The Benefits and Consequences of Animal Rights

During the past decade, we have witnessed in this country and throughout the world the advent of a philosophy which declares that animals, like humans, should be accorded certain considerations and rights simply by reason of their existence as living, sentient creatures. Articulated in varying degrees by authors and lecturers such as Peter Singer, Tom Regan, Bernie Rollin, Michael Fox, and others, this philosophy has, without question, had a great impact on the ways in which animals are perceived and regarded in present-day society. Likewise, it has also influenced the tenor and style of how those of us within the animal-protection movement are now seeking to eradicate and deter the abuse and suffering inflicted upon animals.

We who represent the more traditional animal-protection movement have played an important and perhaps indispensable role in the evolving of this new philosophy and movement. Many years prior to the advent of animal rights as an acknowledged philosophy, those who constituted the animal-protection movement were vigorously affirming the ethical and moral dimensions of animal protection, thereby helping to cultivate the seedbed in which this philosophy is now taking root and flowering. Perhaps it would have happened without us, but certainly not to the degree nor with the speed with which it has now come on the scene.

But if, indeed, we have in large measure been the facilitators of this new force working for the rights of animals, we are also its beneficiaries. In the first place, this new philosophy has served as a catalyst in the shaping of our own philosophies, policies, and goals. It has reminded us that there is no place for complacency and idleness when the dimensions of animal suffering are ever expanding. It has called us to accountability regarding priorities and purposes and helped us better to articulate who we are, why we exist, and where we are going.

Further, the animal-rights philosophy has served to help various organizations bridge their differences and unite on several fronts to form alliances and consortiums to attack more forcefully those who exploit and abuse animals. It has also provided avenues of expression and involvement missing within many of the more traditional organizational structures and programming strategies. In other words, it has assisted us in making our activism more visible, more viable, and more effective.

More importantly, the animal-rights philosophy has also had a dramatic impact on specific areas of animal exploitation and abuse, most notably in their use as subjects for laboratory experimentation and testing as well as the various ways in which they are raised, processed, and utilized for food. But the degree to which this philosophy will continue to become a positive force for animals within our society remains uncertain. That it has already made a difference goes without saying; how determinative that difference will become is not yet predictable.

For, even as this emerging philosophy and the resulting movement are being acknowledged as benefiting animals, they are also creating a resistance and backlash of no small proportions, especially when expressed in terms of "animal liberation." And, when those forms of protest are accompanied by violence, destruction, and life-threatening pronouncements, a disavowal and rejection of this philosophy by society at large is a virtual certainty. Though the goals for which we strive may be defensible, it is not to be expected that society will embrace, accept, or even tolerate actions and consequences that threaten its own perceived well-being and self-interest.

We may be permitted our own self-indulgences as regards personal life-styles and, indeed, our occasional public victories. But it is certain the kind of pervasive change we are seeking to effect will result, finally, not from a fire sale requiring a totally new inventory but from a calculated and temperate change of design.
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Summer 1986
On Civil Disobedience

by Dr. Thomas H. Regan

A distinguished scholar, philosopher, teacher, author, and lecturer, Tom Regan has gained international standing through his articulation of animal-rights perspectives. He has written, edited, or co-edited six major works on the subject, including Animal Rights and Human Obligations and The Case for Animal Rights. He has argued the case for treating animals with the respect inherently due them before audiences of lawyers and medical doctors, in medical and veterinary schools, at prestigious universities, to members of Congress, and before the United Nations.

Here, Dr. Regan offers a view of an issue of immediate concern to animal-rights activists.

Civil disobedience is a morally defensible strategy for encouraging social change. Its power has been demonstrated throughout history, even as recently as the peaceful change of government in the Philippines. By violating the law, the agents of civil disobedience make a public statement about an existing injustice. By accepting the possibility of punishment, they shoulder the burdens of injustice themselves. In this way, civil disobedients accept a token of the evil imposed on those whose interests they represent.

As a strategy, civil disobedience is the last, not the first, choice. Other nonviolent methods for effecting social change—discussions and boycotts, for example—must first be tried. Only after these approaches have met with unresponsiveness should civil disobedience be used.

Such approaches have been used repeatedly in an effort to bring about verifiable accountability and increased ethical sensitivity on the part of scientists who use non-human animals. But despite these efforts, progress has been negligible.

Many activists, understandably impatient with the pace of change, are ready to commit acts of violence. While sympathizing with their frustration, we all need to recognize that there are other steps that can be taken. These are the steps leading to nonviolent civil disobedience. The time has come for every person seriously committed to the struggle for animal rights to consider taking these steps. The moral and political pressure for change must increase, not decrease—but not at the cost of violence.

This escalation of activism would be unnecessary if the appropriate persons within the research community responded appropriately. These are the people who now must decide whether to invite civil disobedience or to avoid it, not only on one occasion, involving a few, but for as long and as often as it takes, involving ever increasing numbers. For this is a means of expressing moral concern which, once allowed to begin, will not die. And it is also a form of social protest whose ranks will swell, not shrink, over time. History teaches this if it teaches anything.
What Is That Puppy?

So many of you have called or written us for information on the puppy that appeared on the cover of the Spring issue of the News that we contacted Ron Kimball, the California photographer who took the shot, to get some details. "The puppy belongs to a friend of mine," he explained. "I took one look at those eyes and knew I had to photograph him." Taken in 1983, the photograph has been published elsewhere, which may be why it looked familiar to some of you. "The dog looks a lot different now that he's grown," reports Mr. Kimball. He has no idea what breed or breed mixture created that appealing little face. One thing is certain—Cover Pup's relatives were small. For another photograph, Mr. Kimball was able to sit him on a piano keyboard with room to spare.

For all of you disappointed potential adopters, we have only one suggestion: take the photo to your local shelter, and, if you meet its standards for adoption, see if the staff would be willing to keep an eye peeled for a look-alike and give you a call when it comes in.

Bells Ring for HSUS

Italian architect Paolo Soleri has created a series of wind bells to symbolize the struggle to preserve the natural world and fight man-made ills. Each bell in this "Ring a Bell for a Cause" series represents a different problem of particular interest to the creator. Soleri has created for The HSUS a "Care for the Wildlife" bell, pictured here, and a "Save the Whale" bell. For every bell sold, Soleri's Cosanti Foundation will donate 15 percent of the price to The HSUS.

Each bell is $94, including shipping and handling. (Arizona residents must add sales tax.) Contact Cosanti Originals, 6433 Doubletree Road, Scottsdale, AZ 85253.

Ride for Freedom

Animal-rights activists have not forgotten the Silver Spring monkeys, the object of intense media attention five years ago when they were seized from a Maryland laboratory, the Institute for Behavioral Research (IBR), operated by Dr. Edward Taub. Although Dr. Taub was tried on animal-cruelty charges and his laboratory closed, the monkeys' ordeal has not ended. They have been warehoused in barren cages at a National Institutes of Health facility for years. In May, HSUS members and others participated in a motorcade beginning at the Capitol and ending at the NIH building in Bethesda, Md., to draw attention to the plight of the fifteen surviving monkeys.

The motorcade and rally were organized by People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA). Neither NIH nor IBR wants the monkeys, which are being cared for at a cost of $30,000 annually to taxpayers, but both have rejected PETA's plan to transfer the monkeys to the Primarily Primates sanctuary in Texas, where they could live the remainder of their lives in a naturalistic setting.

An inspiring roster of speakers, including HSUS scientific director Michael W. Fox, spoke to the crowd at NIH. Whether the new round of attention focused on the luckless Silver Spring monkeys will dislodge NIH and IBR from their immovable position remains to be seen.

Interacting in Boston

In August, The Delta Society will host an international conference on human–animal interaction in Boston. "Living Together: People, Animals, and the Environment" will bring together scientists, social service personnel, and other experts from around the world to share new research.

The Delta Society, of Renton, Wash., is a nonprofit public service organization that acts as an information source for research on the role of animals in people's lives. Dates for the conference are August 20–23, 1986. More information is available at (312) 836–7128.
THE DAIRY COW DEBACLE: The Government Mandates Face Branding

by Dr. Michael W. Fox

Beginning, appropriately enough, on April 1, 1986, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) set in motion a program designed to reduce the chronic overproduction of milk and dairy products but, instead, generated a hue and cry over government-mandated cruelty. The government proposed to buy from farmers between 1.8 and 2 million dairy cows, calves, and heifers and remove the animals from production.* This drop in the number of dairy animals would save the government an estimated $3.4 billion in Commodity Credit Corporation purchases of surplus milk and cheese. Farmers interested in the whole-herd buy-out program were to submit bids on what price they would accept by May 6, 1986. Unfortunately, the program carried a cruel and unnecessary proviso. All farmers whose bids were accepted had to agree to brand the government-purchased animals on the face with a hot iron.

Branding was its solution. Cows would be burned with a three-inch "x" on the right jaw, calves with a two-inch mark. The USDA gave dairy farmers the following advice:

It may be necessary to experiment a bit to find the right heat... If too hot, the iron will start a hair fire... Burning deeper than necessary to obtain the brand impression will result in blotched sores that take too long to heal and result in a bad brand.

According to veterinarian J.K. Atwell, deputy administrator in the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the USDA division that recommended hot-iron face-branding, "Hot-iron branding meets all the department's requirements for permanently marking animals." Freeze-branding was rejected by the USDA because it (erroneously) believed a freeze-brand would not show up immediately on white-faced animals unless it was applied long enough to burn.

Dr. Atwell said the "x" was chosen because farmers who could not find branding irons with that configuration could heat up a strip of metal with a blowtorch and make two separate line-burns to create an "x" (thus, of course, burning the cows twice!).

*An estimated 981,619 cows, 340,789 heifers, and 257,995 calves will be bought up by the government, most of which will be slaughtered.

A Wisconsin farmer grimaces as he applies a hot branding iron to the cheek of a dairy cow purchased by the government in its whole-herd buy-out program.
Most dairy farmers are inexperienced at hot-iron branding, since this is a practice almost exclusive to western beef cattle ranchers. This lack of familiarity with branding procedures could prove dangerous to farmers forced to follow USDA regulations. The bellowing and struggling of branded cows, triggered by pain, would make it extremely difficult for the farmers to handle their animals once they had disfigured one or two of them. Such violent resistance on the part of normally tractable animals could only increase the probability of injury to cows and handlers alike.

The USDA gave little regard to the fact that the skin around a cow's jaw is especially thin, containing major facial nerves and muscles that could be easily damaged by a hot iron. Eating would be difficult and extremely painful, especially for young calves. Since the summer fly season was imminent, secondary infection and self-mutilation from the animals rubbing the brand were other predictable adverse consequences of hot-iron face-branding.

The HSUS made several appeals to the USDA, pointing out that more humane alternatives do exist. Since some animals would be going to slaughter within a short time, these animals would not need to be so permanently and cruelly mutilated. Farmers could mark the animals with indelible dyes that last sixty to ninety days or an ear "x" tattoo that could last at least one year before fading.

We emphasized that freeze-branding was the third humane alternative that, we believed, satisfied the USDA's criteria of permanence and easy visibility. It was the method of choice for all animals not going to slaughter immediately. Virtually painless, it entails placing a copper branding iron (which has been supercooled in liquid nitrogen or ethyl alcohol and dry ice) against the animal's shaved skin for thirty to sixty seconds. The freezing medium is readily available to dairy farmers from artificial insemination centers and state veterinary pathology labs.

The freeze-branded "x" would be immediately visible as a glazed mark and white hairs would appear in one month. The brand on white areas would be permanent and easily visible, since the damaged hair would grow out in a broken pattern not confluent with the normal lay of the hair. The USDA showed no forethought in announcing the branding scheme. Its APHIS veterinary advisors were as much responsible for the adoption of this cruel and primitive method of marking animals as were the bureaucrats whose procrustean policy reflected an insensitivity toward both dairy farmers and their stock. The decision was a shock to the nation and should have been an embarrassment to the government.

On April 14, The HSUS presented testimony before the House Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry to urge it to prohibit the USDA from mandating hot-iron face-branding.

"These innocent dairy animals shouldn't have to suffer for the greed of a few farmers who increased production on borrowed money and now have created...a misguided federal program [that] will waste millions of taxpayer dollars and torture millions of innocent animals...."

—A Wisconsin farmer
Capitol Hill Heroes

During the tense, final days before the USDA's hot-iron face-branding requirement was struck down by the court, several congressmen distinguished themselves in the pursuit of humane treatment for dairy cattle.

