A Rare Opportunity

It is generally my custom to select this column to express personal views and thoughts on a given subject, or those expressing the policy or position of The Humane Society of the United States regarding a major issue. Rarely have I used it to elaborate on articles of information contained elsewhere in this magazine. However, there are two articles in this issue of the News that merit special comment, “Working at the Roots,” by Edward S. Duvin and “Working to Protect and Preserve,” by Phyllis V. Roberts. Each addresses issues of major interest and concern to The HSUS in its efforts to influence the society in which we live for the betterment of animals, and each identifies avenues of outreach into the larger community that are indispensable in ultimately affecting a positive change in the attitudes and practices of humankind toward the environment in which we live.

“Working at the Roots” is one of many articles written by Ed Duvin and published during the past several years as Animalines, a small publication that has inspired and motivated thousands of persons worldwide. I became increasingly intrigued to meet the author of these provocative and perceptive articles, known to me only by his signature, E.S.D., at the conclusion of each issue of Animalines. And, not at all to my surprise, the man himself was as provocative and charitable as the words he put to paper. But, more importantly, he was and is a personification of the challenges and rigorous life-style his writings prescribe.

Ed Duvin is also a facilitator and a healer. He has successfully bridged the gap that too often exists between those working at the grassroots level of animal protection/rights and those working within organizational structures; between those who feel isolated and alone in these efforts and those who are supported by both the institution of which they are a part and colleagues working at their side; between those who have chosen a life-style of abstinence and self-denial and those who essentially embrace the norms and practices of the larger society in which they live.

To further the work of Ed Duvin and the ideals expressed in “Working at the Roots” and previous issues of Animalines, The HSUS has joined with Mr. Duvin in creating the Center for the Respect of Life and Environment. “The Center,” writes Ed Duvin, “is committed to move beyond the fragmented approach that has characterized our movement’s history for over a century and to begin painting a broader portrait which conveys the devastation we are inflicting on our earth, other creatures, and ourselves—not in negative terms, but through outreach efforts designed to create an inviolable circle of life.”

The second article, written by Phyllis Roberts, current international president of the General Federation of Women’s Clubs, describes a two-year program recently undertaken by this outstanding organization and The HSUS. What the article does not say, however, is that it is Phyllis Roberts personally who has made this joint venture possible. Because of her great love and concern for animals, she made the decision several months ago that, during her tenure as president, the GFWC would undertake several projects whose purpose and objective is the appreciation, preservation, and protection of animals.

We are extremely grateful that Phyllis Roberts sought out The HSUS to be a partner in this joint venture. In so doing, she has dramatically enlarged the audience to which our concerns are addressed and, perhaps more significantly, she has enlisted into active participation in our efforts to protect animals from abuse and suffering approximately 500,000 women throughout the United States.

The HSUS is grateful for these two dedicated persons, for the values they embrace and foster, and for the opportunity to join with them in extending the message of the sanctity of all life to an ever-widening audience. It is, indeed, a rare opportunity.
James Herriot
Awarded
Joseph Wood Krutch Medal

by John A. Hoyt

My first impression on meeting the well-known author James Herriot was that he is in every way the country veterinarian you meet in his marvelous books. It was also my last impression as we said good-bye on the cobbledstone street in front of the Golden Fleece Hotel in Thirsk, England.

Known throughout this lovely Yorkshire village as Alf, James Alfred Wight is virtually oblivious to the fame his many books have brought him worldwide. Nor is he its victim. For it is this lovely countryside that is still his home—a place where he continues to practice veterinary medicine: lives quietly and modestly with his charming wife, Joan, their two children, and three grandchildren; and takes frequent and regular walks with his terrier, Bodie.

His having been designated by the HSUS board of directors the 1986 recipient of our Joseph Wood Krutch Medal, Mrs. Hoyt and I had journeyed in early June to Thirsk to present to Dr. Wight this award in recognition of his "significant contribution toward the improvement of life and environment" through the many books he has authored as James Herriot. Still engaged in veterinary practice with his partner, known in his stories as Siegfried, as well as with his son, Jim, Dr. Wight possessed a total lack of pretentiousness or self-importance. He seemed almost amazed to hear one more time the ways in which his stories have touched so many persons and helped to instill in them a genuine affection and regard for animals, not only for those of the animal kingdom, but for all the things they do which bring joy to their homes. They tell me, too, about their troubles and sorrows, in fact, about the whole range of experiences which go into the keeping of a dog. Perhaps this is a good way of replying to them all, "Because these are the things which happened to me."

It can surely be said that American readers of James Herriot's books, by far his largest audience throughout the world, have found in him and his relationship with animals the attributes of a modern-day St. Francis of Assisi. His sensitivity, caring, and genuine affection for these creatures have awakened in literally thousands of persons an appreciation and regard for animals not previously experienced. By no means a crusader for "animal rights," this gentle man has nonetheless perhaps done more to promote a genuine appreciation and caring for animals than any other single individual throughout the world.

