surviving individuals and make them vulnerable to attacks by other primate groups.

Sometimes mother apes and monkeys are killed with their infants, but when babies do survive, the hunter usually captures them and takes them to market. There they are sold as pets. Sometimes the hunter takes an infant home to be eaten later or chained up for amusement. In a five-day span, WSPA investigators observed two chimpanzees and three gorillas chained in logging settlements.

Cities offer large markets for pet apes. Both Africans and foreigners can purchase young chimpanzees and gorillas for $100 (although chimpanzees are more commonly kept as pets).

Once such animals mature, they become difficult for pet owners to handle. As a result, many pets end up in sanctuaries. If they survive, these victims of the bushmeat trade become dependent on human care.

Recent measures have been taken to reduce the overall trade in and hunting for bushmeat, but primates—and other endangered species—continue to be killed at alarming rates. Species such as crowned monkeys and dwarf crocodiles face extinction in some localities.

Organizations such as the Bushmeat Project and WSPA and coalitions of organizations such as the Ape Alliance, of which The HSUS is a member, are seeking solutions to the bushmeat crisis. In 1996 an agreement was made between WSPA, the European Parliament, and a French-owned ammunition manufacturer to halt the west-central African production of gun cartridges powerful enough to kill a gorilla or forest elephant. The ammunition had been used in the region almost exclusively to poach large mammals, such as elephants, who are protected by national and international laws.

European logging companies in Africa must be held accountable for their role in the decimation of wild species through the commercial bushmeat trade. They should eliminate the hunting, trading, harboring, and transporting of endangered species in their settlements and set up programs to educate their workers about the importance of protecting primates and other endangered animals. Logging operators should also supply alternative forms of protein to their workers. African governments that contract out their timber cutting should promote bushmeat alternative programs in their cities.

However, neither loggers nor African governments have the financial resources to effect these changes alone. With global cooperation, several hundred thousand animals could be spared each year from the bushmeat trade. Please write to the French Ambassador (His Excellency Francois V. Bujon, French Embassy, 4101 Reservoir Rd., NW, Washington, DC 20007) asking that France require all French-owned logging companies operating in Africa to adopt and enforce a code of conduct that prohibits its loggers from facilitating the bushmeat trade. Write to the Cameroonian Ambassador (His Excellency Jerome Mendouga, Embassy of the Republic of Cameroon, 2349 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20008) asking that Cameroon require all logging companies to establish a code of conduct that prohibits loggers from facilitating the bushmeat trade. Send copies of your letters to Secretary of State Madeleine Albright (Department of State, 2201 C St., NW, Washington, DC 20520), who can raise this issue during diplomatic discussions with countries where bushmeat is sold.—Crystal Dawn Miller, special assistant to the HSUS director, Wildlife Trade Program.
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THE HSUS WAS FOUNDED IN 1954 TO PROMOTE HUMANE treatment of animals and to foster respect, understanding, and compassion for all creatures and their environment.

ANIMAL-PROTECTION PROGRAMS

More than sixty-six thousand visits were logged on the HSUS Internet site, www.hsus.org. The award-winning quarterly HSUS News reached more than 250,000 HSUS members with each issue. We gave a striking new look to our traditional "Animals... It’s Their World Too" graphics and produced dozens of items in advance of our 1998 Animal Care Expo. The Humane Society of the United States Complete Guide to Dog Care was readied for publication in early 1998. We produced new kits for long-standing HSUS programs on circuses, animal fighting, and animal dissection in school settings. Our First Strike™ campaign materials on the connection between animal cruelty and human violence proved so popular that many were reprinted within months of their debut. The Animal Activist Alert focused the attention of our most active members on crucial issues.

The HSUS was mentioned in thousands of media outlets in relation to HSUS programs and other animal-related topics. Newsweek, the New York Times, the San Francisco Chronicle, the Washington Post, and hundreds of other publications, along with major television affiliates, covered the HSUS's efforts to protect elephants from ivory traders and trophy hunters. Several hundred articles and broadcast stories addressed our First Strike program.

We had thousands of letters to editors published; topics ranged from tips on protecting dogs and cats in inclement weather to recognizing members of Congress who support animal-protection legislation.

Special projects included the 1997 HSUS symposium, where we encouraged hundreds of animal-protection and social-service professionals to cooperate in treating animal abuse as a serious offense. Our public service announcements (PSAs) on animal cruelty ran in dozens of markets, and we produced influential new videos in support of our anti-circus and First Strike campaigns and our positions on poultry farm practices, immunocontraception, and animal dissection. Narrated in English, French, and Spanish, our videos on whales, turtles, bears, and African elephants were presented at the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) in Zimbabwe. We created Pet Minute, a series of television re-

Staffed with the nation’s leading experts on animal issues and possessing the largest membership and constituency of any animal-protection organization in the world, The HSUS is uniquely positioned to effect meaningful and lasting social change for animals. We push to protect animals in every forum: in the schools; in the print and electronic media; on the World Wide Web; in the marketplace; in local, state, and federal legislative bodies; in the courtroom; and in animal shelters and local humane societies.

All animals—whether wild or domestic, in distress or in safe environs—have a friend in The HSUS.

Nothing is more important to our success than you. You enable us to function and to grow to meet the new challenges every day brings forth. You work in your communities to educate people about the plight of animals. You participate in our democratic system of government. And you make responsible consumer choices.

You are The HSUS. I am pleased to report to you, our partners in protecting animals, on our remarkable record of progress and achievement in 1997.

Paul G. Irwin
President, CEO
ports on responsible pet care, and distributed it to television stations nationwide. The HSUS also provided video footage to local and national television outlets.

We ran print ads describing our positions on timely issues, including whale and dolphin protection, pet overpopulation, farm-animal protection, and disaster relief for animals. We also placed anti-fur billboards and bus ads in key cities. We published Wild Neighbors, which offers humane solutions for conflicts with wildlife, and Wildlife Tracks, a newsletter that informs thousands of grassroots activists working nationwide to protect wildlife and habitat.