On March 5, Rep. Sherwood L. Boehlert of New York expressed his concerns on the house floor about the branding method, using a model of a dairy cow to illustrate the dangers. He commented, "[Face-branding] certainly isn't very humane for the benevolent cow and it could be downright dangerous for the branding farmer." He urged all members of the House to "...let the people at the Department of Agriculture know how you feel."

Following up on his floor statement, Rep. Boehlert and five of his colleagues wrote to Secretary of Agriculture Richard E. Lyng in strong opposition to the hot-iron branding provision and asked that an alternative branding method be allowed.

On April 8, Rep. Frank Horton of New York introduced H.R. 407, which expressed the concerns and urgings of the House of Representatives that the secretary of agriculture investigate alternative identification procedures. Within days, Rep. Horton found 128 cosponsors who supported the HSUS position that those dairy cattle that are part of the USDA's whole-herd buy-out program should not be subjected to painful face-branding.

Rep. James M. Jeffords of Vermont stepped forward to urge hearings and guided our efforts in exposing this unnecessary cruelty to gentle farm animals. As ranking minority member on the livestock subcommittee, he joined chairman Tony Coelho in writing a special letter to Sec. Lyng, expressing subcommittee concerns on this issue.

Capitol Hill efforts reached their peak as The HSUS and other groups spoke to the House of Representatives' Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry during hearings chaired by Rep. Coelho. The hearings were the first held on farm animal concerns since the 1978 Humane Slaughter Act passed. Rep. Coelho heard testimony on April 10 and April 14 to discuss humane concerns and suggested alternatives.

Speaking for The HSUS was Dr. Michael W. Fox, scientific director. Dr. Fox told the subcommittee that the bellowing and struggling of the cow, brought on by the pain caused by the hot-iron brand, "...will increase the probability of injury to animals and handlers alike."

Our astonishing grassroots network produced many large-animal veterinarians concerned about the welfare of the buy-out cows. Of these, Dr. Ralph C. Abraham of Rayville, Louisiana, deserves special mention. On only a few days notice, he flew to Washington to speak on behalf of the animals he treats. Dr. Abraham illustrated for the subcommittee members the complex structure of a cow's face and its importance to the survival of the rest of the body. Referring to the muscles, blood vessels, and nerves of the face, Dr. Abraham explained, "All function as a unit and all become less efficient when one of the members of the unit becomes injured. From experience, I can tell you that it doesn't take much trauma to the region for this to become a problem...the animal
can easily die.”

Dr. Abraham was joined on the witness stand by Floyd Fumasi of Galt, California. Mr. Fumasi, a dairy farmer, told the subcommittee that the cows in the program would be unnecessarily hurt not only by the branding but also by the methods needed to restrain the cow during the painful procedure. “We are going to have to use nose tongs to try to hold their heads still and, when they’re used, you run the risk of tearing the cow’s nose. Also, we’re going to have to use squeeze chutes to hold their bodies still and, with the thrashing around that they’re going to do, we’re risking broken legs,” he said.


Dr. Michael W. Fox testifies before the Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry of the House of Representatives to urge prohibition of hot-iron face-branding.

ing. Ironically, this same subcommittee heard testimony from the National Cattlemen’s Association, which had filed suit to stop the USDA from flooding the market with the meat of slaughtered dairy cattle and lowering the price of beef.

Since the USDA stubbornly refused to instigate any more humane alternatives to the hot-iron face-brand, the issue was taken to court. On April 16, a federal judge in Rochester, New York, ruled that the USDA could not require such branding until a full trial was held but did not forbid the voluntary use of hot irons by farmers. The plaintiff in that suit was the Humane Society of Rochester and Monroe County, New York. Following this ruling, which did not fully resolve the cruelty issue, The HSUS amended a lawsuit it had filed April 9 in Washington, D.C., in an attempt to have any continued use of hot-iron facial branding totally prohibited.

That suit charged that the branding is contrary to the federal public policy of humaneness to animals and specifically asked the court to order the USDA to consider and implement more humane alternatives of identification for cattle.

The USDA announced that it would amend the branding instructions to allow producers to freeze-brand. It did not withdraw its policy of hot-iron branding, however, rather advising

“The branding requirements for female dairy cattle in the dairy-termination program have caused me much anguish and concern. Branding cattle with a hot iron in the hip area is torturous enough, but the requirement to brand on the jaw with a three-inch ‘x’ is out of reason.”

—A North Carolina farmer
Veterinarian Ralph Abraham of Louisiana (left) and farmer Floyd Fumasi of California prepare to testify in favor of alternatives to hot-iron branding before the House subcommittee in April.

"To brand these cows on the face is cruel as they will keep rubbing [the brand] and keep it open."
—A New York farmer

farmers to consult with a veterinarian and suggesting "that the area to be branded be desensitized in some way" and that an electrical thermostatically controlled branding iron be used.

In response to this amendment, The HSUS sent out a press release warning farmers that we were ready to support prosecution of anyone who proceeded with hot-iron face-branding, on the basis of various state statutes prohibiting cruelty to animals.

John A. Hoyt, president of The HSUS, commented, "The USDA has announced that it will accept freeze-branding, a virtually painless procedure, to mark cattle that will be sold as part of the buy-out program. Consequently, The HSUS can conceive of no acceptable reason for farmers to inflict unnecessary cruelty on these animals by hot-branding them on the face. We are prepared to work with local humane organizations to prosecute the perpetrators of such suffering according to the anti-cruelty laws of the states in which these acts occur."

We encouraged HSUS members to contact the USDA to protest the hot-iron facial branding. Many of them were given the erroneous impression by the USDA that the government had done away with the hot-iron method and that farmers were using the more humane method of freeze-branding. In actuality, the USDA did not prohibit the hot-iron branding but simply allowed the farmers a choice. It would seem that most of the cattle and calves that were branded by the May 6, 1986, deadline were burned with hot irons.

This dairy cow debacle has brought the insensitivity of the USDA toward the welfare of farm animals into the public eye. In almost ten years of working on a variety of animal-welfare issues, I have never had so many letters and telephone calls from the farming community and from the public at large urging The HSUS to do something to stop this cruel government mandate from being implemented. Many farmers told me that they were afraid to complain to USDA because they might jeopardize acceptance of their bids. Others told me that they feared that, if their bids were accepted and they refused to follow the branding orders, they would be in violation of their contracts and liable to punitive fines of up to $1,000 for each animal not face-branded.

The dairy buy-out program is one-third completed. The first disposal period ended on May 6; two more are scheduled to run from May through mid-1987.

The HSUS will continue to fight for the prohibition of hot-iron facial branding in all USDA programs and push for a reevaluation of the entire buy-out plan. The buy-out is already in jeopardy, since the USDA has been ordered to limit the numbers of animals sent to market following a successful legal action by beef cattle producers' associations. Ludicrously, since the USDA has no controls to stop new dairy farms from being established and for existing dairy farms from expanding, the buy-out may have no long-term effect on dairy production, and the mass slaughter of dairy cattle could become a cyclical event.

The USDA should regard the dairy cow debacle as an opportunity to encourage the adoption of the most humane and effective means of identifying farm animals (including swine, beef cattle, and dairy cows) in its own disease-control and residue-monitoring programs. Implantation of microchips, which allows for easy, painless, and accurate identification, holds the solution to the agency’s seemingly in-
solvable problem. If the government would take the initiative in using this technology, it would be a significant step toward the phasing out of all cruel and mutilative methods of animal identification, especially the barbaric practice of hot-iron branding.

This dairy buy-out program is part of a trend in agriculture toward the growth of “super farms.” Smaller dairy farmers are being forced to sell out, leaving the supplying of milk to large dairy factories where cows “burn out” at a young age, suffer from the stresses of high production, and are denied the individual care and attention that have long been the tradition of the family farm dairy operation.

From a Third World perspective, where so many hungry souls would benefit from imports of the U.S. dairy surplus, the killing of so many highly productive animals is unconscionable. However, Tom Vongarlem of the USDA’s Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Program has responded that, if he had anything to do with it, no cows would be exported to Third World countries because of the harm it would do to the U.S. dairy export trade! So much for any altruistic concern over world hunger on the part of the government.

In a last-ditch attempt to stop this slaughter of the nation’s dairy herds, The HSUS wrote to Richard Lyng, secretary of agriculture, on April 30, urging him to suspend the buy-out dairy program following the thermonuclear reactor disaster in the Soviet Union. This disaster could mean that hundreds of square miles of agricultural land would be contaminated with radiation fallout and all dairy products produced therein condemned. We may face a dire need for U.S. dairy produce in the Soviet Union and Europe in the near future.

All of these diverse circumstances—economic, bureaucratic, ecological, and moral—have converged to urge a reconsideration of the buy-out program. We can only hope USDA is paying attention.

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

“We do not want to have to submit our animals to this horror.”
—A Wisconsin farmer

Reflect for a moment...

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

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

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

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

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

Please send: Will information

Name _____________________________
Address ____________________________________
City __________________ State ______ Zip ______

Mail in confidence to: Murdaugh S. Madden, Vice President/General Counsel, The Humane Society of the United States, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.
THE TANGLED WEB OF ANIMAL ABUSE:
The Links between Cruelty to Animals and Human Violence

Four of the most famous violent criminals in recent years had histories of abusing animals: from left, Edmund Emil Kemper III; David Berkowitz; James Oliver Huberty; and Albert DeSalvo.
by Dr. Randall Lockwood and Guy R. Hodge

In 1984, Pennsylvania SPCA officials arrested Dwayne Wright for attacking six dogs with lye in a highly publicized cruelty case. The SPCA reported that "the grisly attacks apparently were committed just to see the dogs suffer." Before Mr. Wright could stand trial for these offenses in Pennsylvania, however, law enforcement officials in New Jersey requested his extradition to face murder charges in the death of a disabled man. Mr. Wright is presently serving a twenty-year sentence for murder.

Such stories of people who exhibit violence toward both human beings and animals are disturbingly common and come as little surprise to those involved with animal welfare. The belief that one's treatment of animals is closely associated with the treatment of fellow human beings has a long history in philosophy. This idea served as the ethical foundation for the rise of the animal-welfare movement during the nineteenth century.

Despite the widespread historical recognition of the link between cruelty to animals and other forms of violent or antisocial behavior, this connection has, until recently, largely been ignored by law-enforcement agencies, the judicial system, social service agencies, and others in a position to take action. This is not surprising when we consider how long it has taken society to recognize widespread problems of child abuse and other manifestations of domestic violence.

Over the last decade, social scientists and human-service agencies have finally begun to examine cruelty to animals as a serious human problem. What has prompted this concern? First, there have been many dramatic cases such as that of Mr. Wright. Second, social scientists have been paying increasing attention to all forms of family violence, including abuse and neglect of children, spouses, and the elderly. Researchers studying human-animal relationships have repeatedly demonstrated the central role that pets can play in many normal and disturbed families. Increasing numbers of investigations of organized cruelty, such as dogfighting, have revealed that a multitude of other, unrelated offenses coexist with that activity. Finally, greater attention has been drawn to animal abuse by an increasingly concerned public that has responded negatively to mild punishments handed down in animal-cruelty cases.

Scientific studies of the connections between animal abuse and human violence are still few in number, but those that exist are providing valuable insights into the roots of antisocial behavior.

Animal Cruelty and Adult Violence

Much of the early evidence that inspired interest in this issue came from anecdotal case histories of individual criminals. There is compelling circumstantial evidence linking two groups of criminals—serial and mass murderers—with acts of cruelty to animals. There is a significantly high incidence of such acts, usually prior to age twenty-five, among people who have engaged in multiple murders:

- Albert DeSalvo, the self-confessed "Boston Strangler" who killed thirteen women in 1962-63 and was sentenced to life imprisonment on unrelated charges of armed robbery, assault, and sex offenses involving four women, had, in his youth, trapped dogs and cats in orange crates and shot arrows through the boxes.
- Edmund Emil Kemper III, convicted in 1973 on eight counts of first-degree murder for killing eight women, including his mother, had revealed at his trial that he had a history of abusing cats and dogs.
• David Berkowitz, New York City's "Son of Sam" gunman who pleaded guilty to thirteen murder and attempted murder charges, had shot a neighbor's Labrador retriever. Berkowitz claimed that the dog was the spiritual force that compelled him to kill.

• Brenda Spencer fired forty shots from a rifle at arriving San Diego school children, fatally wounding two and injuring nine others. During the subsequent investigation, neighbors informed police that Ms. Spencer had repeatedly abused dogs and cats, often by setting their tails on fire.