Not only through his books but also through the medium of television, James Herriot has become a frequent "visitor" in the homes of literally millions of Americans. Shown on numerous public television stations throughout the nation, All Creatures Great and Small is currently being spon­sored on KQED in San Francisco and WETA in Washington, D.C., by The HSUS. (If this magnificent series is not currently being aired in your community, urge your public television station to begin doing so.)

The Humane Society of the United States is proud and honored to recognize James Herriot as its 1986 Joseph Wood Krutch medalist. Regrettably, he is unable to attend our annual conference in Miami Beach to receive this award in person. However, were it not for that fact, it is not likely that Mrs. Hoyt and I would have had the privilege of becoming an intimate part of his worldwide family on that very special day in June of 1986.

John A. Hoyt is president of The HSUS.
Working Together to Protect and Preserve

by Phyllis V. Roberts

The General Federation of Women's Clubs (GFWC), the world's largest and oldest nondenominational, nonpartisan international service organization of volunteer women, and The Humane Society of the United States are undertaking joint study and action programs during the two-year administration of the newly installed international president of GFWC, Phyllis V. Roberts, of Fairfax, Virginia.

In this article, Ms. Roberts describes those programs, as well as her own feelings about animals and conservation issues.

Until recently, I thought of the humane society as an organization that picked up stray dogs and cats and located good homes for them. Then, about a year ago, I discovered the vastness of the programming and concerns of The Humane Society of the United States, whose members are as dedicated to preserving grizzlies and wolves as they are to protecting domestic animals from inhumane treatment. At that point, I was beginning to make plans for the programs and projects that would be implemented during my administration as international president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. I hoped to develop a strong environmental/conervation/animal—rights program. So, I was elated to learn that The HSUS was also involved extensively in those areas and, further, that this outstanding organization was both willing and eager to work cooperatively with GFWC in this endeavor. Thus was born the partnership between The HSUS and GFWC for projects such as Preservation of Endangered Species, Wildlife Conservation, "Kids and Kindness," and Companion Animals.

I grew up with animals and have always loved them. We have shared our home with an assortment of God’s four-legged (and legless) creatures, and our four dogs and two cats are members of our family. It has always been difficult for me to understand how people could abuse, mistreat, neglect, and exploit animals. I felt sure that GFWC members share my feelings and would join me in doing everything possible to prevent those acts of cruelty.

It seems that, almost daily, we hear animal horror stories: the plight of the grizzly, the poisoning of the coyote, the shooting of wolves, the slaughter of elephants and rhinos for their tusks and horns, the deaths of birds and primates as they are being shipped to the United States, the wanton killing of whales, seals, kangaroos—the list goes on and on.

Rather than protect these beautiful creatures that share our world, we have exploited them for their fur, for use in experiments, and for the pet trade. These occurrences, plus the shocking fact that thousands of species disappear from the face of the earth each year, convinced me of the need for undertaking an extensive education and action program on behalf of animals.

It is my hope that, during these next two years of my administration, the 500,000 members of the General Federation of Women's Clubs in the United States will be carrying the banner for preservation and protection as they implement the action and study programs that will be promoted with the assistance of The HSUS.

These five programs are exciting and beneficial. Since GFWC is a volunteer community-service organization, we are urging our 10,000 clubs (and our international membership of ten million in forty-six countries) to implement the programs in their communities and, thus, become a significant force in improving the relations among people, animals, and their environment.

In addition to programs administered through our six departments (The Arts, Conservation, Education, Home Life, Public Affairs, and International Affairs), a President's Special Project is designated by each GFWC international president during her term of office. I have chosen "Preservation of Endangered Species" as my special project for 1986-88 and will be working closely with The HSUS in achieving the following goals:

1. Collecting and distributing information on the plight of endangered species and encouraging public efforts to ensure their preservation and restoration;
2. Limiting the use of wildlife as pets because of the threats posed to wildlife by international wildlife trade and the cruelty involved in this activity;
3. Setting state programs that benefit endangered and threatened species.

Among the activities in which we are urging club participation are:
• Joining a conservation group
• Becoming informed about wildlife and conservation issues in your area
• Finding out what species in your area are endangered or threatened
• Not buying exotic or wild animals as pets
• Not buying products made from endangered or threatened species
• Canada-wide violations of wildlife laws to your local game warden

In our Conservation Department is a joint GFWC/HSUS Wildlife Conservation Program designed to familiarize GFWC members with critical wildlife issues. As part of the action plan, we are urging clubs to adopt one or more national wildlife refuges, if nearby, and become familiar with refuge wildlife and programs.

GFWC passed a resolution in 1985 opposing the sale of "wild" game traps, and we are urging club members to distribute literature on the cruelty of trapping.

Through our Education Department, we are working with the National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE), a division of The HSUS, to promote the "Kids and Kindness" program in schools. A program that will teach children the value of justice, goodwill, and humanity toward all life. Clubs are urged to adopt a teacher, who will then receive copies of Children & Animals and Kind News for use in the classroom.

A Companion Animals Program is part of our Public Affairs plan of work with The HSUS. While issues being stressed are the importance of licensing pets in accordance with local laws, the importance of spaying and neutering pets, the need for proper veterinary care and current inoculations, and the opposition to using pets for laboratory research.