We distributed information for activists on the suffering of animals in circuses and on the pro-hunting bias of state wildlife agencies. The magazine The Animals' Agenda featured six HSUS print/video items among those its readers chose as effective tools for activism.

The HSUS offered multiday disaster-preparedness exercises, field demonstrations of humane solutions to wildlife conflicts, and euthanasia-technician training, as well as daylong sessions dealing with basics of cruelty investigation, large- animal cruelty investigation, and animal behavior.

We also coordinated or participated in sixty-two training events in thirty-two states and Canada, reaching more than twenty-five hundred people.

EARTHVOICE. EarthVoice, formerly known as EarthKind, is the global environmental arm of The HSUS. Its mission is to create a humane society by focusing on ways to reverse the decline of biodiversity around the world.

EarthVoice worked to implement Agenda 21, which was set forth at the 1992 Earth Summit, and to foster values, such as those in the proposed Earth Charter, that seek to restore balance, harmony, and integrity to the relationship between humans and the other animal inhabitants of Earth.

EarthVoice was an influential international leader through its work at the United Nations (UN), the President's Council for Sustainable Development, and the Global Environmental Facility.

Our investigators provided extensive assistance to the Iowa prosecutor preparing a nationally publicized case against three men charged with bludgeoning sixteen cats to death in an animal sanctuary.

We investigated the circumstances surrounding the death in New Mexico of an elephant owned by the King Royal Circus, assisted in the subsequent prosecution of the circus owners, and attended U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) hearings on the revocation of the circus's license to exhibit animals.

We sent investigators to a broiler chicken operation in the Southeast and obtained shocking video footage of abusive handling of chickens. The tape was then used to publicize the suffering of animals on factory farms.

Investigators worked with the Dutch Society for the Protection of Animals on an undercover investigation into the pet turtle trade. Compelling video footage documenting the methods for capturing, farming, and transporting turtles assisted the group's efforts to ban the import of red-eared sliders and other turtles sold as pets.

We researched, drafted, and mailed to fifty thousand physicians a brochure describing estrogen-replacement drugs and therapies that are alternatives to Premarin®, a drug derived from the urine of pregnant mares restrained for months in urine collection harnesses.

Investigative researchers collected and organized data on circuses, the fur trade, the Iditarod Sled Dog Race, horse slaughter, the tuna-dolphin issue, whaling, the reptile trade, exotic-animal auctions, and the dissection trade.

With nine regional offices overseeing forty-six states, The HSUS served constituents locally and extended national HSUS programs into local communities. The HSUS was instrumental in relocating to a safe haven 259 Canada geese destined for slaughter in Minnesota. We also won a major victory by convincing Michigan to abandon its roundup and slaughter of Canada geese.

We helped rescue more than two hundred animals from an animal collector in New Hampshire and worked on a major cruelty case involving more than ninety lions and tigers in Mississippi. A reward we offered for information later led to an arrest and conviction in a disturbing cruelty case in Illinois.
We helped relocate animals from a New Jersey zoo and removed dangerous barbed-wire fences from the range of wild horses on the Montana-Wyoming border. In San Francisco, we continued efforts to stop the cruelties associated with live-animal markets. We provided expertise to law enforcement officials through expert testimony in trials and workshops on animal-fighting issues.

We completed a three-year effort to revise Florida's regulations governing animals belonging to zoos and aquaria. We worked on a computer network to allow Missouri's humane agencies to share vital information.

HSUS disaster teams were in California and Minnesota for weeks responding to floods. In California we were the only national animal-protection organization to participate in an El Niño Community Preparedness Summit.

At CITES The HSUS and Humane Society International (HSI) built and led an effective international alliance to protect animals and plants that are subject to international commercial trade.

HSUS/HSI cosponsored the first Pan African Symposium on Nonconsumptive Approaches to Wildlife Conservation to promote the positive values associated with nonconsumptive uses of wildlife.

HSUS/HSI agreed to provide an unprecedented $1 million to South Africa's National Parks Board over five years for the humane control of elephant populations, land acquisition and preservation, promotion and implementation of ecotourism programs, and relocation of animals when appropriate.

Acknowledged leaders in the development of immunocontraception for humane wildlife population control, an

HSUS research team delivered immunocontraceptive vaccine injections to elephants at Kruger National Park in South Africa. The HSUS also increased the number of deer-immunocontraception field sites and shared immunocontraception technology and expertise with fifty-three zoos and aquaria worldwide to help prevent unwanted births of animals in captivity.

In an effort to head off threats to whales from the Makah Indians of Washington State as well as from Japan and Norway, The HSUS prepared a number of extensive legal and scientific analyses and reports for presentation at the annual International Whaling Commission meeting. The HSUS was granted consultative status with the UN, allowing us to attend official meetings and provide expertise on animal issues. We joined EarthVoice in discussions about Agenda 21 and played an active role in the UN General Assembly debate on global drift netting.

To support future anti-trapping efforts, we continued to compile a national database of reports from veterinarians who have treated wild and domestic animals caught in traps.

We worked toward resolving problems arising from marine mammal interactions with commercial fisheries and toward improving the USDA's care and maintenance standards for captive marine mammals.

The HSUS worked with communities nationwide to promote nonlethal means of resolving conflicts between wildlife and humans. Working with a Maryland developer, for example, we stopped a planned deer kill and replaced it with a humane wildlife-mitigation plan that we hope will yield a useful model for other communities.

The HSUS Wildlife Rehabilitation Training Center (WRTC) on Cape Cod provided treatment for approximately seven hundred wildlife patients and offered wildlife rehabilitation training to veterinary students and the wildlife rehabilitation community. Center staff also presented other training seminars at its facility and throughout the country.

We joined with the U.S. Postal Service to promote National Dog Bite Prevention Week, a campaign to educate the general public on how responsible pet ownership can help prevent dog bites.