• Carroll Edward Cole, one of the most prolific killers in modern history, was executed in December of 1985 for five of the thirty-five murders of which he was accused. Mr. Cole had said that his first act of violence was burning his dog's tail.

Reportign Cruelty

As a rule, failure to provide adequate food, water, and shelter or the use of physical force sufficient to leave a mark or otherwise cause injury constitutes cruelty to animals according to most state laws.

If you believe an animal is being mistreated, promptly telephone your local animal-welfare agency. If you cannot obtain a listing for a local humane society, call the local police for assistance. If there is no humane society in the area, then the police should investigate your complaint. Provide the dispatcher with all the details, including:

• A description of the incident and type of abuse
• The date and time of the incident
• A description of the animal(s)
• The exact address at which the animal can be found
• The name of the animal's owner, if any
• A description of the abuser (age, height, weight) and name, if known
• Any other relevant details such as license plate numbers that may aid in apprehending the abuser
• Your name, address, and telephone number. Also inform the dispatcher if you were an eyewitness to the incident. If your information is to be of value to law-enforcement and animal-welfare agencies, you must be willing to testify against animal abusers.
as a child was to strangle a puppy.

- In 1984, James Huberty was shot by police after killing twenty-one children and adults at a McDonalds restaurant in San Ysidro, California. As a teenager, Mr. Huberty had been accused of having shot his neighbor’s dog with an airgun.

Although most animal abusers will not commit sensational murders, serial killers almost invariably have histories of animal abuse earlier in their lives. This connection has serious implications for law enforcement, since the Federal Bureau of Investigation has indicated that brutal and irrational serial killings account for one-quarter of all unsolved murders in the United States each year.

Single case histories do not provide much insight into the origins of animal abuse and its connections to other forms of violence. For this reason, a number of scientists have looked at larger populations of criminals to explore this association. In 1966, Drs. D.S. Hellman and Nathan Blackman published one of the first formal studies. Their analysis of life histories of eighty-four prison inmates showed that 75 percent of those charged with violent crimes had an early record of cruelty to animals, fire-setting, and bed-wetting. Several subsequent studies looked for this “triad” of symptoms in other violent criminals, with mixed results.

Over the last few years, a different picture has emerged. Psychiatrist Alan Felthous surveyed several groups of violent adults. In one group of eighteen psychiatric patients who had repeatedly tortured dogs and cats, he found that all had high levels of aggression to people, including one patient who had murdered a boy. These abusers also shared a common history of brutal parental punishment. Dr. Felthous and others have thus identified a slightly different triad consisting of physical abuse by parents, cruelty to animals, and violence toward people. Almost all serious animal abusers are males, but Dr. Felthous has found similar patterns in the lives of assaultive women as well.

One of the most detailed surveys of adult criminals has recently been done by Dr. Felthous and Dr. Stephen Kellett. They looked at animal cruelty among three groups of men including aggressive criminals, nonaggressive criminals, and noncriminals. Ratings of aggressiveness for the criminals were based on reports of their behavior in prison, not on the violence of their crimes. Among the aggressive criminals, 25 percent reported five or more childhood acts of cruelty toward animals, compared to 6 percent of the nonaggressive criminals and none in the sample of noncriminals. Aggressive criminals were also more likely to report fear or dislike of particular animals.

This study is one of the first to explore the specific motives behind animal cruelty in these violent men. Some resorted to cruelty to control an animal’s behavior, for example, using beatings and electric prods to gain compliance from dogs. Many of the men used violence as a form of retaliation. One burned a cat that had scratched him, and another drowned a dog that barked too much. A third motivation was prejudice. Many abusers harbored hatred for specific animals. Cats were victims because they were often seen as “sneaky” and “creepy.”

This study identified additional complex motives for animal abuse. Some cruelty came from a desire to shock other people or to impress them with the abuser’s capacity for violence. In some cases, cruelty to animals was used to retaliate against others, especially neighbors.

Animal cruelty has been correlated with other forms of adult wrongdoing. A recent study by Dr. Michael Bessey of the University of Manitoba concluded that “violators of wildlife laws may be involved in multidextrinous illegal activities.” He identified three clusters of offenses that seemed to go together. People who engaged in “unethical” acts such as aerial hunting were also likely to hunt endangered species, injure wildlife with snowmobiles, or illegally hunt game at night. Those who were guilty of “dangerous” acts typically violated laws related to firearm handling and public intoxication. A third group of violators typically broke laws related to property and had histories of poaching and trespassing.

Organized abuse of animals also has its links to other crimes. HSUS investigator Bob Baker, who has extensive experience with dogfighting, says, “Dogfights are the scene of all kinds of crimes, including gambling, drug dealing, and possession of illegal weapons.” He adds, “One of the most disturbing things is the number of children in attendance at these fights—from infants to teenagers. These children are exposed to all the brutality and illegal acts that go along with this sport!”

Animal Cruelty and Juvenile Violence

Most of the research on animal abuse and adult crime has indicated that the first instances of cruelty to animals take place early in the abusers’ lives. As anthropologist Margaret Mead noted, “One of the most dangerous things that can happen to a child is to kill or torture an animal and get away with it.” Nearly all young children go through a stage of “innocent” cruelty during which they may harm insects or other small animals in the process of exploring the world and discovering their abilities. Most children, however, with proper guidance from parents and teachers, can be-
come sensitive to the fact that animals can experience pain and suffering and thus try to avoid causing such pain. Some, however, seem to become locked into a pattern of cruelty that can last a lifetime.

In 1971, Dr. Fernando Tapia reviewed the cases of eighteen boys who were under treatment because of incidents of severe cruelty to animals. All showed other problems of violence including bullying, theft, and arson. Most had histories of parental neglect, brutality, and rejection. Seven years later, Dr. Tapia was able to follow up on thirteen of these cases, now entering young adulthood. Eight of the thirteen were still involved in animal cruelty. In general, animal abuse ended only in the case of the boys who had been removed from abusive parents and placed in foster homes.

What starts young boys on the road to animal cruelty and later violence against others? Some have suggested that these children lack the capacity to love, to form close ties to either people or animals, but recent research suggests that it is not that simple. A University of Minnesota study by Dr. Michael Robin and others looked at attitudes toward animals in 507 delinquent and nondelinquent adolescents. Nearly all of these children (91 percent) reported having had a "special pet" at some time in their lives. The delinquent children were three times more likely to report that they sought out their pet during times of trouble and discussed their problems with it. A key difference between the delinquent and nondelinquent groups was that 34 percent of the delinquent children had lost their special pet through intentional or accidental killing. In many cases, an abusive father had disposed of this loved animal in some violent way, resulting in deep resentment on the part of the child.

It may be that some juveniles begin to abuse animals to convince themselves that they don't care about the things they often seem to lose. Some are convinced of their "badness" by parents and behave in the way that they think is expected of them. Some are imitating the family violence that seems to be a "normal" way of life for them. Others feel helpless and use animals as victims to demonstrate their power and authority or as scapegoats for the anger they feel against parents or society as a whole. Finally, some of these young abusers simply seem to have never learned to value the lives of others.

Animal Abuse and Family Problems

The research we have described strongly suggests that animal abuse is not just the result of some personality flaw in the abuser, but a symptom of a deeply disturbed family. As Boris Levinson has observed, "Pets mirror the tensions of their adopted families." Research specifically looking at family dynamics supports this idea.

In 1980, James Hutton reviewed RSPCA cruelty reports for one community in England. Of twenty-three families with a history of animal abuse, 83 percent had been identified by human social service agencies as having children at risk of abuse or neglect. In 1983, Deviney, Dickert, and Lockwood reported on the care of pets within fifty-seven families being treated by New Jersey's Division of Youth and Family Services because of the incidents of child abuse. At least one person had abused pets in 86 percent of the families in which children had been physically abused! In about two-thirds of these cases, it was the abusive parent who had killed or injured a pet. Children were the abusers in the remaining third. These and other studies confirm that cruelty to animals can be one of many signs of a family in need of professional help.

Animal Abuse and Mental Illness

Although it would seem to be clear that many animal abusers are in need of help, the psychiatric community has been very slow to recognize this. Surprisingly, the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, the "handbook" for many professionals in the American Psychiatric Association, makes no mention of cruelty to animals as a sign of mental illness. This troubles many concerned psychiatrists, including Dr. Peter Field of the Psychologists for the Ethical Treatment of Animals. That organization recommends that "children who abuse animals be referred for appropriate treatment inasmuch as this is not a benign stage of growing up, but rather a sign of emotional illness."

Other psychiatrists have found additional links between animal abuse and mental disorders. Dr. Eugene Bliss, a University of Utah psychiatrist and expert on multiple personalities, has described the strange case of "Andrea," this woman had twenty-eight distinct personalities, two of which had killed cats. Like many patients with this disorder, her personality had begun to split when she was a victim of physical and psychological abuse. On at least one occasion, her father had punished her by forcing her to watch him throw kittens in a roaring furnace. Dr. Frank Putnam of the National Institutes of Mental Health has noted that witnessing such acts of cruelty can be as traumatic as being a victim of physical abuse.

Animal abuse rarely involves a single act of cruelty against one victim. It is part of a complex net of disturbed relationships that we are just beginning to understand. Within this tangled web, an abused child becomes violent to others, including animals.
beginning to acknowledge the humane society’s treatment of animals is of human beings.

It is likely that he, too, is at risk of becoming an abusive parent who, in turn, may produce another generation of violent children.

What can those of us involved in animal welfare do to help the people and animals caught in this web? First, although the connection between cruelty to animals and other human problems has been well established by careful research, many professionals seem unaware of this work. It is important to share this information with those who are in a position to see such problems, including veterinarians, law-enforcement officers, animal-control officers, humane agents, shelter workers, and child-welfare professionals. It is also helpful to get people in these professions talking to each other. Often, they discover that they have been dealing with some of the same families or individuals.

Second, as Drs. Kellert and Felthous point out, “Most judicial authorities tend to minimize the importance of animal cruelty among children.” It is essential to urge appropriate psychiatric intervention in the case of adult and juvenile offenders. Ideally, such treatment must deal with the entire family, not just the abuser.

Crime is not only a symptom of other disorders, but animal abuse in and of itself is also a crime that often occurs alongside other crimes. Cruelty to animals is generally a misdemeanor punishable by fine and imprisonment, but such penalties are rare. The humane public can voice its concern. In recent cases in Florida, California, Virginia, and Louisiana, outspoken citizens have played a major role in getting stiff penalties for animal abusers.

In a recent case, two seventeen-year-old boys were caught as they attempted to decapitate a cat but went unpunished. The local district attorney offered sound advice to several HSUS members who complained about this mild treatment. He wrote: “It is obvious by the number of letters I have received that this case has stirred the emotions of many, many people. It would be my suggestion that you advise your local legislators of your concerns and urge them to act on strengthening our Juvenile Court System. Your position is correct and, perhaps, working together, we can affect change which would help stop such violent acts.” Another way in which you can help is to be alert to the possibility of animal abuse in your community. Many abusers are able to hide their actions from law enforcement officials as well as from friends and even families. Their best protection has been the fear and silence of others. There are definite steps you can take when you see or suspect cruelty to animals (see sidebar).

Some states, recognizing the severity of the problem, are making it easier to fight cruelty. Wisconsin and Minnesota have enacted unusual statutes that ensure the investigation of cruelty complaints even in the absence of a local humane society. The laws allow a citizen who has reason to believe that an act of cruelty has occurred to apply to a circuit court for a search warrant. A judge will question the citizen and any other witnesses under oath. If the court is satisfied that there is probable cause to believe that an act of abuse has occurred, the judge may issue a warrant directing a local law enforcement officer to “proceed immediately” to the location, conduct a search, and take custody of any animals on the property. The judge also has the authority to direct that a veterinarian accompany law enforcement officers to help with the investigation or to aid the animals. If your community lacks the resources to investigate animal cruelty, similar statutes might be helpful in combating this problem.

Perhaps the most important approach to the problem of animal cruelty is prevention. Some acts take place because authority figures allow them to occur by failing to discipline childhood episodes of cruelty. Without proper intervention, children may graduate to more serious abuses including violence against people. Do not ignore even minor acts of cruelty. Correct the child and, when possible, express your concerns to his or her parents. Appropriate intervention may, in this way, stop a cycle of escalating abuse.