We are also implementing a state legislation program that will inform club members about state-level issues such as pound seizure, trapping, pari-mutuel betting on horse and dog racing, rodeo, and animal fighting.

Through our International Affairs Department, we are working with The HSUS to educate club members on the effects of international trade in wildlife and on promoting protection of endangered and vulnerable species of wildlife worldwide.

Edwin Way Teale said, "If among the delights of the open world, I were to choose the sights, the sounds and the fragrances I most want to see and hear and smell on a final day on earth, I think I would choose these: the clear, sweet song of a white-throated sparrow singing at dawn, the smell of pine trees, the lovely calling of the Canada goose, the sigh of a dragonfly glinting in the sunshine, the voice of the hermit thrush far in a darkening woods at evening."

To that I would add the grandeur and majesty of the bald eagle as it soars to its nest, high on an unspoiled rock in an unpoluted sky. These—and so many others—are the wonders for which we must marshal our forces and work together to protect and preserve. GFWC is pleased to be working with The HSUS, of the United States in achieving our far-reaching and mutual goals in this important effort.
LENDING A HAND TO WILD BIRDS

Threats to the Wild Bird Population — and How You Can Help

Wild birds in North America face many perils, among them loss of habitat, assaults by humans, and predation by domestic cats. It's no wonder, then, that beleaguered birds can benefit from some friendly intervention on the part of concerned and knowledgeable wildlife observers.

The coexistence of man and bird is, at best, an uneasy truce. Birds have been displaced from the land by bulldozers and the townhouses, shopping centers, and parking lots springing up in their wake. But, once the human occupants have moved into new neighborhoods, the birds—the original suburbanites—have come back to restake their claims. Some are proving remarkably adaptable at living in or around human accommodations.

The return of the wild creatures has met with a mixed reception. Nature lovers have been pleased to welcome robins, doves, and other bird neighbors. Not everyone, however, is happy about sharing his home and office with bird life, and too much of a good thing—in this case, birds—often turns people from friends to foes. Once-welcomed geese are later accused of fouling golf courses; woodpeckers occasionally damage homes by drumming; and pigeons excrete droppings on automobiles.

The principal complaints against wild birds, however, are that they find human dwellings suitable sites for roosting or nesting. Homeowners or businessmen who find themselves unwilling hosts to pigeons and other birds have used poisons, firearms, or traps to rid themselves of their unwelcome visitors. Not only are these methods cruel, but they are also ineffective. Wild birds enter the human domain in search of food or shelter. As long as these basic needs are to be found in business districts and residential neighborhoods, birds will continue their invasions. As long as communities continue to permit birds, others will take their place and the problem will worsen. Sadly, until people learn to identify and eliminate the attractions that lure birds where they are not welcome, mass exterminations will remain a potent threat to the welfare of bird life.

What can you do to help? Speak out against the use of poisons, guns, and traps to control "pest" birds. Encourage citizens and city officials to exercise restraint in dealing with wild-bird problems and invite them to obtain technical advice from The HSUS on managing wild birds.

Another threat to wild birds is loss of habitat, not only in the United States but also in the rain forests of Central and South America. Did you know that, during the coldest months of the year, more than half of our native bird species migrate to winter feeding grounds in the rain forests of Latin America and the Caribbean? In one year, an estimated 77,000 square miles of rain forests—an area equivalent in size to Nebraska—are flat­tened for timber or farmland. Biologists fear that, if rain forests continue to be decimated at the current rate, many species of birds may disappear entirely within the next fifteen years. We could say good-bye to flycatchers, peewees, tanagers, warblers, thrushes, vireos, gnatcatchers, whippoorwills, and several raptors.

Through The HSUS and other animal-protection and conservation organizations, our members are mounting an international campaign to preserve the remaining rain forests that are so critical to the survival of bird life. Foreign governments are being asked to set aside portions of the rain forests as nature preserves.

In the United States, we are working to ensure that national wildlife refuges, national parks, and other public lands are managed as sanctuaries for birds and other wildlife. You can become a part of these global efforts to preserve precious habitat by supporting The HSUS and like-minded groups.

Closer to home, the domestic cat, when allowed to roam free, is also a great threat to wild birds. This companion animal is one of the primary causes of mortality among songbirds. Most birds caught by cats die of injuries or shock. The teeth or claws of cats, while making only a small wound, penetrate deep into the bird's body,
injuring vital organs. The tragedy is compounded if the cat kills a parent bird, leaving the orphaned nestlings to starve or die from exposure. Fastening a bell around a cat's neck is of virtually no aid to birds since cats are too quick and agile to provide warning of an impending attack. Cats should be kept in the house or supervised when outdoors. This policy is of benefit not only to bird life but also to the cat itself, which in the outdoors is vulnerable to speeding automobiles, diseases, hostile animals, and animal abusers.

Helping Birds in Distress

Anyone who spends time hiking or gardening will occasionally happen upon a young bird that seemingly is orphaned and in need of care. Most wild birds are born helpless and live in the nest for several days to several months after hatching. Many of the birds that need our direct help are those that have left their nests prematurely. They either tried to fly before they were able or they were fallen or were bumped from the nest.