Animal Sheltering our bimonthly periodical for animal-care and -control professionals, boasted the largest gain in subscribers in its nineteen-year history. The magazine was named "Most Improved Magazine" by the Society of National Association Publications. National Animal Shelter Appreciation Week promoted a positive image of local animal care and control. We conducted several in-depth shelter evaluations and provided materials to hundreds of shelters. We continued our efforts to protect
### Combined Statement of Financial Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>December 31</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>$18,896,826</td>
<td>$13,160,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables, deposits, and prepaid expenses</td>
<td>1,847,997</td>
<td>1,536,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments, at market value</td>
<td>43,596,701</td>
<td>39,018,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed assets, net of depreciation</td>
<td>10,582,025</td>
<td>10,541,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$74,923,549</td>
<td>$64,258,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>57,205,329</td>
<td>47,714,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily restricted</td>
<td>4,382,549</td>
<td>4,724,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently restricted</td>
<td>6,076,003</td>
<td>6,018,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities and Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>$74,923,549</td>
<td>$64,258,136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Combined Statement of Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Temporarily Restricted</th>
<th>Permanently Restricted</th>
<th>Year Ended December 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue, Other Additions, and Transfers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions and grants</td>
<td>$30,066,151</td>
<td>$5,515,499</td>
<td>$57,424</td>
<td>$35,639,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bequests</td>
<td>7,037,717</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,053,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>8,387,735</td>
<td>2,170,860</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,558,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of literature and other income</td>
<td>456,991</td>
<td>209,542</td>
<td></td>
<td>666,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue and Other Additions</strong></td>
<td>$45,948,594</td>
<td>$7,911,901</td>
<td>$57,424</td>
<td>$53,917,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers (net assets released from restrictions)</td>
<td>8,253,683</td>
<td>(8,253,683)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue, Other Additions, and Transfers</strong></td>
<td>$54,202,277</td>
<td>($341,782)</td>
<td>$57,424</td>
<td>$53,917,919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenses and Other Deductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Temporarily Restricted</th>
<th>Permanently Restricted</th>
<th>Year Ended December 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animal-protection programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public education, membership information, and publications</td>
<td>$13,600,129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,600,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruelty investigations and regional offices</td>
<td>3,577,218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,577,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife, animal-habitat, and sheltering programs</td>
<td>4,923,808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,923,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth- and higher-education programs</td>
<td>2,278,793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,278,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal assistance, litigation, legislation and government relations</td>
<td>1,883,753</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,883,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal-research issues and bioethics and farm animals</td>
<td>1,058,627</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,058,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and general</td>
<td>3,753,142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,753,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership development</td>
<td>2,287,834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,287,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund-raising</td>
<td>11,348,281</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,348,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses and Other Deductions</strong></td>
<td>$44,711,585</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$44,711,585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Change in Net Assets before Cumulative Effect of Changes in Accounting Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Net Assets before Cumulative Effect of Changes in Accounting Principles</th>
<th>Year Ended December 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9,490,692 (341,782)</td>
<td>$57,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$9,206,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,232,231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The HSUS is tax exempt under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Contributions are tax deductible to the extent allowed by law.

The HSUS's audited financial statements are available upon request.
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cats, dogs, and other companion animals through campaigns, media appearances, and publications. Our staff provided education to the general public and support to shelters on a variety of issues ranging from dogfighting to careers working with animals.

Our Animal Care Expo, attended by more than one thousand animal-care and -control professionals, celebrated its sixth anniversary in Orlando, Florida, with workshops, training seminars, and the largest exhibit hall in the animal-care and -control field.

THE HSUS WILDLIFE LAND TRUST. Supported by more than 350,000 donors in 1997, the Trust accepted permanent protection responsibilities on six sanctuary properties in five states. An additional sanctuary property came to the Trust through a bequest. Two properties were accepted as trade lands, which may be sold or traded by the Trust either to support land stewardship responsibilities or to purchase more suitable sanctuary properties.

The Trust now permanently protects twenty-one sanctuary properties in twelve states.

HUMANE SOCIETY INTERNATIONAL. In Australia we uncovered and effectively dealt with the illegal sale of cats and dogs from pounds for medical research, improved current anti-cruelty legislation, exposed the export of live deer for bloodletting, and began a national alternatives-to-animal-research loan program. We won protection for several endangered species and critical woodland habitats.

We confronted Italy over its failure to adhere to an agreement with the United States to cease illegal drift netting and at the European Parliament helped bring about a shift in European policies on drift netting. With the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA), we raised awareness of animal-protection issues among U.S. travel agencies; we helped underwrite the UN Food and Agriculture Organization’s workshops in humane handling and slaughter techniques in Myanmar and Malawi; and we supported Global Communications for Conservation, Inc.’s India Project for Animals and Nature.
CRLE staff responded to six hundred requests for information on career and educational opportunities involving animals and on how to make colleges more environmentally responsible. CRLE became the secretariat for University Leaders for a Sustainable Future and coproduced in Assisi, Italy, a conference exploring the social policies and lifestyles necessary to support a humane society. CRLE sponsored a conference to develop and promote an agricultural ethic that makes concern for the land and for animals central to American agriculture in the twenty-first century. We supported eight theological institutions and universities implementing eco-justice-oriented curricula and humane, sustainable practices. In Earth Ethics, CRLE’s quarterly journal, articles explored the Earth Charter and the Assisi conference.

NAHHEE's monthly classroom newspaper for elementary students, was read by 1.2 million children in ten countries. As part of a pilot project, NAHHEE coordinated the development of a supplemental Spanish-language KIND News text for five hundred teachers in Puerto Rico.

We published KIND Teacher magazine, the teaching resource that accompanies KIND News, and the 1997-98 issue of HSUS Student Network News, our annual publication for secondary students. Four NAHHEE award programs recognized exceptional accomplishments in humane education: the National KIND Teacher Award, the KIND Children's Book Award, the KIND Club Achievement Award, and the Adopt-A-Teacher Achievement Award.