We also know that some abuse is motivated by fear and ignorance of animals and an inability to empathize with the needs and feelings of others. Humane educators constantly work to instill the knowledge and values that can help prevent children from starting on a destructive path. These efforts cannot undo generations of abuse and other family problems, but they can be an effective step in breaking the vicious cycle of family violence.

Scientists and lawmakers are slowly beginning to acknowledge the humane movement’s long-held position that society’s treatment of animals is inseparable from its treatment of human beings. This “new” realization echoes the sentiment of eighteenth-century philosopher Immanuel Kant: “He who is cruel to animals becomes hard also in his dealings with men. We can judge the heart of a man by his treatment of animals.”

A bibliography on this subject is available from Dr. Randall Lockwood, The HSUS, 2100 L St., N.W., Washington, DC 20037.

Dr. Randall Lockwood is director of Higher Education Programs and Guy R. Hodge is director of Data and Information Services for The HSUS.
Trapping Campaign Continues, Intensifies

In April, The HSUS hosted a joint meeting of Canadian and American nongovernmental animal-welfare organizations to discuss a coordinated approach to attacking the cruelty of trapping. Out of this meeting came a better understanding of the issue in the two countries and proposals that were to be taken up at the June meeting of the World Society for the Protection of Animals in Luxembourg.

In this country, The HSUS is working with the Society for Animal Protective Legislation (SAPL) to sponsor “Betsy the Beaver,” a giant balloon in the shape of a beaver. “Betsy,” which appeared at a New York “fur fair” and in Columbus, Ohio; Trenton, N.J.; and New Haven, Conn., in April and May, publicized the cruelty of trapping beavers, foxes, bobcats, and other commercially valuable animals. The HSUS planned also to participate actively in trapping demonstrations to be held in conjunction with the June “fur fair” at Madison Square Garden in New York.

Unfortunately, the New York trapping suit to end use of the steel-jaw leghold trap, filed last fall (see the Winter 1986 HSUS News), was not decided in our favor at the district court level. A number of animal-welfare organizations, including the Animal Legal Defense Fund and The HSUS, are appealing this ruling. It is our hope that the appellate court will decide that use of the leghold trap in New York State is illegal under the anti-cruelty statutes.

In New Jersey, The HSUS was scheduled to send staff members John Grandy, Guy Hodge, and Nina Austenberg to testify in support of that state’s leghold trap ban when the issue went to trial in June.

We can report one significant and complete victory: the National Rifle Association decided not to appeal our triumph in a lawsuit to prohibit hunting and trapping in most national parks (see the Spring 1986 HSUS News).

We now urge our members to become even more actively involved this coming fall in our anti-trapping campaign. We plan to produce what we hope will be a persuasive advertising campaign in a number of magazines nationwide. To help with this initiative, we have produced a Trapping Awareness kit, which contains a variety of materials including posters, reproducible advertisements and photographs for use in local newspapers, suggested public service announcements for local radio stations, “No Trapping” signs for property, a fact sheet, and model state trapping laws.

The Trapping Awareness kit is available from The HSUS for $5.00. We have also produced an important document included in the Trapping Awareness kit but which can be ordered separately. “Material for Use in Letters to the Editor” contains information individual members can use in refuting pro-trapping arguments or in bringing the cruelty of trapping to the attention of the public. Single copies are free to members; two to five are $1.00 each; a dozen is $6.00. We urge you to use the Trapping Awareness kit whenever you write about trapping. This is an excellent way to spread the word and generate positive action in your community.
Education Activities and Services

In 1985, the Companion Animals Department held workshops on “Solving Animal Problems in Your Community” in conjunction with the regional office educational programs in Texas, West Virginia, Florida, and New Jersey. Five two-week sessions of the Animal Control Academy brought the total number of graduates of this program to over 1,000 since its beginnings in 1979. The director of the academy conducted 8 two-day sessions for euthanasia technicians. The Professional Education and Training Services Program was planned and instituted for professional shelter managers, and Shelter Sense, the HSUS newsletter for animal-welfare professionals, increased its circulation to 3,000 nationwide. A new computer program incorporating data from more than 300 shelters allows the department to monitor trends in numbers of animals handled, budget, human population dynamics, and other important statistics.

More than 20 items of federal legislation received careful attention in 1985. HSUS staff appeared before the Senate and House 11 times to testify on issues affecting Pribilof seals, wild horses, laboratory animals, and Animal Welfare Act funding; visited more than 70 senate offices to urge defeat of the North Pacific Fur Seal Treaty; and worked actively with several other groups to achieve the closing of the head-trauma laboratory at the University of Pennsylvania. Two major new laws affecting laboratory animals — authorization of National Institutes of Health funding and the Dole/Brown amendments to the Animal Welfare Act — benefited from the tireless efforts of our staff.

The HSUS laboratory animal welfare department provided tactical advice, workshops, direct testimony, and literature to more than 20 groups fighting pound seizure in 5 states.

Our scientific staff testified before 4 congressional committees on the use of pound animals in research; the need for funds for alternatives to laboratory animal research; the closing of regional primate centers; elimination of funding for the head-injury laboratory at the University of Pennsylvania; and increased funding for enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act. Staff was active in the HSUS campaign against the inhumane handling of animals by dog dealers and others supplying animals for research.

The Animal Activist Alert kept its readership of more than 7,000 activists informed on 35 major issues, 15 federal bills, and 25 new state laws.

As part of the HSUS seal campaign, the gift division of Mattel, Inc., was authorized to market “Snuggles the Seal,” a plush animal novelty that symbolized the suffering of seals. In March, dozens of our animal activists encircled the U.S. Department of Commerce in Washington, D.C., with thousands of petitions protesting the Pribilof seal hunt.

The HSUS helped to form a coalition of 18 animal-welfare and environmental organizations to institute a boycott of Japan Air Lines in protest against Japanese violation of the International Whaling Commission’s restrictions on whaling. A program specialist undertook an 8-city tour to promote our boycott of fish products from all whaling nations.

The HSUS published almost 200 leaflets, periodicals, decals, reprints, fact sheets, pamphlets, bumper stickers, and other materials to aid activists and members of the general public alike in understanding issues affecting animals.

The Higher Education Programs division worked closely with more than 40 college educators planning courses on animal rights and animal welfare. The program director addressed more than 20 undergraduates, graduate, and faculty groups, as well as 3HSUS regional workshops, 3 sessions of the Animal Control Academy, and several professional educational conferences.

The National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE), The HSUS’s educational division, moved into the Norma Terris Humane Education Center’s new wing. The teacher’s magazine, Humane Education, was given a new name, Children & Animals, and became a more lively publication. Kind News, a youth-oriented newspaper, increased its publication from 4 issues per year to 5. The division published both a special report dealing with the results and implications of NAAHE’s extensive humane education evaluation project and “Captive Wild Animals,” the fourth in a series of brochures for children. NAAHE also contributed substantially to “The Dangers of Project WILD,” published by the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems. NAAHE staff members conducted 19 workshops and training programs in 10 states.

On Capitol Hill, The HSUS cosponsored a month-long art exhibit that opened with a gala reception in which 14 members of Congress received certificates of appreciation for their work on behalf of animals.

Membership and General Public Information

The public relations department issued more than three dozen press releases on pet care, marine mammals, wildlife issues, factory farming and meat-production concerns, HSUS programs and events, abuses in zoos, horse racing, and dog racing. More than 90,000 flyers and 4,000 posters were distributed for our “hot dog in hot car”
campaign. The public relations department placed a record number of ads on trapping in newspapers and national magazines, winning support for our fight against the leghold trap. We also placed a large advertisement in The Washington Post protesting the Pribilof seal hunt. The HSUS’s messages were picked up nearly 3,000 times throughout the year in media from coast to coast. Our stories and issues were presented in such prestigious forums as The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal, and “NBC Nightly News.”

Program Services and Cruelty Investigations

HSUS investigators conducted wide-ranging investigations into the purchase, sale, and transportation of dogs and cats to research institutions (the “animal slave trade”) in 4 states. Their exposé of cruelties generated extensive publicity, a commitment from one university medical school no longer to purchase animals from a major supplier whose operation was unacceptable, and assurance from the U.S. Department of Agriculture that The HSUS’s formal complaints would be investigated.

In 6 states, investigators worked with lo-
eral authorities to stop dogfighting and cockfighting. They held training workshops for law enforcement officers on how to prepare for and stage raids on animal-fighting events. Through HSUS effort, legislation upgrading dogfighting to a felony offense was passed in Florida, Virginia, and Montana.

The department assisted local humane societies in defeating attempts to legalize horse racing in Wisconsin, Tennessee, Texas, and Mississippi. The HSUS turned back an effort to weaken horse-drugging regulations in Minnesota and successfully prevented the introduction of dog-racing tracks on Indian reservations. Other campaigns were fought to stop legalization of dog racing in 4 states.

Investigators stopped a planned rodeo in the city of Baltimore, Md.; obtained a firm commitment from the Fairfax County, Va., Park Authority no longer to hold rodeos within its jurisdiction; and achieved passage of an ordinance in Baltimore County, Md., banning calf roping.

HSUS investigators continued their activities against puppy mills. "NBC Nightly News" accompanied staff on investigations of 20 breeding operations. Department staff appeared on cable and network television programs to expose the suffering of animals in puppy mills. Workshops were conducted in 7 states and thousands of pieces of literature were distributed at the American Kennel Club Centennial Show held in Philadelphia, Pa.

The department also assisted local and state organizations with information on abuse in animal-pulling contests, rodeos, horse transportation, animal sacrifices, stolen pets, dog dealers, and carriage horses.

Wildlife and the Environment

Through extensive negotiations, lobbying, and testimony, The HSUS succeeded in eliminating the commercial slaughter of the North Pacific fur seal for the first time since 1956. We joined 44 U.S. senators and a coalition of animal-welfare organizations in successfully opposing ratification of the North Pacific Fur Seal Treaty. We sent representatives to ensure that the subsistence hunt held was as humane and waste-free as possible.

We continued our lawsuit to end sport hunting on national wildlife refuges and protested the opening of new hunting programs on 7 refuges. We objected to plans for trapping and continued deer hunting in the Great Swamp (N.J.) national refuge master plan and continued our fight against Project WILD, a biased, secondary-level wildlife education curriculum.

Our struggle against reregistration and experimental use of the poison Compound 1080 in predator control continued in 2 lawsuits.

We worked through a coalition for reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act. We fought against the steel-jaw leghold trap in New Jersey, Nevada, and New York and against bounties on coyotes in 2 states.

We called for closed seasons on the black duck, dusky Canada goose, and tundra swan and protested the September hunting of mourning doves.

We sent representatives to the fifth biannual Conference of the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna, held in Argentina, which voted protection for a number of North American species.

Our captive-wildlife department conducted zoo investigations and on-site inspections in 21 states, Puerto Rico, and Washington, D.C.

We campaigned to clean up Florida's roadside zoos and recommended changes in Florida's regulations protecting such animals. We intervened in a Florida zoo's decision to dispose of surplus animals, began an investigation of surplus zoo animals in the exotic meat trade, and opposed the cruelty involved in creating the Ringling Brothers Barnum and Bailey circus "unicorn."

We inspected exotic-animal auctions, completed work on the state model bill on captive wild animal protection, and assisted government officials in preparing bills to restrict private ownership of wild/exotic animals.

The Institute for the Study of Animal Problems

The institute prepared the second volume of its annual, Advances in Animal Welfare Science, for publication. Another major project, a lawsuit against the United States Department of Agriculture attempting to halt research involving the transfer of human growth genes into farm animals to enhance productivity, came to trial in October, to be decided after further work in support of our position had been completed. The staff completed work on a research review of the literature on the welfare problems of confinement-housed breeding sows and battery-caged laying hens.

A study of the impact of tropical rainforest destruction on the wildlife of Central and South America, undertaken in 1985, will be used as documentation for a general overview report on this subject for HSUS members.

Lectures, workshops, seminars, and guest...
appearances by the institute's director, Dr. Michael Fox, brought philosophical and moral aspects of animal welfare to diverse educational forums throughout the county.

**Litigation and Legal Services**

The General Counsel's Office provided support for a wide variety of on-going campaigns and investigations, particularly the continuing efforts to prohibit the release of pound animals for research purposes.

The office filed a complaint directly against the University of Mississippi's laboratory animal facility in Ripley, Miss., bypassing the United States Department of Agriculture's sluggish enforcement machinery. The complaint was instrumental in the university's decision to stop purchasing animals at Ripley for laboratory use.