Before you rescue a baby bird, observe the situation carefully. A sick bird will do a far better job than you, the rescuer, of getting its young to safety. It is usually safe to leave the nestling. The bird will do a far better job than you; you do not have its experience of survival. Cats should be kept outdoors. This policy is of benefit not only to birds but also to their predators. Hostile animals, and animal abusers.

You may be tempted to rescue a nestling only if the nest cannot be located or if it has been destroyed. Many of these infants are abandoned with no reason other than your scent—that is an old wives’ tale. Babies actually have a poor sense of smell and will not notice your scent on the nestling.

If, after a long period of observation, you see no sign of a nest, the bird is probably orphaned and in need of expert care. Persons who specialize in raising and rehabilitating orphaned and injured wildlife are called wildlife rehabilitators. These persons, most of whom have degrees and/or certificates, are licensed by state wildlife agencies to care for native wild animals. To locate such persons in your area, telephone an animal shelter, veterinary hospital, nature center, or Extension Service agent. They will be able to guide you to someone with the facilities and experience to raise your nestling. Your primary job will be to keep the bird warm and comfortable until you can get it to a wildlife rehabilitator.

If you cannot immediately get the bird to expert help, there are a few things you can do to keep it warm and safe. The first is to provide some sort of temporary housing. A quart berry basket, such as that in which strawberries are packaged, makes an ideal nest. Line the basket with unscented facial tissues and mold them to the shape of the basket. Whenever the baby soles its nest, remove the dirty tissues and replace them. Place the nest basket inside a large cardboard box. The box will keep the bird safely penned if it should jump or tumble from the basket. Place the box in a quiet, draft-free part of the house, preferably out of reach of young children.

Warmth is critical to the survival of a young bird. If the animal is chilled when it is discovered, vigorously rub your hands together to warm them and gently cup the bird between them. The nest basket can be warmed with either a heating pad or water bottle. The heating pad should be set on low and placed under the cardboard container. Or, fill two glass jars with warm water, close tightly, dry them, wrap them in small towels, and place them on opposite sides of the nest basket. Periodically check the temperature inside the basket to make sure that the bird is warm and comfortable. Too much heat can cause as much harm as too little. If the bird holds its mouth open and pants, it is overheated.

A bird that has just been rescued is probably too chilled and frightened to swallow food, so be careful feeding a bird only if it cannot immediately be taken to a wildlife rehabilitator. Feeding a bird is a critical process. If you do not attempt to feed a solid diet to a baby bird that has been chilled, it may die. Start with warm milk sweetened with a bit of sugar. Use a medicine dropper and placement single drop in the bird’s mouth or on the tip of its beak. Allow the bird to swallow before offering milk again.

Once you are sure that the bird can swallow, start feeding very small bites at intervals of several minutes until it is no longer hungry. A good basic diet for songbirds is a mixture of ground cornmeal, sunflower seeds, and canary seed. You can substitute canned dog or cat food, warm milk, the yolk of a hard-boiled egg, and baby cereal. Mix the ingredients to the consistency of a paste that can be picked up on a toothpick tip. A small piece of food is intended only as an emergency ration to satisfy the animal’s hunger until you can expect than put the bird on a proper diet.

A grey squirrel, a branch, and an ear of corn: if you provide separate snacks for squirrels, they are less likely to raid songbird feeders.

value the natural world. Backyard landscaping can provide wildlife habitat. Depending upon your time and level of commitment, you can help birds in a number of ways, from simply putting out a bird feeder to creating yards filled with plants providing wildlife food and shelter.

Sunflower seed (especially black oil sunflower seed and white millet are the foods preferred by most birds. Sunflower seed is a favorite of more than forty kinds of birds, including chickadees, evening grosbeaks, tufted titmice, blue jays, and cardinals. Offer it in hanging or covered feeders on stands some distance from the ground. Scattering some sunflower seed on the ground for squirrels will help prevent them from attacking the feeder.

Millet (white or red) is eaten by at least fifteen species of ground-feeding birds such as sparrows, mourning doves, juncos, and bob-white quail. Offer it in flat, shallow dishes set on the ground, in hopper feeders, or scattered on the ground.

Thistle seed, also called niger seed, is a special favorite of goldfinches and will attract other birds as well. It should be offered in hanging feeders. Special thistle feeders are available that have smaller-than-normal holes which are notorious for their opportunist habit of pilfering food intended for other species. A simple solution to this problem is to purchase packages of specialty seed. Such mixes contain thistle, sunflower, or safflower seeds. Despite the higher prices of specialty bird feed, you will actually be saving money because a small quantity will feed as many birds as an entire bag of food.

Squirrels and birds can coexist. The solution to this problem is to purchase packages of specialty seed. Such mixes contain thistle, sunflower, or safflower seeds. Despite the higher prices of specialty bird feed, you will actually be saving money because a small quantity will feed as many birds as an entire bag of food.