The HSUS fought attacks on U.S. dolphin-protection laws by the pro-trade Clinton administration, fishing groups, and five environmental organizations. After an enormous struggle, Congress did weaken U.S. laws, but we secured compromises to eliminate some of the potentially most harmful changes.

The HSUS and labor and environmental groups helped to block the granting of fast-track authority to the president on decisions involving international trade. This victory set a precedent for retaining American domestic laws that protect animals and the environment.

The HSUS led the fight against taxpayer funding for an elephant trophy hunting program in Zimbabwe known as CAMPFIRE and helped persuade the Clinton administration to continue to oppose international efforts to reopen the international ivory trade.

We secured language in appropriations legislation that bars subsidies for promoting mink sales, and we successfully lobbied for money for the USDA to implement humane horse-transport regulations.

We worked to have several major pieces of legislation introduced, including bills to target the trade in bear parts, to stop canned hunts, to curtail the theft of companion animals for animal research, and to make illegal the abuse of injured cattle at stockyards.

We tracked three hundred bills in state legislatures, helping to pass twenty-five animal-protection laws and thwarting dozens of bills that would have harmed animals. Building on 1996's ballot initiative successes, The HSUS spearheaded measures to ban commercial and recreational trapping of wildlife in California; outlaw cockfighting in Arizona and Missouri; and restore long-standing protection for mourning doves in Ohio.

The HSUS worked to reform the U.S. government's Wildlife Services by encouraging Congress to reduce funding for predator control in the West.

The HSUS and our coplaintiffs won an important legal battle to stop the National Park Service (NPS) from slaughtering deer at Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area, thereby preventing the NPS from setting a dangerous lethal-control precedent.

HSUS proposals convinced Ohio State University to implement humane reforms of the use of rabbits and mice in its microbiology course. Pressure from The HSUS and others led the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to cancel its participation in primate experiments on the Bion space mission.

The HSUS and partners in academia,
government, and industry established an information resource on the Internet about alternative research methods. The 1997 Gillette/HSUS Alternatives Research Grant Program awarded $100,000 for research to develop alternatives to the rabbit Draize Eye-Irritancy Test. We bestowed the 1997 Russell and Burch Award on Horst Spielmann, M.D., for his outstanding contributions to the alternatives field. We joined the advisory boards of the Center for Alternatives to Animal Testing, the Interagency Coordinating Committee for the Validation of Alternative Methods, and the Institute for In Vitro Sciences.

Through print, lectures, and the media, we publicized our message on reforming the use of animals in biomedical experimentation and education. We also researched and wrote materials for a new information kit on alternatives to classroom dissection.

The environmental and food-safety consequences of factory farming were priorities in 1997. When a Pfiesteria outbreak in Chesapeake Bay tributaries was linked to runoff of waste from factory farms, we helped launch federal and state efforts to regulate factory-farm pollution and documented the correlation between factory farming and food-borne illnesses. We allied ourselves with contract broiler-chicken farmers and provided expertise for the HSUS poultry-practices video.

We filed a petition against the U.S. Food and Drug Administration’s expansion of extra-label drug use because of the potential for increased administration of drugs to factory-farm animals.

We released a video and report exposing abuses in the ratite industry; created materials explaining humane alternatives to school-run egg-hatching projects; and established rewards for solving cases of cruelty to farm animals. In an ongoing initiative, we encouraged major supermarket chains in Dallas, Minneapolis, and Vermont to offer eggs from uncaged hens to their customers as an alternative to intensively produced eggs.

We also launched the Soul of Agriculture project with a national conference to establish an agricultural production ethics statement and plan of action for the twenty-first century.

SUPPORTING SERVICES

MANAGEMENT AND GENERAL

HSUS staff carries out the daily operations necessary to sustain our work. The president is charged with administering The HSUS on behalf of the board of directors. Under the president’s oversight, the treasurer prepares the annual operations budget for approval by the board and oversees HSUS assets, making disbursements for expenses and maintaining the financial records necessary to meet federal and state reporting requirements. The HSUS maintains headquarters in Washington, D.C.; an operations center in Gaithersburg, Maryland; the National Humane Education Center; and NAHEE facilities.

We expanded catalog sales and restructured our licensing program, placing emphasis on larger revenue producers.

MEMBERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

The HSUS underwrites its budget with annual membership dues and through contributions and legacies from members and others. The society produces and distributes literature describing its goals and current endeavors to a constituency of more than 5.7 million people. It also provides information to the general public with the intention of enlisting new members of the society.

FUND-RAISING

The HSUS must earn the confidence of its members and donors if it is to continue to generate the resources required for operations. It does this primarily by educating the public regarding its activities on behalf of animals and the ways in which those efforts have made a difference. The HSUS continues to succeed in enlisting the support of an increasing constituency that shares our concerns and objectives and provides legacies, deferred gifts, endowments, and regular contributions and gifts to underwrite our mission.
Our New Publications Catalog Debuts

Order your copy of the new 1998–99 HSUS Publications Catalog and see for yourself the more than fifty new books, posters, videos, and flyers we’ve produced to complement the hundreds of longtime sellers still available. For a free copy, send us this coupon. Allow 4–6 weeks for delivery.

Name __________________________________________
Organization (if applicable) __________________________
Address __________________________________________
City ______________________ State ______ Zip __________

Mail to Publications Catalog, The HSUS, 2100 L St., NW, Washington, DC 20037.

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 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 __________________________________________
Address __________________________________________
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.
Word came in the form of a fax the day before Thanksgiving 1997. The HSUS received from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) our long-sought permit to capture and remove geese from a penned facility in Minnesota. We didn’t know how many geese we would be able to take—it could be anywhere from 180 to 280. The permit granted us only one day—Thursday, December 4—to remove the geese. If we failed to meet any of the FWS’s numerous requirements, our permit would be withdrawn and the state would be granted a permit to begin slaughtering the geese the following day. We had less than a week to prepare for our undertaking.