The General Counsel's Office also provided support and advice in a suit that sought to stop an authorized hunt of mountain lions in Placer County, Calif.

The General Counsel's Office prepared and presented a detailed protest to the Idaho Fish and Game Commission on a hunt of Rocky Mountain elk planned by the commission without adequate data on the actual number of adults and new calves surviving the severe 1984-85 winter.

Other activities included extensive work on model legislation, particularly pound seizure, and counsel to local societies on issues including tax-exempt status and the operation of spay/neuter and full-service veterinary clinics.

**Regional Programs and Services**

The North Central Regional Office investigated fur farms, with an emphasis on the rising, confinement, killing, and selling of foxes for the garment trade. The regional director was appointed as the animal-welfare representative for the Illinois Non-Game Advisory Board to help oversee expenditure of the state's non-game wildlife fund and spoke out against Project WILD.

The Gulf States Regional Office staff persuaded 7 Texas animal-control facilities to stop using decompression chambers for euthanasia. The director served as an architectural consultant for 54 animal shelters. The staff performed 36 shelter inspections and 22 on-site investigations during the year.

The Southeast Regional Office handled 21 investigations of animal abuse. Staff members visited 12 shelter facilities, met with 5 statewide animal-welfare and control associations, participated in 8 training workshops, and supplied informational materials on campaign issues to nearly 200 organizations throughout the region.

The Mid-Atlantic Regional Office dealt with more than 3,000 calls, ranging from questions on legislation to requests for assistance in cruelty investigations. The director visited 10 zoos and served on the New Jersey Department of Health's advisory committee, which oversees 2 pilot spay/neuter programs and the state's animal-control officers' certification program.

The New England Regional Office was instrumental in the passage of a New Hampshire law to protect animals from cruelty in science fair projects and a Connecticut law to prohibit the sale of raccoons as pets. The director produced a videotape on a fire evacuation plan for animal shelters; coordinated the Connecticut coalition to ban the steel-jaw leghold trap; and oversaw completion of an addition to the Norma Terris Humane Education Center.

The West Coast Regional Office drafted humane operating guidelines for public stockyards and livestock auctions adopted by humane groups and reviewed by the livestock industry. The regional investigator was involved in a number of illegal animal-fighting investigations and conducted training programs for law enforcement and humane society personnel in California and Colorado. The office conducted on-site inspections of 6 animal-control facilities, visited 18 local humane societies, responded to 130 requests for humane education materials, provided assistance to 116 organizations, and responded to 23 pieces of legislation in 5 states.

The Great Lakes Regional Office was actively involved in 21 bills in 4 states. Investigations into various bunching and other dog-dealer operations continued. The office joined many of the almost 700 humane organizations in the area in mounting spirited opposition to Project WILD and pound seizure.

**Special Projects**


We undertook a trapping ad campaign; supported a creative alliance between the rabbinical and animal-welfare communities dealing with the issue of kosher slaughter; and contributed to the Network for Animales and Females.

Additional special projects were budgeted within individual department structures.

**Gifts to Other Societies**

Part of The HSUS's commitment to animal welfare takes the form of financial support for the endeavors of other organizations. In 1985, Agenda, the Alaska Wildlife Alliance, the Animal Rights Network, Between the Species, The Delta Society, The Delta Society McCulloch Memorial Fund, the Michigan Humane Society, Monitor, Inc., the National Coalition to Protect Our Pets, St. Hubert's Giralda, Animal Legal Defense Fund, and the World Society for the Protection of Animals received such support.

**Administration and Management**

The Humane Society of the United States maintains a headquarters building in Washington, D.C., 8 regional office facilities, and the Norma Terris Humane Education Center. In addition, the society provides adequate equipment and personnel to administer the programs and business attendant to our responsibilities.

**Membership Development**

The impact of the animal-welfare movement is negatively affected by a small constituency. Consequently, The Humane Society of the United States has been involved in a vigorous campaign to increase our membership and our circle of influence through membership development.

The constituency of The HSUS is now in excess of 500,000 persons.

**Fund-raising**

The HSUS funds its programs through membership dues and general contributions. Close-Up Reports and a year-end appeal are the principal vehicles for seeking membership support. In addition, The HSUS continues to receive thoughtful gifts through bequests from faithful friends and members.
NAAHE Announces Changes

The National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE) is pleased to announce the appointment of Molly Roberts as editor of both *Children & Animals*, NAAHE's magazine for classroom teachers, and *Kind News*, NAAHE's newspaper for children. Ms. Roberts has more than thirteen years' experience in advertising, public relations, writing, and editing. She is a certified art teacher for grades kindergarten through twelve and is skilled in art, graphic design, and layout.

Various features within *Children & Animals* have been redirected to correlate more directly with the material in *Kind News* and provide teaching ideas and activities especially for shelter educators and others in nontraditional teaching capacities. *Kind News* has also undergone several changes to make it both more attractive and more useful to students and teachers. *Kind News* for Juniors is now written for students in grades two through four. *Kind News* for Seniors is for students in grades five and six. Ms. Roberts is spending even more time in schools than have previous NAAHE editors, talking to *Children & Animals* and *Kind News* readers—teachers and students. Their ideas will help in planning upcoming issues of both magazines.

NAAHE has also added several new publications to its resource list. For children in grades three through six, four new informational brochures ("Animals," "Pet Animals," "Endangered Animals," and "Captive Wild Animals") are now available. These brochures provide students with background information on each of the issues and numerous suggestions on ways they can help to improve the lives of animals.

Institute Charts Ominous Trends

The HSUS's Institute for the Study of Animal Problems has been monitoring two trends relevant to animal-welfare science and philosophy that are of interest to all humanitarians. The first concerns the welfare of farm animals subjected to genetic engineering. This new biotechnology is now being used to increase milk production in dairy cows by as much as 40 percent. Our evidence indicates that, if this research on genetically engineered bovine growth hormone is commercially developed and adopted by the dairy industry, it will cause cows greater production-related stress and disease and shortened life spans. It will force many smaller dairy farmers out of business as well. Despite creating these hardships, such genetic tinkering will, most likely, not reduce the price of milk or in any other way benefit consumers.

The second noteworthy trend is in the appearance of articles opposing animal-rights philosophy from a Christian fundamentalist perspective. It is ironic that religion is now being used to justify various forms of animal exploitation, from animal research to trapping and hunting.

The institute's director, Dr. Michael W. Fox, spoke on animal behavior and welfare to groups in Austin, Tex., and London, England, and addressed the student chapter of the American Veterinary Medical Association at Ohio State University on animal rights and veterinary ethics.
No longer do years pass free of eventful change in the animal-welfare movement. Every twelve-month cycle is filled with controversy, struggle, and achievement. For this reason, we prepare our annual conference program with care, realizing it offers activists and traditionalists alike a rare opportunity to take stock of our movement, try to understand the varying viewpoints within it, and find their place among them.

This year, HSUS conference attendees are encouraged to attend a unique one-day seminar, "We Are Our Brothers' Keeper: The Care, Use, and Disposition of Primates in Captivity," featuring several of the world's most prestigious and influential primatologists. Participants will question the use of primates in research, discuss the role of zoos, and expose the tragic primate pet trade. This could be a one-time opportunity to meet and hear these highly respected experts.

Major addresses by Amy Freeman Lee, secretary of the HSUS board of directors; Randall Lockwood, HSUS director of Higher Education Programs; Roger Fouts, director of Friends of Washoe; and Trevor Scott, director general of the World Society for the Protection of Animals, will bring to our conferees national and international perspectives on timely animal-welfare issues.

A full complement of workshops, including new topics such as laboratory animal-care committees, vicious-dog problems, the PETS program, and strategies for television coverage of animal issues, will challenge conferees and provide forums for exchange.

Ideal location, stimulating program, and dedicated participants lead to one conclusion—all roads should lead to Miami Beach in October.

We will be there. We count on you being there, too.

Doral Hotel On-The-Ocean room rates for the conference are: single, $62; double, $67. Rates will be honored from October 19 through October 28.

Travel Note
Eastern Airlines has been named "Official Carrier" for the HSUS 1986 annual conference. To obtain an unrestricted discount of 60 percent off normal round-trip coach fare to and from Miami, call Eastern toll-free at 1-800-468-7022 (outside Florida) or 1-800-282-0244 (within Florida) Monday through Friday, 8 a.m. to 9 p.m. ET and give the agent the HSUS account number: EZ10P41.
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 21

7:30 p.m.-9:00 p.m.
Registration

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 22

We Are Our Brothers' Keeper:
The Care, Use, and Disposition of
Primates in Captivity
A Day-long Symposium

8:00 a.m.
Registration

9:00 a.m.
Welcome/Introductory Remarks
John A. Hoyt, HSUS president
Patricia Forkan, HSUS vice president for Program and
Communications, moderator

9:15 a.m.
The Primate Trade: Pipeline to
Captivity
Dr. Geza Teleki, former director
of National Parks, Sierra Leone,
West Africa

10:00 a.m.
Sacrificing Primates in the
Name of Science
Dr. John McArdle, director,
Laboratory Animal Welfare, HSUS

10:30 a.m.
Coffee Break

10:45 a.m.
How to Know Your Primate
Dr. Roger Fouts, professor of
psychology, Central Washington
University; director, Friends of
Washoe

11:15 a.m.
Rehabilitation of Chimpanzees:
A Success Story
Janice Carter, Gambia Wildlife
Conservation Department,
West Africa

11:45 a.m.
Audience Questions and
Answers

12:15 p.m.
Lunch (on your own)

1:30 p.m.
Pet-Trade Tragedy
Wally Swett, director, Primarily
Primates

2:00 p.m.
Panel Discussion
Dr. Randall Lockwood, director,
Higher Education Programs,
HSUS, moderator

Teaching People to Be Better
Primates: The Chimpanzee
Project
Ann Pierce, coordinator,
Chimpanzee
Man and Ape and the Zoo
Terry Maple, director,
Atlanta Zoo
Habitats for Happiness
Michael Pereira, research
manager, Duke University
Center for the Study of Primate
Biology and History

8:00 p.m.
Get Acquainted Social/Cash Bar

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 23

8:00 a.m.
Registration

9:00 a.m.
Opening Remarks
Paul G. Irwin, executive vice
president and treasurer, program
moderator
Coleman Burke, chairman, Board
of Directors
John A. Hoyt, president

9:30 a.m.
Keynote Address: Creature
Comforts
Dr. Amy Freeman Lee

10:30 a.m.
Coffee Break

11:00 a.m.
Chimp Talk: Converting with a
Sibling Species
Dr. Roger Fouts, professor of
psychology, Central Washington
University; director, Friends of
Washoe

PETS program director Barbara Cassidy awarded certificates of achievement at last year's conference.
Noon-1:30 p.m.
Book Sale
Humane Education Materials

1:30 p.m.-3:15 p.m.
Workshops
1. Learning to Win: Strategies for Success
   Stacy Wyman, Campbell Plowden
2. Newsletters: Effective Editing and Production*
   Deborah Salem
3. Humane Education: Productive Partnerships
   Patty Finch
4. Animal Fighting: Investigation of Illegal Ventures
   Frantz Dantzler, Eric Sakach, Bernie Weller
5. Pound Seizure: Continuing the Fight
   Dr. John McArdle

3:15 p.m.
Break

3:30 p.m.-5:15 p.m.
Workshops
1. Newsletters: A Useful Public Relations Tool*
   Deborah Reed
2. Lobbying and Political Activities: Avoiding Legal Problems
   Roger Kindler
3. Animal Neighbors: How to Live with Them
   Guy Hodge
4. Vicious Dogs: Designing Effective Regulations for Your Community
   Dr. Randall Lockwood
5. Animal-Sacrifice Cults: A Hidden Problem
   Marc Paulhus, Robert Baker

8:00 p.m.
Film Festival
John Dommers, moderator

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 24

8:00 a.m.
Registration

9:00 a.m.
What Kind of Beasts Are We?
Dr. Randall Lockwood, director, Higher Education Programs

10:00 a.m.
Coffee Break

10:30 a.m.
Animals and Man—Some Ethical Considerations
   Trevor Scott, director—general, World Society for the Protection of Animals

11:00 a.m.
Annual Membership Meeting
   Coleman Burke, chairman, presiding
   President's Report
   Treasurer's Report
   Elections Committee Report
   Elections to Nominating Committee