Hummingbird feeders are available in a variety of shapes and sizes. Most hummingbirds migrate to warm tropical areas for the winter in order to survive. Feeding them after early August may stop them from continuing their migration.

Merchandise can be discouraged by the price of nursery stock. Often, you can obtain attractive and expensive seed and shrubs just by taking shovel in hand and salvaging plants destined for bulldozing at construction sites. (Ask permission first, of course!) Dogswoods, mountain laurel, and hollies are a few of the ornamental shrubs found growing in the wild that are popular with people and wildlife alike.

To attract a variety of wild animals, you should select a diversity of plants. There is no one plant that will be favored by all of the birds, mammals, and reptiles native to your area. Supplement your plantings with feeders to assure your wildlife guests of a varied and nutritional diet. Wild animals will also require water. A small pool, bird bath, or other regular water source will help attract wildlife to your yard.

With a little bit of effort, you will soon have wild animals crawling, flying, and walking to your wildlife garden.

Recommended Reading
Want more information on wildlife gardens? We recommend the following:
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President John A. Hoyt to Head World Society for the Protection of Animals

Directors of the World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA), meeting in Luxembourg from May 28 to 31, elected as their president for the next two years HSUS President John A. Hoyt. In this capacity, Mr. Hoyt heads the largest international animal-protection society, composed of 364 member societies representing sixty-two countries. "The abuse and suffering experienced by animals is universal," said Mr. Hoyt, "and the WSPA is uniquely in a position to bring them significant relief by combining the efforts of hundreds of societies, representing literally millions of individuals worldwide. It is also that organization which can spearhead international efforts to eradicate permanently the cruelty and misuse to which animals are so often subjected."

With its headquarters in London, the WSPA works extensively throughout the world. Either directly or indirectly through the efforts of its staff or member societies, nearly every major legislative body throughout the world is petitioned vigorously and with regularity seeking protection for animals. Informational and educational materials are provided in several languages to assist individual organizations, national governments, and numerous international agencies in providing for more humane consideration and treatment of animals.

There is rarely a major world disaster to which the WSPA does not respond with manpower, money, supplies, and equipment to provide emergency relief for the animals that are victims of such disasters. Joining the WSPA directors in Luxembourg were delegates from twenty-eight countries meeting in conference for two days. Several major addresses and conference resolutions provided both inspiration and direction for the program and activities of this international body during the next two years.

Major consideration was given to the export of live sheep from Australia, New Zealand, and the United States destined for international shipment both by land and sea, which results in appalling suffering and unacceptable mortality rates. After hearing impassioned presentations by representatives from both New Zealand and Australia, the WSPA passed a resolution, "Calling upon the governments of New Zealand and Australia to take immediate steps to legislate against any future shipments of live animals for slaughter...and endorsing the decision of the WSPA board to authorize the imposition and implementation of a worldwide consumer boycott of sheep products originating from either of these countries if either or both governments fail to take immediate and positive steps to end the export of live sheep for slaughter." As of August, no significant response had been made, although a dialogue between the WSPA and New Zealand officials had begun.

Shipment of live sheep and goats from the United States into Mexico, where many are destined for slaughter under inhumane conditions, are currently being investigated by the HSUS and the WSPA's Western Hemisphere office in Boston, Massachusetts (see Around the Regions). Delegates to the biennial conference strongly urged the European Economic Community to implement a ban against the importation of all products from trapped fur animals into member countries, a ban similar to that imposed against the importation of the skins of harp seals. This latter action has been generally recognized as the turning point in bringing the clubbing of Canadian harp seal pups to an end.

The conference delegates also endorsed the decision of the WSPA board of directors to launch an international anti-fur campaign. A commission to implement this action has been formed and is currently developing a campaign strategy.

Significant concern was expressed by WSPA delegates regarding the violence and terrorism increasingly being associated with efforts to "liberate" animals. In response, the conference approved a resolution that "unequivocally deplores and denounces all acts of violence performed in pursuit of animal protection...and affirms that compassion for animals must also embrace compassion for humans, and that the cause of animal protection is neither furthered nor enhanced by such reprehensible tactics and behavior."

Other resolutions affirmed the WSPA's complete opposition to the surgical mutilation of companion animals for cosmetic purposes; battery-caged; the real call for; sow stall-rearing systems; and the barbaric surgical procedure called mulezing performed on Australian sheep and lambs.

A new program recommended to the WSPA directors by President Hoyt is a partnership coupling major animal-protection societies with newly developing societies in Third World countries, where animal protection receives virtually no public or governmental support. Several societies have already joined The HSUS in pledging their participation and support. During his tenure as president, Mr. Hoyt will travel throughout the world on behalf of the WSPA, meeting with numerous member societies, negotiating with government officials for more effective laws and practices affecting the welfare of animals, and seeking to enlist an ever-growing number of humanitarians worldwide into the WSPA family.