In 1996 the HSUS, Minnesota Humane Society, and Friends of Animals and Their Environment (FATE) had sued the FWS for issuing a permit under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to allow the state of Minnesota to kill geese in approximately thirty locations. Geese had been slaughtered that year and most of the next, but the U.S. District Court had taken no action. Then on August 23, 1997, the presiding judge invalidated the state’s permit. U.S. District Judge Richard H. Kyle held that the state had failed to demonstrate what the law required—that the geese were causing serious damage—in order to justify their slaughter.* But the decision was rendered so late in the summer that it seemed likely that it was too late to save any geese that year. Just one day later, however, on August 24, the FWS notified the HSUS that there were several hundred geese still being held in a pen at a state facility outside St. Paul. They were the last group of birds waiting for slaughter.

The HSUS hoped to find a solution that would save these remaining birds. We met with the FWS in October. At that time we were given thirty days to find a suitable home for the geese. The FWS believed no state would accept them and that no national wildlife refuge could take them. Relocation near Minnesota would be unacceptable because the geese might simply find their way back.

We needed to find a jurisdiction that relied on neither federal nor state approval for the planned relocation. We turned to the sovereign authority granted Native Americans on their lands. We began a telephone search for tribes that might feel concerned about the plight of the geese. The Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma responded with warmth and enthusiasm, and we knew immediately that we had found our partner in this operation.

Because moving a large group of Canada geese a thousand miles in winter on short notice would be a complex undertaking, we assembled a dedicated team of HSUS staff with expertise in handling and moving animals.

We spent two days evaluating the Choctaw site in southeastern Oklahoma to determine if the location offered suitable food sources, water, shelter, and some protection from predators since the geese had had their wings clipped and were temporarily flightless. What we found was encouraging: a sprawling cattle ranch with grassy fenced pastures on the shore of a lake.

Dividing into an Oklahoma team and a Minnesota team, we split up tasks: finding transport in the form of an eighteen-wheel tractor trailer filled with twenty specially-built wooden crates; selecting the release site; constructing a holding pen for the geese at the site; and planning a safe release of the birds. We needed to confirm that the birds’ imminent arrival would not be a problem for the Choctaw Nation and make sure that signs prohibiting hunting would be posted in the release area.

**By Richard Farinato and Nancy Perry**

Out of Harm’s
On Tuesday, December 2, the Oklahoma team arrived at the release site and built a 5,000-square-foot wire pen to hold the geese for observation upon their arrival. The second team assembled in Minnesota on Wednesday to assess the birds, the conditions under which the team would be working, and the final plan for capturing, crating, and loading the birds. Weather forecasts predicted snow.

For all of a snowy Thursday, the Minnesota team captured, examined, crated, and loaded 259 geese. By five o’clock that evening, the trailer was bound for Oklahoma, with the geese crated safely in beds of straw. Behind the trailer was a van carrying the Minnesota team. The trip from Minnesota to Oklahoma took twenty-two hours. Meanwhile the Oklahoma team completed some last-minute preparations and waited for a call from the van. At 2:30 Friday afternoon, the team met the weary travelers twenty miles from the release site. *The state had claimed that the goose droppings were an annoyance to landowners and park users. Its other claims of public health and safety concerns (bacteria from droppings, goose collisions with air and car traffic, goose attacks) were unsubstantiated and could not satisfy any legal requirements for a permit to kill geese.

and led them to the birds’ new home.

With only two hours of daylight left, both teams began to unload the geese. The tractor trailer backed up to the gate area of the pen, and, one by one, the heavy crates were carefully lifted and carried to the gate. One wood panel was removed from the crate’s front, and the geese began to walk out into their new home. Flapping their wings, they honked their excitement at being out of the crates, then began to feed on the pasture grasses and cracked corn set out for them.

All the geese came through the trip in fine shape. HSUS team members and Choctaw Nation officials watched the birds until it was too dark to see and then departed, exhausted but happy. A final check later that night found the birds peacefully resting in the pen.

When team leaders returned to the release site on Saturday morning, they found that some of the geese had managed to slip out of the pen and find their way to the outer reaches of the lake. After observing the “runaways,” the team leaders decided to release the remaining birds. They removed the rear wall of the pen and urged the birds down to the lake. The first few geese entered the water; then there was a rushing blur as the others followed. Within minutes all were bathing, preening, and calling to one another. Free after months of confinement, they resumed their lives as wild geese.

For those of us watching from land, the moment provided both reward and relief. Our planning and cooperation had paid off. HSUS staff have returned in the intervening months to observe the geese settling into their new environment. The birds seem to be doing well. They have remained in the immediate area, spending their time on the lake or in the adjoining fields. We will continue to monitor their progress and document their behavior.

Their future looks bright. Once their power of flight returns, they will be free to go where they please. Wherever that might be, these geese will be symbols, veterans of the battles that have been fought against the efforts of human beings to sanitize and control the natural rhythms and relationships of animals and their environments.

Richard Farinato is HSUS director, Captive Wildlife Protection. Nancy Perry is HSUS director, Grassroots Campaigns.
Once lived next door to a couple who had a dog named Chelsea. Chelsea lived indoors with her family, who made sure she received plenty of exercise. But when allowed out in her backyard, she often found the lure of a neighborhood basketball game too tempting. She would escape from her yard to join it, dodging traffic as she went. Her owners could never discover Chelsea’s escape route. Then one day I stepped onto my backyard deck, glanced toward the tall stockade fence that separated their yard from mine, and saw Chelsea looking back at me! With her feet carefully placed on the crosspiece near the top of the fence, the big dog appeared to be suspended in midair. Then Chelsea tiptoed along her horizontal wooden “walkway” to the gate and leaped easily over it, on her way to the basketball court.

Chelsea’s agility made her a very difficult dog to confine safely. Her owners eventually supplemented the solid fence with an electronic training system (marked by flags). Insets: An anti-barking collar, left, joins an electronic confinement device; a collar in place.