Noon-1:30 p.m.
Book Sale
Humane Education Materials

1:30 p.m.-3:15 p.m.
Workshops
1. Dogs and Cats: Understanding Behavior—Kinship and Communion
   Dr. Michael Fox

3:15 p.m.
Break

3:30 p.m.-5:15 p.m.
Workshops
1. Lobbying Comes Alive:
   Making Your Voice Count
   Ann Church
2. Humane Education: Pose the Questions, Find the Answers
   Patty Finch, Lorraine Moore
3. Farm Animal Welfare: Happier Animals—Healthier Humans
   Dr. Michael Fox
4. Resources for More Professional Humane Societies and Shelters
   Barbara Cassidy
5. Animal-Care Committees: Be an Influential Member
   Dr. John McArdle

8:00 p.m.
Feature Film

Dr. Amy Freeman Lee introduced guest panelists in a recent HSUS conference session.
**SUNDAY, OCTOBER 25**

8:00 a.m.  
Registration

9:00 a.m.-10:30 a.m.  
Workshops

1. Working at the Roots  
   Edward S. Duvin

2. Trapping/Furs: Action against Cruelty  
   Dr. John Grandy

3. Publicity: Making Effective Use of the Media  
   Kathy Bauch; panel of print, radio, TV personalities

   Dr. Randall Lockwood

5. Euthanasia: Update on Drugs and Methods  
   Phyllis Wright, Dr. Michael Fox

10:30 a.m.  
Coffee Break

11:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m.  
Workshops

1. Dog and Horse Racing: Confronting the Abuses  
   Robert Baker, Scott Klug

2. Strengthening Humane Campaigns with the Environmental Perspective  
   Campbell Plowden

3. Animal Sheltering and Control: Update on New Laws  
   Phyllis Wright

   Dr. Michael Fox, Guy Hodge, Stacy Wyman

5. Generating Dollars: Getting on Radio and Television in Your Local Market  
   H.I. (Sonny) Bloch

**Afternoon/Lunch**  
(on your own)

6:30 p.m.  
Reception/Cash Bar

7:30 p.m.  
Awards Banquet  
John A. Hoyt, master of ceremonies  
Presentation of Joseph Wood Krutch Medal

**Adjournment of Conference**

*Conferences should bring samples of their organization's newsletter to these workshops.*

---

**REGISTRATION FORM**

1986 Annual Conference  
The Humane Society of the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please check:</th>
<th>Cost Per Person</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| □ Entire HSUS Annual Conference  
  Oct. 23-25 | $60 | $_____ |
|       | Includes general sessions, workshops, and awards banquet. (Select meal and indicate number of people.) |
| □ Vegetarian | | |
| □ Non-Vegetarian | | |

| □ Primate Symposium  
  Wednesday, Oct. 22 | $10 | $_____ |

If you are unable to attend the entire conference, the fees per day and for the awards banquet are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Per Person</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Thursday, Oct. 23</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Friday, Oct. 24</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Saturday, Oct. 25</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Awards banquet not included)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Awards banquet, Saturday evening</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Select meal and indicate number of people.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Vegetarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Non-Vegetarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Make checks payable to The HSUS; U.S. funds only. Cancellation fee of $10 will be charged after Wednesday, Oct. 15.)

A hotel registration form will be mailed upon receipt of this form. You must make reservations directly with the hotel prior to Tuesday, Sept. 30, 1986.

If registration is for more than one person, please print additional names.

---

Complete and return this form with payment to HSUS Conference, 2100 L St., N.W., Washington, DC 20037.

Name ____________________________ (please print)

Address ___________________________

City ____________________________State_______ZIP code__________
National Pound Seizure Ban Introduced in the House of Representatives

For almost forty years, animal activists have worked to stop the reprehensible practice of taking pet dogs and cats from pounds and shelters and using them for research purposes. At last, we have found a friend in Congress to sponsor legislation that would virtually eliminate the use of federal funds for research projects involving such animals.

On May 21, Rep. Robert J. Mrazek of New York introduced H.R. 4871, the Pet Protection Act, to establish what is tantamount to a national ban on pound seizure. Passage of this bill would spell an end to the unnecessary suffering of an estimated 300,000 pet animals taken from the nation's shelters each year for use in trivial and often unnecessary research experiments, questionable product-safety tests, and redundant teaching demonstrations.

According to Rep. Mrazek, "Shelter animals are not suitable for use in research because nothing is known about their...backgrounds. Despite this fact, some federally funded researchers continue to purchase dogs and cats from local shelters both directly and through intermediaries. These researchers unfailingly select those animals which appear to be the healthiest, most obedient, and most adoptable."

The Mrazek bill would prohibit the expenditure of any federal money awarded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) for the purchase or use of any cat or dog acquired directly or indirectly from an animal shelter. Because NIH provides the funding for nearly all uses of pet cats and dogs in biomedical research, H.R. 4871 would effectively Activities of bunchers, such as this Ohio man, lead activists to support national pound seizure legislation.
put an end to the use of pets in such experiments.

As a routine practice, the use of pets in experiments did not begin until after World War II. At that time, the U.S. government founded its principal research institutes, and large numbers of scientists began careers in research. Large-scale breeders of laboratory animals, however, were not available, and the only dependable source of inexpensive animals appeared to be local animal shelters. No studies were ever conducted to determine if pets were appropriate models for use in research.

Surprisingly, the research community itself has spent the last thirty-five years gradually reducing its use of pet cats and dogs. Despite the fact that shelter animals today constitute fewer than 1 percent of the seventy million animals used in biomedical research and testing, representatives of the biomedical community contend that these animals are vital to research. Many routinely portray those opposed to pound seizure as well-intentioned but irrational, emotional, or anti-science "humanics." They imply that, unless the supply of pound animals is maintained, major breakthroughs in medical research will be sidetracked and our children and loved ones will suffer undefined yet dire consequences.

Although attempting to divert public attention from the real issues by characterizing our concern as a misguided attack on all biomedical research, the research community is obviously merely trying to keep an outdated and inappropriate practice alive. Releasing shelter animals for research cannot be justified on the grounds of economics, accumulated knowledge, medical necessity, or claims (often erroneous) that lab animals receive adequate protection and care. In fact, although biomedical researchers contend that an end to pound seizure would seriously hinder critical research projects, the evidence clearly indicates otherwise.

- The largest biomedical research entity in the world, the National Institutes of Health, prohibits the use of shelter animals in its own extensive research programs and has done so for nearly ten years.
- Pound seizure is currently prohibited in Delaware, Hawaii, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, as well as England, Holland, Denmark, and Sweden, all of which engage in major biomedical research programs.
- Of the three states using the largest number of animals in research, two have already banned pound seizure.
- Three of the six states with the largest number of registered research facilities do not permit pound seizure.
- Two of the four states using the largest number of dogs in research also prohibit pound seizure.
- The World Health Organization and the Council of Europe, a group that represents all of the Common Market countries in Western Europe, have recommended against the use of shelter animals.

Using pet animals in research is not only altogether unnecessary but also clearly undermines the purpose for which shelters were originally established, as refuges. Providing dogs and cats with humane care until adopted or euthanatized, shelters were never intended as warehouses from which research institutions could procure a constant supply of animals.

When pets are released for use in experimentation, the public loses confidence in local shelters and animal-control agencies and stops cooperating with their programs.

(Continued on page 29)
(Continued from page 27)

As long as the research community continues to perceive shelters as cheap, dependable, and inexhaustible resources that can be easily exploited, there is no incentive for it to utilize the more appropriate alternatives available.

Shelter animals aren't the only dogs and cats at risk from pound seizure. Pets are stolen from their owners for resale to research institutions. These tragic thefts will continue until the market for pet-type animals dries up. Only by banning pound seizure can we begin to eliminate what has become a highly lucrative slave trade in pet cats and dogs.

The terrible specter of our families' cats and dogs in federally funded research labs can be permanently eradicated if H.R. 4871 is enacted. Write and/or call your representative in Congress and ask him or her to both cosponsor H.R. 4871 and take the necessary actions to ensure its passage. Compose a one-page letter stressing the need for this important legislation.

H.R. 4871 has been referred to the house subcommittee that oversees National Institutes of Health research. Please write to Rep. Henry A. Waxman, chairman (Health and the Environment Subcommittee, 2415 Rayburn Bldg., Washington, DC 20515) asking him to hold hearings and support this bill.

Because the language in the Mrazek bill deals with federal funding, the House Appropriations Committee must also consider this legislation. Please write these key members of that committee whose support is vital for enactment: The Hon. William H. Natcher, Chairman, Labor/HHS Appropriations Subcommittee, 2358 Rayburn Bldg., Washington, DC 20515; The Hon. Jamie L. Whitten, Chairman, House Appropriations Committee, H-228 Capitol Bldg., Washington, DC 20515; and The Hon. Silvio O. Conte, Ranking Minority Member, House Appropriations Committee, 1016 Longworth Bldg., Washington, DC 20515.

Efforts to ban pound seizure must continue at state and local levels, as well. If you are involved in such a campaign, please intensify your efforts. If you wish to launch an anti-pound-seizure campaign in your area, contact the HSUS laboratory animal welfare department for assistance. Finally, ask your local humane societies; animal-control agencies; civic organizations; churches; and municipal, county, and state governments to write in support of H.R. 4871. Contact The HSUS to obtain a sample resolution in support of this important bill and urge these groups to pass the resolution. Send copies of the resolution, typed on their letterheads, to The HSUS. We will personally deliver them to the appropriate congressional offices.

Time is finally running out for pound seizure. You can help us speed up the process and spare tomorrow's strayed, stolen, or abandoned animals from a life no pet deserves.

More Protection?

We are pleased to report that new protection has been proposed for the many laboratory animals used in federally funded alcohol and drug abuse studies and psychological research.

At the urging of The HSUS, the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Health and the Environment and the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources have agreed to amend the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA) authorization to bring this agency under the same statutes recently enacted to protect laboratory animals in NIH (see the Winter and Spring 1986 HSUS News).

ADAMHA would be required to follow the same guidelines that are used by NIH. These require recipients of federally funded facilities to make training available to laboratory personnel in humane care and treatment and alternatives to live animal experimentation. Painkillers, tranquilizers, and appropriate means of euthanasia would be required for laboratory animals. Each facility would have a functioning animal-care committee that includes a veterinarian and an outside member whose sole concern is the welfare of the laboratory animals; the committee would inspect the facility at least twice a year and notify the agency of any violations. If violations are not corrected, ADAMHA would have the authority to revoke funding.

This ADAMHA authorization, which is still pending in the House Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, has passed the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources and is on its way to the Senate floor. The HSUS will follow this legislation closely to safeguard its important protective provisions. House Subcommittee Chairman Henry A. Waxman of California and Senate Chairman Orrin G. Hatch of Utah are to be commended for their initiatives.

Please thank the representatives and senators who helped to have these important provisions attached to the authorization. Ask them to ensure that these provisions are kept intact throughout the legislative process: Rep. Henry A. Waxman and Rep. Edward R. Madigan, House of Representatives, Washington, DC 20515; Senator Orrin G. Hatch and Senator Edward M. Kennedy, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510.
They Made a Difference

Our friends in Congress are mentioned both in the Federal Report and in other articles in this issue. For their help for dairy cows, laboratory animals, greyhounds, and racehorses, these special members deserve our recognition and your thanks.

For lab animals:
- Rep. Doug Walgren of Pennsylvania
- Rep. Henry A. Waxman of California
- Sen. Orrin G. Hatch of Utah
- Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts
- Sen. Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., of Maryland

For prohibition of pound seizure:

For stopping hot-iron branding of dairy cows:
- Rep. Frank Horton of New York
- Rep. Tony Coelho of California
- Rep. James M. Jeffords of Vermont

For funding of the Animal Welfare Act:

For opposition to racing on Indian lands:
- Rep. Tony Coelho of California

Let These Primates Go

Fifty-four senators and 247 congressmen have signed a letter to NIH director James B. Wyngaarden about the fifteen primates removed by police in 1981 from Dr. Edward Taub's laboratory at the Institutes for Behavioral Research (IBR), an NIH grant recipient. They are asking that these monkeys not be returned to experimentation but be sent instead to a sanctuary (see Tracks in this issue).

Lobbyists and volunteers from several groups, including People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals and National Alliance for Animal Legislation, canvassed Capitol Hill in search of congressional supporters and were rewarded with this astounding bipartisan majority in the House and Senate. The congressional letters, initiated by Reps. Robert C. Smith and Charlie Rose and Sen. Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., remind Dr. Wyngaarden that Primarily Primates, a nonprofit sanctuary in San Antonio, Tex., is willing to provide a permanent home for the Silver Spring monkeys for the rest of their lives, at no cost to taxpayers.