The HSUS is pleased and honored that its own president, John A. Hoyt, has been chosen to lead this significant international organization speaking and working on behalf of animals. If you are interested in becoming an individual member of the WSPA, write to the Western Hemisphere Office, WSPA, 20 Perkins Street, P.O. Box 190, Boston, MA 02130.
It is ironic that the animal-welfare movement has been unable to articulate a coherent portrait of what we stand for to the public, as the two great pioneers of our movement—Henry Bergh and George Angell—were very explicit in conveying their purpose more than a century ago. When Angell was asked why he spent his life working for the rights of animals, he simply responded: "We must transcend the one universal experience that can be comprehended by all, for it transcends artificial language and intellectual barriers. Suffering is clearly not the only relevant moral factor pertaining to the treatment of animals, as any abuse of life and of itself violates the symmetry and sanctity of nature; however, the universality of suffering must be more imaginatively imparted to the public. Only we could stop quarreling and competing amongst ourselves long enough to reflect on the power of Angell's words regarding "working at the roots" of suffering. In the most literal sense, Angell and Bergh were pure "radicals"—meaning they strove to reach the basic core of suffering. It is in this sense that all of us, irrespective of ideology, should return to the movement's roots, for the larger society must come to understand that suffering honors no boundaries and spares no species—and that which diminishes one being, diminishes all beings. We need not equivocate or complicate our message, for Bergh said it quite simply in 1870: "...a creature as small as an ant is as important to the infinite scheme...the mightiest person on earth. The rights of animals are as sacred and inviolable as those of a human."

Bergh and Angell did not intend to shock or intimidate the public with their "radical" views, but they understood the necessity of our movement to have a firm and all-encompassing moral foundation—not rigid to the point of being unyielding, but clearly upholding the universal principles of respect for all life. We are widely perceived by the public as an acrimonious group of malcontents who agree on nothing other than a decided preference for animals over humans. How could they think otherwise, given our propensity to expend more energy bickering and maneuvering amongst ourselves than creatively expressing our commitment to the rights of nonhumans alone, rather than to all life. Every endeavor we undertake is skillfully distorted by our adversaries, for they capitalize on the prevailing belief that our movement values animal life over humans. We must begin to communicate unequivocally that the world we seek is not one of competition between human and nonhuman, but where all beings are viewed as indispensable threads of a living tapestry—interconnected to each other and to all the natural processes that sustain life.

We are all gratified by the growing activism and visibility of our movement, but there is little tangible indication of a shift in public attitudes. Indeed, our vocabulary for communicating with the public has become even more esoteric, as phrases such as "animal extremists" and "inherent rights" have virtually no meaning to an unenlightened populace. Even more troubling is that our words have become more removed from individual suffering, so have our attitudes. Caring people who do "hands-on" work with companion and other animals have been made to feel irrelevant by those in the movement who believe we should all be involved in "loftier" pursuits. It is in vogue now to talk in terms of billions, and though we are all pleased by the movement's expanded vision, it borders on the bizarre to speak derivatively of those who address individual suffering—no matter how small the scale. "Hands-on" work might be out of fashion but suffering never is, and all of our noble sentiments about billions mean nothing if not translated into individual compassion.

What I am suggesting is a transfer of energy from our self-destructive patterns to bring our message creatively to the public with the power of our witness. We cannot produce miracles overnight, given our limited numbers and resources, but we can begin to communicate imaginatively the magic of life to all who will listen—not by words alone, but through our own conduct reflecting the values we seek to impart to others. The differences between us are real and cannot and should not be ignored; however, if we have any integrity as a movement, then we must transcend these differences in conveying our life-affirming message to the public. It is expedient to blame an insensitive citizenry for our lack of progress, but sober reflection is often best served by looking in the mirror.

Edward S. Duvin is director of the Center for the Respect of Life and the Environment, a division of The HSUS.

Working at the Roots
by Edward S. Duvin
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A Unified Voice for Animals

by Ann Church

Does this sound familiar? You’re on the staff of a local humane society, you’ve just received a report of starving dogs at a local farm, the shelter’s refrigerator is on its last legs, your volunteer program is out of control, and you need to hold a membership meeting for which you haven’t even prepared an agenda. On top of everything else, you want to work for enactment of a stronger state law, to get your shelter. You need to clone yourself, but until that’s possible, where can you get help?

The answer, in many cases, is a humane federation—a statewide coalition of animal activists. A federation gives its members a strong, unified voice, broadly extends its influence beyond its individual members, and can provide services needed by more than one member at the same time. As Jack Conlon, current president of the Florida Federation of Humane Societies and member of the board of directors of The HSUS, says, “A federation should be what individual societies cannot be themselves.”

A federation is an ideal way to ensure that the humane community is well represented in a legislative body. The federation can be a significant power—choosing legislative priorities for the session; assigning or hiring someone to lobby at the state capitol; enlisting various members to contact their own representatives; and gathering pertinent and relevant information in the state for use in lobbying key legislators. This approach is far more effective than a variety of groups all working for something different.

An example of a successful statewide group with a specific purpose is the Texas Humane Information Network (THIN). Members of this federation meet annually to set legislative goals; have formed an effective telephone calling system; and can point to the passage of several state laws, including a circus- and zoo bill that brings facilities under Texas Department of Health standards. Other federations have been established to improve the animal-shelter operations within the state. The Wisconsin Federated Humane Societies, for example, sponsors annual seminars on animal-control issues, inviting speakers from national groups, local universities, and the local department of agriculture. Topics covered include such items as euthanasia techniques, volunteer programs, and disease control.