The quality of electronic training products has improved significantly in recent years, and many dog owners have found they can use these products as an effective, humane means to alter their dogs’ undesirable behavior.
with an electronic confinement system. Once she’d been trained to avoid the system’s boundaries, Chelsea realized that her days of great escape were over.

Many dog owners are turning to electronic training aids for help in resolving undesirable behavior in their pets. While older products were often unreliable and difficult to use humanely, new technology has led to products that can be used to address safely and effectively the undesirable and sometimes dangerous behavior of our companion dogs. These new, aggressively marketed products range from anti-barking collars and hidden confinement systems to remote training devices. In 1997 U.S. pet owners purchased more than 250,000 remote training devices, 500,000 containment systems, and 550,000 anti-barking collars.

The use of electronic training aids has been controversial because of their negative methods for correcting an animal’s behavior. Positive methods of training—such as rewarding a dog with food or praise—should be used whenever possible, but negative correction does not necessarily have to be painful or harmful to a companion animal. Many animals learn quickly from appropriate negative correction. When a dog owner says “No” to tell her dog that he is behaving improperly and to redirect his behavior, she is using negative correction.

The most controversial electronic training aids use static shock for correction. It is important to understand that not all types of “shock” are equal. Modern electronic training aids deliver a static-shock correction of about 5 kilovolts—almost 40 percent less than the static shock one receives after walking across a nylon carpet in dry weather. (By comparison, an electric fence used to confine large animals provides a 20-kilovolt shock.) For most dogs the static shock provided by an electronic training device specifically designed for that dog’s size is an attention-getting reminder that he is performing a behavior that he has been trained not to perform, such as barking inappropriately or crossing the boundaries of his yard.

The two most popular electronic training aids are an anti-barking collar and a containment system. Both barking and escape behaviors are frustrating problems encountered by dog owners. Unfortunately, many owners focus their efforts on stopping the barking or preventing escape, without first determining why the dog is behaving the way he is. The most humane and effective solution to both problems is to determine and then eliminate the cause of the behavior. In most cases when a dog’s social, physical, and behavioral needs are met, behavioral problems disappear.

Some dogs, however, find barking or escaping fun and continue to bark or escape even when their needs have been met. Both behaviors endanger a dog’s life. Uncontrolled barking angers neighbors, sometimes to the point of retaliation against the dog. Free-roaming dogs are at risk of being hit by automobiles and of attack from other dogs, wildlife, and even humans. Both behaviors can cause dog owners to relinquish their dogs to animal shelters, where few prospective adopters choose a chronic Barker or escape artist. For his own safety and well-being, the dog’s behavior must be altered, and an electronic training aid can be safely used to change the behavior of some dogs.

There are two types of electronic training aids for barking behavior: those that correct the dog with a static shock, and those that correct the dog with a spray of citronella, an annoying but harmless substance. In both cases the dog wears a collar with an electronic sound-sensor that is activated by the vibration caused by the dog’s bark. Each time a dog barks, she receives either a static shock or a spray of citronella. The correction is effective because it is immediate and does not require the owner’s presence. Both devices should be used in conjunction with other methods of training, such as rewarding the dog for calm, quiet behavior and properly socializing her to the stimuli that incite barking, such as passing neighbors and ringing doorbells.

Confine ment systems are also based on static-shock or citronella-spray correction. A metal wire is placed around the perimeter of the dog’s yard and is usually buried a few inches below ground to prevent breakage. A low-output radio transmitter is installed in a garage or utility room and emits an AM radio signal along the wire, which acts as an antenna. The radio signal is broadcast an adjustable distance from the wire and triggers the device worn on the dog’s collar. The dog’s owner then trains the dog so that he recognizes the boundaries of his yard. Once he has been trained, the dog is given a “correction” when he approaches the fence, either a static shock or a spray of citronella, depending on which type of system is being used.

Before purchasing an electronic confinement system, a dog owner must make a commitment to training the dog so that the confinement system can reliably contain him. Most dogs learn to recognize their boundaries and are rarely corrected by the confinement system. As with any training, however, a periodic refresher course may be necessary. Some dogs will find a way to evade the system, finding a means of escape every time their new routes are discovered. Others may simply cross the electronic field, especially if the temptation to escape is strong enough. (Once outside the boundary, the dog will be corrected if he attempts to return to his yard.) Electrical power failures, damage to the underground wires, lightning, and dead batteries may short-circuit the electronic field and permit the dog to cross the boundary without correction.

The best use for an electronic confinement system is as a backup for a solid fence, but electronic confinement systems often are touted for their invisibility when used alone. Some owners like the fact that...
Hidden systems can't protect dogs from others.
Inset: Owners should not encircle their homes with electronic systems, forcing delivery people to enter the dog's territory.

the system can be moved with them to a new home or the boundaries changed whenever necessary. A fenceless system, however, cannot protect the dog from passersby, including other dogs, wildlife, and cruel humans. A confined dog who is attacked must either face his attacker or be corrected by the electronic system if he tries to escape. Because the system is hidden, passersby may surmise either that the dog, if in sight, can readily approach them or that no dog lives on the property at all.

For these reasons electronic confinement systems are not appropriate for dogs known to exhibit territorial behavior, although they may be useful backup systems for a solid, well-constructed fence used to confine such dogs.

The electronic training aid least used is the remote training device, which comes in two types. The ultrasonic training aid is a handheld device that emits two ultrasonic frequencies that are audible to the dog but inaudible to humans. One of these is a "startling" sound, used as a negative correction when the dog exhibits the undesired behavior, and the other is a neutral sound that the dog is taught to associate with positive rewards such as food and praise. The other remote type, the static-shock training aid, consists of a collar similar to the one used with the static-shock confinement systems and a handheld device that activates the collar. The collar will emit both a warning tone and a static-shock correction, at the owner's discretion.