Since 1981, NIH has spent more than $30,000 each year merely to keep these primates in sterile cages. The senate letter concludes: continued inaction by NIH will perpetuate an unacceptable, costly, and unproductive situation.

No More Branding?

When Rep. Frank Horton of New York introduced H.R. 407 on April 8, 127 of his house colleagues quickly joined him in urging the secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to investigate alternative identification procedures to be used in place of hot-iron face-branding of dairy cows.

This resolution would direct the USDA to look into alternatives and report to the House Agriculture Committee within ninety days. It would further require annual reports of the progress of this investigation as well as any conclusions reached. More humane marking systems, which eventually could replace branding altogether, would be explored.

Asserting that "Alternatives are available" and citing the use of a dye-tattoo marking system at one of USDA's facilities, Rep. Horton urged his colleagues to join him in passing this resolution.

Since Congress is already eyeing its adjournment, planned in early October, the only sure way to pass H.R. 407 is for the bill to attract at least 290 cosponsors so it can be brought up on the house "consent calendar."

Every cosponsor counts! Please ask your representative to add his or her name to H.R. 407.

AWA Extinction?

Recently, during the course of hearings on the administration's proposed budget for fiscal year 1987, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service administrator Bert Hawkins let slip a revealing bit of strategy that should alarm all of us. In response to written questioning by Rep. Bob Traxler of Michigan on APHIS plans for enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act under the administration's elimination of funding from its budget proposal, Mr. Hawkins reported that the USDA, APHIS's parent agency, might seek repeal of the AWA should no money be available for APHIS to perform its inspections. A second alternative, according to Mr. Hawkins, would be for USDA to seek to change the AWA wording to allow individual states to enforce the act. This eventuality would lead to fifty different sets of standards for acceptable conditions for animals in laboratories, puppy mills, zoos, and other facilities—chaos almost not to be imagined.

When The HSUS took its turn on the witness stands of both the house and senate appropriations subcommittees, we reiterated the need for funding for APHIS inspections. We urge you to write the chairmen of these committees and ask that they restore funding for AWA enforcement. We thank Rep. Traxler, who has kept faithful watch over funding for adequate enforcement of the AWA, for his vigilance in pressing Mr. Hawkins on the administration's plans for this flawed but still extremely valuable law.


In the Senate, write Sen. Thad Cochran, Chairman, Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, SD-140 Dirksen Bldg., Washington, DC 20510.
New Ethics Board for NIH

When the NIH authorization was enacted at the end of 1985, not only did new protection for lab animals become law, but a new biomedical ethics board also was established to study issues arising from health care delivery and biomedical and behavioral research.

The board will consist of six congressmen and six senators (listed below). Its members may serve up to eight years unless they leave office before then. This board will issue ongoing reports to Congress about its findings. It will be served by an advisory committee consisting of fourteen members representing research and medicine and related areas, such as ethics, theology, law, or public affairs.

House board members are Reps. Henry A. Waxman of California; Thomas A. Luken of Ohio; J. Roy Rowland of Georgia; Willis D. Grande, Jr., of Ohio; Thomas J. Tauke of Iowa; and Thomas J. Bliley, Jr., of Virginia.

Senate board members are Sens. Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., of Connecticut; Dave Durenberger of Minnesota; Gordon J. Humphrey of New Hampshire; Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts; Dale Bumpers of Arkansas; and Albert Gore, Jr., of Tennessee.

The HSUS will be urging the board to include ethical issues involving the use of animals in research as part of its agenda. If your senator or representative is listed above, please let him know that you want the welfare of laboratory animals to be part of the board’s deliberations.

Alternatives First

For the first time in congressional history, hearings exclusively on alternatives to the use of animals in education, testing, and research were held in the House on May 6.

Rep. Doug Walgren of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Technology, presided over questioning of the panel, which included government agency representatives from NIH, National Institute of Environmental Health Services, and the Food and Drug Administration. Representing the private sector was the Center for Alternatives to Animal Testing at Johns Hopkins School of Public Health. Lead witness was Dr. Gary B. Ellis, project director of the study on alternatives done by the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), released in February. Witnesses were questioned by Rep. Walgren and Rep. Sherwood L. Boehlert of New York, ranking minority member on the subcommittee.

Dr. Ellis stressed the development of alternatives in the fields of education and testing as the greatest potential areas for replacement of animals. Both Reps. Walgren and Boehlert expressed concern that the agencies be adequately funded at a level to allow exploration and validation of more alternative methods.

Witnesses pointed to the use of the classical LD-50 toxicity test as the most likely test to be discontinued because of its negligible scientific contributions.

As the hearings closed, Rep. Walgren promised that congressional interest in alternatives had just begun. The HSUS is hopeful this means more hearings will be held in the House. We have begun working for senate hearings, as well.

Four More Years

Thanks to wise legislative maneuvering on the part of Rep. Tony Coelho of California, H.R. 2020, a bill to regulate gambling on Indian lands, contains a four-year moratorium on the introduction of dog and horse racing. The House of Representatives passed this legislation in April. The General Accounting Office (GAO) is to use that time to undertake a study to determine what body would be the best regulator of pari-mutuel gambling—the Indian tribes themselves, the states, or the U.S. government. The GAO study would have to be submitted to Congress within two years of the date the law is enacted, and Congress would then have two additional years to take action on the GAO recommendations.

The senate version of the bill, S. 902, is still pending in the Select Committee on Indian Affairs. HSUS investigator Bob Baker has articulated our concerns about the cruelty in racing before this committee; more hearings were to be held in June. The HSUS is grateful to our many activists who wrote their congressmen to ask that racing be kept off these lands.

Let your senators know that you oppose any expansion of dog and horse racing, but that to allow these sports on Indian reservations, which currently do not have to meet state racing commission requirements, is to open up a Pandora’s box of cruelties for racing animals.

Any member of the Senate may be reached c/o The U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. Any representative may be reached c/o The House of Representatives, Washington, DC 20515.
HSUS Periodicals: Many Ways to Stay Informed about Animal Welfare

We're glad we can count you as part of The HSUS, but we find many people aren't aware of the variety of periodicals we publish to serve the many different—and important—interests of those in animal welfare.

All of these publications are prepared by The HSUS's nationally experienced professional staff. Shouldn't you order one today?

The HSUS News Quarterly membership magazine of The Humane Society of the U.S., with up-to-date reports on HSUS activities in national, international, and regional animal-welfare issues. $10 minimum membership contribution.

Shelter Sense A lively, unique, informative newsletter for animal-sheltering and -control personnel that offers answers to community animal problems. Ten times a year. $5 per subscription.

Children & Animals A practical, colorful publication of The HSUS’s National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE), filled with activities and suggestions for classroom teachers and educators in animal-welfare organizations, animal-control agencies, nature centers, and zoos. Quarterly. $10 minimum membership contribution to NAAHE.

Animal Activist Alert A four-page, quarterly newsletter with the latest information on state and federal legislation and special activist campaigns. Free to HSUS members on our Action Alert Team.


I would like to receive these periodicals of The HSUS:

The HSUS News. Enroll me as a voting member of The HSUS ($10 per year) and send me 4 issues.

Shelter Sense. Enter a subscription to Shelter Sense ($5 per year) and send me 10 issues. I enclose

Animal Activist Alert. I am a voting member ($10 per year) of The HSUS. Please add me to the HSUS Action Alert Team.

Kind News for Juniors. Enter a subscription to Kind News for Juniors ($10 per year) and send me 35 copies of each of 5 issues. I enclose

Kind News for Seniors. Enter a subscription to Kind News for Seniors ($10 per year) and send me 35 copies of each of 5 issues. I enclose

Children & Animals. Enroll me as a NAAHE member ($10 per year) and send me 4 issues. I enclose

Make checks payable to The HSUS. Please return this coupon to The HSUS, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037, along with your payment.
**New England**

**Charges Dismissed**

Working in cooperation with leaders of the New Haven–based Animal Rights Front, New England Regional Director John Dommers assisted Francelle Dorman, a resident of Niantic, Conn., and the first person in the Constitution State to be charged with hunter harassment, in successfully avoiding prosecution.

Mrs. Dorman followed three hunters into the marsh near her home and, according to her own account, began a conversation with them hoping that she could "make them feel a little compassion for the animals." A forty-five-minute dialogue ended when one of the hunters summoned a state police officer to arrest her.

Mrs. Dorman did not believe that she could be arrested for simply watching and conversing with the hunters.

Mrs. Dorman's case was eventually dismissed in court. She has initiated action against the hunters and police for false arrest.

**Hunter-Harassment Bill Unconstitutional**

The New Hampshire Supreme Court unanimously ruled on May 8, 1986, that a proposed bill prohibiting the harassment of hunters, trappers, and fishermen would be unconstitutional.

"House Bill 148, while ostensibly involving only the exercise of the police power, necessarily implicates the state constitution's free speech guarantee...and would constitute a violation thereof," said the justices in an advisory opinion sought by the House.

The court recognized that the right of individuals to hunt, trap, and fish in a lawful manner "is clearly a proper protection." But it said the state's exercise "of its police power may not unreasonably interfere with an individual's right to free speech."

The bill could read broadly enough to prohibit conservationists from addressing pro-conservation statements to those same hunters on public lands. Such comprehensive, content-based restrictions are not permissible under the state constitution, said the justices.

The New England Regional Office, New Hampshire animal-protection organizations, and the New Hampshire Civil Liberties Union had testified against the bill in January.

**Whale of a Program**

"The New Era of Peaceful Coexistence: What Are Its Implications for Whales and Humans?" was the topic of a symposium designed specifically for high school students and teachers held at the Science Museum of Connecticut in Hartford in April. Sponsored by a coalition of statewide conservation and education organizations, including the HSUS New England Regional Office and NAAHE, the program attracted over 200 participants.

Outstanding whale scientists from throughout New England, including Roger Payne, Charles Mayo, Howard Winn, and Steve Katona, were among the speakers. Their topics included human/cetacean interaction, strandings, entanglement, habitat protection, whale watching, and careers in marine mammalogy.

Oxen, horse, and pony pulling contests are all too common events at summer and fall agricultural fairs throughout New England. The New England Regional Office will be gathering information on the many hidden cruelties of this activity throughout the fair season. Members are urged to send news clippings indicating any problems identified with pulling contests, including injuries to and drugging of animals, to the HSUS New England Regional Office, Norma Terris Center, P.O. Box 382, East Haddam, CT 06423.

**Southeast**

**Pounding Local Officials**

HSUS Director of Laboratory Animal Welfare John McArdle testified before the Marion County (Fla.) commissioners this spring against pound seizure. Both the Marion County Humane Society and the Southeast Regional Office lobbied actively to ban the release of sheltered animals to research institutions in the county, which is supplier to Florida State University. In May, we had a victory: the county commissioners voted to prohibit pound seizure.

Pound seizure has received intense scrutiny in the city of Jacksonville as well, where the University of Florida has been pressuring local officials to retain its cruel and unnecessary pipeline from pound to laboratory despite criticism from animal-welfare advocates.

Constant political maneuvering has made the outcome of the pound-seizure struggle uncertain in Jacksonville. We'll report on future developments.

**Georgia United**

The Macon–Bibb Humane Society has taken the initiative in forming a Georgia coalition to deal with ani-
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No, No Norway

When the Norwegian cruise ship S.S. Norway paid a special port call to Charleston, S.C., Greenpeace and HSUS staff members presented departing passengers with leaflets asking for their help in convincing the Norwegian government to stop all whaling activities.

On May 19 and 20, The HSUS and Greenpeace held a joint demonstration in opposition to the Norwegian government's refusal to accept the ban on commercial whaling mandated by the International Whaling Commission. Norway is the only country in the world that has announced its intention to ignore completely the whaling moratorium.

Demonstrators with “Flo” in tow take pro-whale message to the Norway.

The next morning, while NBC's "Today" show broadcast live from the ship's deck, protesters, including The HSUS's Campbell Plowden and Marc Paulhus, circled the cruise ship on powered rafts towing "Flo," a giant inflatable whale. On "Flo's" side was a large banner carrying our pro-moratorium, anti-Norwegian message to passengers, crew, and passersby alike.