Generally speaking, what is of interest to one society or shelter is probably of interest to another. A federation plays an invaluable role in relaying information to all. For example, if a state department of health has issued regulations on how to use or obtain sodium pentobarbital for euthanasia, the federation can obtain the information and share it. If quite a few shelters have a complaint about the new regulations, a federation can analyze the situation, formulate a workable solution, and work it out with the agency much more easily than can individuals at the local level. Working through the federation, individuals can send one representative for all groups directly to the state agency. The federation spokesperson will have greater knowledge, based on the information provided by people throughout the state, and will be better received by the state employee, since an official will probably have one knowledgeable person to field complaints from all over the state.

Not all work handled by a federation, however, deals directly with animal care. When a Florida insurance department issued regulations on workers’ compensation and liability insurance, personnel at local animal-control facilities could have been adversely affected. Federation intervention resolved most of the problems without taking time away from local shelters’ primary tasks.

Federations also serve to facilitate networking. It’s not unusual for a federation to have meetings at various conferences, such as the HSUS conference held every autumn, to learn about a variety of local, state, and national concerns and share it with all those back home.

A federation can be a conduit between local and national groups, as well. A good example is the Michigan Federation of Humane Societies’ excellent article on Project WILD, published in its newsletter, in which it gives a clear explanation of the program, views of the Michigan department of natural resources, and information on how to get help from national groups. While issues of great magnitude—factory farming, the use of animals in research, and some wildlife issues—are generally well researched and documented by national groups that want to encourage local action, a federation can help interpret and analyze the information provided to determine its impact at the local level. Such a coalition can get local societies involved in programs such as National Day of the Seal or behind legislation promoted by national groups.

Humane federations are generally statewide coalitions of humane societies, animal-control workers, and similarly minded animal activists.

Starting a Federation

If you live in a state where no active statewide organization exists:

1. Define your purpose sufficiently to attract and keep members. What is your unique contribution?
2. Define your purpose sufficiently to attract and keep members. What is your unique contribution?
3. Define your purpose sufficiently to attract and keep members. What is your unique contribution?
4. Contact others in the state involved in animal-welfare issues—including HSUS regional offices and offices of other national groups—to get their opinions and ideas. Does a federation currently exist? Has one ever existed? If so, what happened to it? Find out as much as possible about the past before you proceed.
5. Contact community animal-welfare leaders in the state and organize a meeting to discuss the need for a federation, its policies, its immediate goals, and how to best proceed to organize. At this point, you are still planning a federation: be flexible, listen to ideas, enlist the help of good people. Try not to let old squabbles defeat you before you start.
6. Anticipate potential problems and address them during your formation. For example, if you don’t want a particular group to become a member and consequently use the federation name to its advantage and at your expense, define your standards for membership. You could require all shelters to have a policy against turning animals over for research purposes or prohibit use of the decompression chamber. You could require everyone to act in accordance with your standards for membership. Oregon activists have recently created the Oregon Animal Welfare Alliance with emphasis on nonprofit animal-welfare and -rights groups. This was done because the animal-control interests are so well organized already that it seemed unnecessary to include them in this group.

7. Contact a lawyer to do the necessary work to make your group a legal entity. It is best to hire someone with experience in this field.
8. Set a specific and attainable goal the first year. Success will breed enthusiasm and increase membership.
one specific need but have evolved into multiple-focused organizations. Improving animal-sheltering functions throughout the state, lobbying, creating humane societies in sections of the state unserved, and bringing humane workers together as a support, tact, and social group are a few of the reasons for federation establishment. Most federations have the following characteristics in common:

- They charge nominal annual dues ranging from $5 to $50 depending upon whether it is an organization or a federation. An individual membership fee. Granting may be difficult, and raising humane organizations implementing programs to reach these goals. Your long-term goal may be in place that will enable the federation's position to be formulated. In most cases, someone simply polls—by phone—the executive board of the group. Even though mistakes may be made, if a federation is unable to work more quickly when necessary, that group may become stagnant and members dissatisfied.

- They include diverse representation within the organization of individuals and societies throughout the state. For example, if all the societies from the large cities are in a state federation—excluding the small towns—the organization is not a true federation. That fact will ultimately become clear to those individuals it is trying to influence. It is also wise to have a good representation of male and female, young and old, and varying humane viewpoints.

- They have a commitment by members to abide by majority rule and act in the interest of the association's position on animal views. This association may be in the form of a donation from the member group's policy handbook, such as The HSUS's, which states prior to an annual meeting, Holloway says, "THIN is the political arm of every humane society in Texas." Because THIN has clearly established its goals, it doesn't mislead anyone. Writing policy statements isn't an easy task, but it can be made simpler if you obtain another federation. The HSUS's, which endorses the association's written policy statements prior to an annual meeting, has been clear in some states that a county in your state, but your society, is characterized by getting entire humane viewpoints. The HSUS has an executive staff who are well-manned humane societies in every state, well-manned humane societies in every state.