Although remote training devices are marketed to the general public, they may not be effective in the hands of a dog owner who is not skilled in correct, humane dog-training techniques, and are probably best used by the dog owner with at least moderately advanced training skills. Although it would be difficult to abuse a dog intentionally with one of these products—well-designed models have built-in safety features such as an automatic shutoff after a certain number of negative corrections—it would be easy for a novice trainer to confuse and frustrate a dog by providing the negative correction at the wrong time.

When considering whether an electronic training aid is the right choice for your dog, carefully consider her personality and responsiveness to training, your specific goals for training her, and your level of knowledge and expertise in dog training. A device that works well for one dog might be inappropriate for another, seemingly similar, dog. A veterinarian, animal behaviorist, or qualified dog trainer may be able to help you decide whether such products can be effectively and humanely used to train your dog or whether other methods might be more suitable.

When choosing an electronic training aid, look for safety features that prevent abuse of the device, such as the automatic shutoff, and that show all parts of the device have UL-certification, which indicates they have passed electrical safety tests. A device that offers an adjustable level of correction can be tailored to provide only as much correction as your dog needs. Choose a product that comes with clearly written information that explains its proper use. Contact the manufacturer's customer service department before purchasing the product to determine how easy it will be to obtain assistance should you have problems using the product properly. The literature provided with the product and the assistance provided by the manufacturer's customer service representatives should focus on the use of the product as a training device used to change rather than simply to control the dog's behavior.

Proper use of electronic training aids can improve the safety and well-being of many dogs and strengthen the bond with their human companions.*

Leslie Sinclair, D.V.M., is HSUS director, Companion Animal Care.

*The HSUS recently signed a licensing agreement with a manufacturer of electronic training aids. Licensing agreements allow carefully screened companies to contribute to The HSUS in exchange for including the HSUS name and logo in their packaging and materials. The HSUS does not endorse or certify the quality or effectiveness of any particular product or brand.
Howard Lyman, Director of The HSUS’s Eating with Conscience program, had every reason to expect the worst when he walked into an Amarillo, Texas, courtroom on January 16, 1998, to face a lawsuit filed by a number of cattle-feedlot companies for remarks he had made about mad cow disease on the influential Oprah Winfrey Show on April 16, 1996. He was about to be judged by a jury of citizens of Amarillo, a city that is the home of a $3-billion-a-year cattle industry that fattens 25 percent of the cattle in the United States in feedlots before sending them to market. Bumper stickers had been spotted in town that read, “The only mad cow is Oprah.”

The topic of the show that brought Mr. Lyman to the Amarillo courtroom was dangerous foods. His appearance had been prompted by a newly announced ban on beef products in the United Kingdom, the result of a strongly suspected link between bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) and the new variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease (vCJD) in humans. Mr. Lyman, who spent much of his early professional life raising cattle and advocates humane animal husbandry, remarked during the course of a five-minute interview that cattle in the United States were being fed the ground-up remains of cattle and other animals, a practice that was suspected of spreading mad cow disease in the United Kingdom. The interview became the subject of a lawsuit and a major legal test of food-disparagement laws.

In the interview Mr. Lyman spoke of the almost one hundred thousand cows every year in the United States who died suddenly of no identifiable cause and whose carcasses (until a ban by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration in August 1997) were then ground up, added to animal feed, and fed to other cows. He cited U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) statistics as the source of his information. He said that if even one dead cow had been suffering from mad cow disease, the practice of including the remains in cattle feed could infect thousands of live cattle. When Ms. Winfrey asked whether cattle, as natural herbivores, should be eating the carcasses of other cows, Mr. Lyman replied that cattle should be eating grass, as nature intended, and not other cows. Ms. Winfrey then said that the thought of feeding cows to cows made her not want to eat beef ever again. She said, “It has just stopped me cold from eating another burger. I’m stopped.”

Also appearing on the show was Gary Weber, Ph.D., of the National Cattlemen’s Association. He stated that government regulations ensured that the beef supply was safe. The day after The Oprah Winfrey Show broadcast, cattle prices began a two-week decline.

In June 1996 Ms. Winfrey, her production company, and Mr. Lyman were sued in Texas by cattle-feedlot companies led by Paul Engler, owner of Cactus Feeders, a $650-million-a-year cattle operation based in Amarillo. Mr. Engler claimed that he lost $6.7 million as a result of the price decline. The lawsuit was filed under a Texas law that holds people liable if they knowingly make a false statement about a food product that causes the product’s producers or growers to lose money as a result. The law and similar laws in twelve other states have created a new class of legal protection known as food-disparagement laws. (No one ever proved that The Oprah Winfrey Show broadcast was responsible for any decline in cattle prices.)

The trial generated sustained national interest, despite a gag order imposed on all parties to the suit by U.S. District Judge Mary Lou Robinson.

In a welcome decision, Judge Robinson ruled on February 16, 1998, that the state’s food-disparagement laws did not apply to the case at hand. As a consequence, the suit continued under a common-law business disparagement applicable to general business transactions. Then, in a unanimous verdict, the jury ruled on February 26, 1998, that Mr. Lyman and Ms. Winfrey...
we're not guilty of libeling the plaintiffs during the course of the telecast.

After the verdict Mr. Lyman said, "Today The Humane Society of the United States and I breathe more easily, knowing that a vigorous debate about potential dangers to our food supply—ranging from E. coli to Pfiesteria to salmonella to mad cow disease—is permissible. Lawsuits like this stifle speech about matters that have implications for the health and welfare of every American consumer. At a time when threats to food safety are arguably greater than ever—threats exacerbated by intensive confinement conditions that abet the spread of disease and by controversial feed practices—we need a free and open discussion about these matters."

Now that the trial is over, and Mr. Lyman has been vindicated, The HSUS is free to express our view of two crucial components of the highly publicized trial.

The first issue is the right of U.S. citizens to free speech under the First Amendment of the Constitution. In the sense that they may have been passed to give agricultural interests an open invitation to sue if they believed themselves to be damaged, these food-disparagement laws are an attack on all Americans' right to free speech. The public good requires that the economic consequences of a public statement never take precedence over the need for rigorous, open debate.