Fighting for Felony Status

Florida's activists are hoping, after ten years of effort, to see the Sunshine State's legislators cast a dark cloud on cockfighting. H.B. 349 would make cockfighting a felony and has the additional benefit of outlawing the use of live bait to train greyhounds for racing. The Southeast office staff has met with numerous legislators and galvanized the state's Action Alert team into action to push for the bill's passage.

In South Carolina, a felony animal-fighting provision faces a rocky road to passage. Although the state senate passed its version of a bill within two days of its introduction, the house of representatives has not yet voted on its version, H.R. 2353, introduced two years ago. Legislators sympathetic to dog- and cockfighters (yes, there are such people) are placing obstacles after obstacle in the path of passage of what should be an obviously necessary law. Since all other South Carolina animal-protection bills are dead and the legislative session nearly over, animal protectionists will concentrate their efforts on the animal-fighting provisions during what time remains.

Midwest

Legislative Ups and Downs

S.B. 26, which would allow Missouri voters to pass judgment on a constitutional amendment authorizing pari-mutuel dog racing, has been introduced in the Missouri senate. (Missouri has already approved the authorization of horse racing.)

Midwest Regional Director Wendell Maddox spent several weeks lobbying members of both legislative bodies to oppose S.B. 26. He also testified in several committee hearings in an attempt to sidetrack the bill while it was still in committee. No such luck: the bill slipped by and went on its way to the full house for debate and vote. Happily, the bill was defeated in that forum by a wide majority.

After an eight-year battle, Missouri lawmakers approved the abolition of state and county wildlife bounties. This action is another victory—this time for wild species—in the Show Me State.

Iowa legislators enacted two laws designed to strengthen the state's anti-cruelty provisions. H.F. 2098 prohibits the abandonment of dogs; H.F. 2120 details specifics on the care of neglected or stray animals.

In Kansas, lawmakers passed a bill to require a county or district attorney to file charges on a sworn complaint of cruelty to animals. We were able to convince them that this was a badly needed instrument to provide greater legal support to those enforcing anti-cruelty laws.

Regional Director Maddox and Field Investigator Bob Baker lobbied the Missouri legislature in opposition to several bills implementing pari-mutuel horse racing. One reduced the state's share of betting revenues from between 6 and 12 to 1 percent; another had to do with allowing county voters to vote out horse racing if it was not being operated in their best interests.

An animal-facility licensing bill, supported by animal-welfare groups, was vetoed by Governor John Carlin because he felt it would create a new bureaucracy to enforce it. We hope to convince a new governor of our position in the next session, when we plan to reintroduce this needed piece of legislation.
Great Lakes

Fighting Fighting
Great Lakes Regional Program Coordinator Kurt Lapham reports that the Great Lakes Animal Fighting Task Force has established a reward of up to $1,000 for the arrest and conviction of any persons in the region found guilty of animal fighting and is raising funds for a toll-free telephone service to handle any tips received. The task force plans to use posters and public service announcements as well to publicize the reward.

Hands-on Large Animals
Many humane societies face an increased number of complaints involving horses, cattle, and other livestock and wish to add to their expertise in handling these cases. Therefore, it is no surprise that more than thirty humane society personnel from Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Ohio attended a large-animal cruelty investigations workshop in South Bend, Ind., April 17 and 18. Cosponsored by the HSUS Great Lakes Regional Office, the Humane Society of St. Joseph County, and the Elkhart County Humane Society, the session included techniques for catching and restraining large species and signs of disease and malnutrition. Speakers included veterinarians, a professor of veterinary science, and HSUS staff members Sandy Rowland and Kurt Lapham.

Bucking Disappointment
Although the Great Lakes office staff fought a proposal to weaken the Ohio bucking strap law by testifying at committee hearings, lobbying, and bombarding members with action alerts, its efforts have met with defeat. Padded bucking straps will now be allowed on performing animals in that state.

We aren’t letting this setback halt our efforts against rodeo. We are asking our members to remind any rodeo sponsor that using a prod on rodeo stock is still illegal in Ohio. Any violations will prompt calls for prosecution.

The Great Lakes Regional Office has announced a circus watch and a rodeo watch. We hope enough local organizations and individuals will join us in this effort to monitor exploitative events throughout the area. Our regional office will serve as a clearinghouse, learning where performances are taking place, notifying local groups, and asking that they not only observe the event but also report the attraction’s next destination. We will then alert the watch’s representative at the next stop so activities can be monitored there.

We hope, in the long run, to use this extensive field observation to restrict circuses and rodeos legislatively throughout the region.

West Coast

Lions Left Alone in ’86
California’s mountain lions, facing a possible threat from sport hunters, have gained a temporary reprieve from the state’s fish and game commission.

In April, the commission adopted a proposal by the California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) to study the mountain lion population rather than set a trophy hunting season in 1986.

The commission and the DFG may set mountain lion hunting regulations in 1987, especially if the results of DFG’s study show such regulations to be “necessary.” At an earlier hearing, a DFG spokesman stated that biologists and game managers lack data on which to set hunting seasons in 1986; they may have that information once this year’s study is completed.

Intense opposition to the DFG’s draft plan to kill all mountain lions in the North Kings area of Fresno County and a second proposal for a limited sport hunt in that area has turned away any possibility of a hunt in the immediate future, but that situation could always change.

The West Coast Regional Office thanks HSUS members for their help in the fight against sport hunting of mountain lions.

Ferrets, No
Thanks, too, to all HSUS members who wrote in opposition to legalization of ferrets as pets in California (see the Winter 1986 HSUS News). On March 7, 1986, the California Fish and Game Commission voted not to permit private ownership of these animals.

Kennel Owner Convicted
Rita Roberts, a Hayward, Calif., kennel owner, was convicted of eighteen counts of animal cruelty on April 3, 1986, and sentenced to two years in jail. Forty-seven
West Coast (continued)

ing dogs had been confiscated from her property in July of 1985 by animal-control officers.

On April 29, Judge David Hun­
ter modified Ms. Robert's sentence to three years on probation. Under the terms of this probation, she may have two or three dogs but may not operate a kennel.

West Coast Regional Director Char Drennon arranged for the seized dogs to be cared for last autumn by the Santa Cruz SPCA, Peninsula Humane, Marin Humane, Santa Clara Humane, and Monterey SPCA. She has continued to monitor the case and cooperate with officials who prosecuted Ms. Roberts in a civil action for $51,000 in liens and costs.

We ask HSUS members to thank Alameda County Deputy District Attorney Bill Denny (Oakland Municipal Court, District Attorney's Office, 661 Washington Street, Oakland, CA 94607) and Assistant City Attorney Valerie Armento (City Center Bldg., 22300 Foothill Blvd., Hayward, CA 94541) for their outstanding work on this case.

For the Birds

In Pennsylvania, S. 1479, a bill to prohibit the importation and sale of wild-caught birds, has received HSUS support. Keystone State members are urged to contact their state senators and ask them to pass this important piece of legislation.

In New York, animal-welfare advocates celebrated a victory in the final days of the state's legislative session when efforts to weaken that state's wild-caught bird law were defeated.

New Jersey's version of the "bird bill," A. 2332, was released from its committee in May. We urge HSUS New Jersey members to write their assemblymen and ask that they support A. 2332, which is receiving strong opposition from the state's well-financed pet industry.
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Hunter-Harassment Bill Held Unconstitutional

The New Hampshire Supreme Court, in an unanimous decision, recently declared unconstitutional H.B. 148, a proposed state bill prohibiting the harassment of hunters, trappers, and fishermen (see Around the Regions). The court recognized that the right of individuals to hunt, trap, and fish in a lawful manner is clearly a proper subject of police-power protection but that the state’s exercise “of its police power may not unreasonably interfere with an individual’s right to free speech.”

In its opinion, which was advisory and rendered while the bill was under consideration by the legislature, the New Hampshire Supreme Court stated that the regulation of free speech contained in H.B. 148 was unconstitutionally vague and overbroad in that critical terms in the bill were left undefined and could therefore be used “to sweep whole categories of protected speech into its ambit.” The court looked to the language of the proposed bill that would prohibit anti-hunting advocates from verbally “provok[ing]” hunters with intent to dissuade them from taking animals and found that the bill could be read broadly enough to prohibit conservationists from addressing pro-conservation statements to those same hunters on public lands, which would clearly not be permissible under the state constitution.

The court found also that the language in the proposed bill potentially violates a landowner’s right to the otherwise lawful and reason-

able use of his property. Specifically, the bill prohibited any person from “engag[ing] in an activity” or “plac[ing] any...substance that would tend to...affect the behavior of a wild animal, with intent to prevent or hinder its lawful taking.” The court found such language to be so broad as to appear to prohibit a landowner from posting property and using food to attract wild animals with the purpose of providing a refuge from hunters.

The New Hampshire Supreme Court’s recognition of the potential chilling effect on free speech in proposed H.B. 148 is encouraging. We hope it will be persuasive upon other courts deciding the constitutionality of similar laws.

Hot-Iron Branding Decision Noteworthy

The district court’s decision in the hot-iron branding suit brought by the Humane Society of Rochester and Monroe County (see the article on page 4) deserves detailed discussion, since it is one of the few examples of a court extending its equitable powers on behalf of a strictly animal-welfare issue, as opposed to one involving wildlife-conservation or environmental issues.

Particularly noteworthy is the way in which the court cut through the more technical and procedural objections to the USDA’s program and simply declared the hot-iron face-branding to be cruel, particularly when a viable, more humane alternative—freeze branding—was readily available.

Even more importantly, the decision amounted to judicial recognition of a national public policy of avoiding unnecessary cruelty to animals. The judge noted that all fifty states and the District of Columbia have enacted anti-cruelty laws over the past century and that, since 1906, the federal government itself has enacted a battery of statutes aimed at protecting and improving conditions for a variety of classes of animals, including livestock, laboratory animals, wild horses, and marine mammals. Notwithstanding the absence of a statute specifically directing USDA to employ the most humane method of identifying cattle, the court apparently deduced from the sum of all these federal and state statutes a public policy of sufficient legal weight and substance to support an injunction altering a major government program.

This legal theory—that a humane public policy by itself mandates or requires government programs to choose among the most humane alternatives—has been proposed before other courts but has rarely, if ever, been accepted.

We hope this legal opinion will serve as persuasive authority for other courts to hand down decisions, on similar grounds, favorable to animal welfare.

The Law Notes are compiled by HSUS General Counsel Murdaugh Stuart Madden and Associate Counsel Roger Kindler.
GREET THE HOLIDAYS WITH OUR PUPPY AND KITTEN

The holidays will be here in a twinkling! It's not too early to plan for the season by ordering our 1986 HSUS greeting cards. Send your holiday wishes to loved ones, friends, and neighbors with two winsome pets, safely at home on a snowy night.

New Hampshire artist Ellen Whitman has created this heartwarming scene just for HSUS members.

Cards are 5" x 7" and in full color. Inside is a message, "Peace on Earth, Goodwill to All Creatures."

Each package of twenty-five cards and envelopes costs $7; $6 if you order four or more packages. Our members eagerly await our new card each year - join the thousands who make HSUS greeting cards part of their holiday tradition.

HSUS Greeting Card Order Form

Please send me ____ packages of HSUS greeting cards at $7 per package

OR

please send me ____ packages of HSUS greeting cards at $6 per package

I enclose $____

Send the cards to:

Name

Address

City State Zip

Make all checks or money orders payable to The HSUS and send this coupon to:

HSUS Greeting Cards
2100 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037

Orders will be sent by UPS and must be delivered to a street address. Please do not use a P.O. box.
1987, Another Good Year For HSUS And You!

Through our good friends at Bo-Tree Productions in Palo Alto, California, The Humane Society of the United States has received many benefits over the years. They have continually made beautiful photographs available to us for use in our various publications. They have provided us with hundreds of calendars at cost to assist in the promotional activities of the Society. The wide circulation of the Bo-Tree calendars has introduced the Society to many new individuals and has created a greater awareness of the Society's work in protecting the nation's animals.

The HSUS also has an agreement with Bo-Tree whereby we receive two percent of the profits generated through the sale of calendars bearing the Society's name.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Many</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Calendar</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T105</td>
<td>Whales &amp; Friends</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T106</td>
<td>Cats</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T108</td>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T104</td>
<td>Bless The Beasts</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T107</td>
<td>Doggone</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T126</td>
<td>Baby Animals To Love</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Order 3 or more calendars and receive a 10% discount!**

Mail your order to: Bo-Tree Productions, Dept. HSUS
3535 E. Wier, #5
Phoenix, AZ 85040
(602) 243-1684