The Texas lawsuit prompted strong support from public interest groups and the press. A New York Times editorial on January 19, 1998, opposed food-disparagement laws: "These harmful and probably unconstitutional statutes are intended to protect farmers and ranchers from malicious or reckless statements suggesting that a food product is not safe for human consumption. But if upheld, these laws could chill needed public debate about food safety and food processing methods." The Washington Post heralded the verdict in a lead editorial on February 28 and pointed out that "there remain pressing food-safety questions that ought to be aired more, not less, as a result of this momentary spotlight." (The HSUS, the Center for Science in the Public Interest, and the American Civil Liberties Union have joined with other organizations to form the Food-Speak Coalition to oppose food-disparagement laws.)

The second issue, which received much less scrutiny, unfortunately, is how farm animals are raised in feedlots and intensive confinement systems. Many animals have died of BSE in the United Kingdom and elsewhere in Europe, and humans have died from vCJD (see the Fall 1997 HSUS News). The full impact of BSE and the new variant of CJD that threatens human health was not revealed in the trial. Defense lawyers believed that their First Amendment arguments would have the most powerful impact on the jury, so most of the results of extensive research on the potential hazards of feeding cows to cows were not presented. The HSUS had hoped that a larger public debate on the health and safety issues surrounding these practices would emerge from the trial. In April 1996 The HSUS published an annotated fact sheet that provides specific details about BSE and its suspected link with vCJD (see sidebar, page 28). The fact sheet provides complete documentation for the statements made by Mr. Lyman on The Oprah Winfrey Show.

The lawsuit appears to have been an attempt to silence The HSUS and anyone else concerned with the way industry-like agriculture treats livestock. The lawsuit tactic did not work, but it clearly challenged the resolve of all people who want to speak freely about food safety and animal well-being. It took considerable time and financial resources to prepare for the trial, and if not for the resolve of The HSUS and Ms. Winfrey to defend our rights, the lawsuit could have silenced critics about an important issue in our society.

Part of the victory must be attributed to Ms. Winfrey's ability to gain people's trust and respect. She not only captured the hearts of many Amarillo residents, but she...
also strongly defended her right to free speech. Mr. Lyman and Ms. Winfrey made it clear that they did not set out to defame beef in April of 1996; their intention was to raise an issue of concern before the U.S. public. Unfortunately, the cattlemen have appealed the decision and another group of cattlemen have filed a similar lawsuit. It seems clear that many in the cattle industry want to block any public examination of how farm animals are treated and of how human-health concerns have developed as a result of the industry's intensive confinement methods.

The HSUS supports farmers who raise their livestock with methods that are more humane than those used in intensive confinement systems. These methods include more-natural living conditions with outdoor access, ample space to move about, and food that is suited to the nutritional needs and nature of the animals. As the largest animal-protection organization in the United States, The HSUS speaks up for the humane treatment of farm animals at every opportunity.

Gary L. Valen is HSUS director, Sustainable Agriculture.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

1. Resist any attempt by your state to stifle free speech with food-disparagement laws, especially if such laws are under consideration. If you live in one of the thirteen states with these laws, urge their repeal.* The right of free speech in this country is sacred.

2. Refuse to purchase products from factory farms. Shop at natural-food stores, food co-ops, and farmers' markets, where you are more likely to find more-humane and sustainable food choices and certified organic products. Reduce the number of animal products in your diet or replace them with grains, pasta, vegetables, fruit, or other meat alternatives.

3. Continue your support of The HSUS in our struggle to gain proper treatment for farm animals and agricultural systems that do not degrade the environment. The HSUS resolves to defend the right to free speech, especially on behalf of animals. Your support adds strength to our efforts—thank you!

*States where new food-disparagement bills have been introduced include California, Illinois, New Hampshire, and Vermont. Thirteen states have passed constitutionally questionable food-disparagement laws: Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Texas.

WELCOME VINDICATION

The outcome of the trial vindicates Ms. Winfrey and Mr. Lyman. Judge Robinson and the Texas jury did not believe the two had made statements that fit the definition of the Texas food-disparagement statutes or had libeled the cattlemen who brought the suit.

More important, Mr. Lyman spoke the truth when he appeared on The Oprah Winfrey Show.

Mr. Lyman was correct in revealing that ruminants were being fed to ruminants (feeding cows to cows). This practice was acknowledged on April 16, 1996, by Dr. Weber. The U.S. government consistently stated that the U.S. beef supply was safe in spite of the widespread use of the ground-up remains of animals as cattle feed. The practice was eventually banned by the Food and Drug Administration, on August 4, 1997, sixteen months after Mr. Lyman appeared on The Oprah Winfrey Show. More recently on January 6, 1998, the USDA’s Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service restricted the importation of live ruminants and meat, meat products, and by-products that according to the agency may pose “a significant risk of introducing BSE.” There is ample evidence to demonstrate that Mr. Lyman’s concerns about the use of ruminant feed were accurate and justified, and in fact helped to spur these policy changes.

Since officials in the United Kingdom had taken almost ten years to acknowledge that many of their scientists suspected a link between BSE and the human disease nvCJD, it was entirely prudent to ask the U.S. government to ban the practice of feeding cows to cows.
We proudly announce the long-awaited publication of *The Humane Society of the United States Complete Guide to Dog Care*, by Marion S. Lane and the staff of The HSUS. This 390-page illustrated hardcover is the book for every dog owner—or prospective dog owner—who wants humane, useful advice on how to create a lifelong partnership with a dog. Helpful information on choosing and training a dog, health and safety concerns, activities to enjoy together—it's all here!

Available in bookstores for $24.95, *The Humane Society of the United States Complete Guide to Dog Care* is available to HSUS members for only $19.95, plus $3.00 shipping and handling.

“A truly excellent book! Extremely helpful and informative, and delightfully written.”
—Ian Dunbar, Ph.D., author of *Dog Behavior: Why Dogs Do What They Do*
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.