- They maintain a board of public members. Although most yearn for one! Volunteers usually carry out planned activities. They publish a newsletter on a regular basis. They offer workshops or conference seminars to educate members on matters of common interest.

- They seldom have a paid staff, although most years for one volunteer. Volunteers usually carry out planned activities. They publish a newsletter on a regular basis. They offer workshops or conference seminars to educate members on matters of common interest.

- They offer workshops or conferences to educate members on matters of common interest.

- They hold annual meetings for the entire membership. They hold board meetings as often as necessary—usually four times a year.

- They have a clear policy. It is imperative that the group know why it exists. If the primary purpose is to help form local societies and facilitate animal control, then it is misleading to say the federation will get much attention. THIN was organized for the expressed purpose of building a network of work on legislation. As President Cile Holloway says, "THIN is the political arm of every humane society in Texas." Because THIN has clearly established its goals, it doesn't mislead anyone. Writing policy statements isn't an easy task, but it can be made simpler if you obtain another federation. The HSUS's, which endorses the association's written policy statements prior to an annual meeting, has been clear in some states that a county in your state, but your society, is characterized by getting entire humane viewpoints. The HSUS has an executive staff who are well-manned humane societies in every state, well-manned humane societies in every state.

- They have a clear policy. It is imperative that the group know why it exists. If the primary purpose is to help form local societies and facilitate animal control, then it is misleading to say the federation will get much attention. THIN was organized for the expressed purpose of building a network of work on legislation. As President Cile Holloway says, "THIN is the political arm of every humane society in Texas." Because THIN has clearly established its goals, it doesn't mislead anyone. Writing policy statements isn't an easy task, but it can be made simpler if you obtain another federation. The HSUS's, which endorses the association's written policy statements prior to an annual meeting, has been clear in some states that a county in your state, but your society, is characterized by getting entire humane viewpoints. The HSUS has an executive staff who are well-manned humane societies in every state, well-manned humane societies in every state.

- They have a clear policy. It is imperative that the group know why it exists. If the primary purpose is to help form local societies and facilitate animal control, then it is misleading to say the federation will get much attention. THIN was organized for the expressed purpose of building a network of work on legislation. As President Cile Holloway says, "THIN is the political arm of every humane society in Texas." Because THIN has clearly established its goals, it doesn't mislead anyone. Writing policy statements isn't an easy task, but it can be made simpler if you obtain another federation. The HSUS's, which endorses the association's written policy statements prior to an annual meeting, has been clear in some states that a county in your state, but your society, is characterized by getting entire humane viewpoints. The HSUS has an executive staff who are well-manned humane societies in every state, well-manned humane societies in every state.

- They have a clear policy. It is imperative that the group know why it exists. If the primary purpose is to help form local societies and facilitate animal control, then it is misleading to say the federation will get much attention. THIN was organized for the expressed purpose of building a network of work on legislation. As President Cile Holloway says, "THIN is the political arm of every humane society in Texas." Because THIN has clearly established its goals, it doesn't mislead anyone. Writing policy statements isn't an easy task, but it can be made simpler if you obtain another federation. The HSUS's, which endorses the association's written policy statements prior to an annual meeting, has been clear in some states that a county in your state, but your society, is characterized by getting entire humane viewpoints. The HSUS has an executive staff who are well-manned humane societies in every state, well-manned humane societies in every state.
"Studying" Whales to Death
by Campbell Plowden

Nineteen eighty-six was supposed to be the year that all commercial whaling stopped, but, as the International Whaling Commission (IWC) opened its annual meeting in Malmo, Sweden, this year, the atmosphere among whale protectionists was far from jubilant. Norwegian vessels had just started killing minke whales, making Norway the third country to violate openly the IWC's moratorium. Norwegian whalers were engaged in a hunt to which the IWC had supposedly granted protection status, but, since Norway had defied itself a scientific permit to kill as many whales as it wants. The country must only submit its research plan to the commission's scientific committee for comment. Even though this committee found serious flaws in both the Korean and Icelandic proposals, both countries were intent on whaling under their scientific masquerade.

With the idea that Iceland and other whaling nations would lose their rights in response to its previous violation, whalers were again on the offensive. The primary debate of the IWC meeting was how to prevent the continuation of commercial whaling under the guise of scientific research. Korea had already submitted plans to conduct lethal research, and other whaling nations were gearing up to follow suit.

Although the entire IWC must vote on proposals for commercial whaling and aboriginal whaling quotas, under its rules, any nation can issue itself a scientific permit to kill as many whales as it wants. The country must only submit its research plan to the commission's scientific committee for comment. Even though this committee found serious flaws in both the Korean and Icelandic proposals, both countries were intent on whaling under their scientific masquerade.

Iceland began its "research" hunt immediately after the IWC meeting concluded. It interpreted the consumption resolution as allowing it to consume some of the flesh, grind up the guts and bones for fertilizer, and still export 90 percent of the prime meat to Japan to reap $20 million in sales. The U.S. said this was a violation of the spirit of the IWC resolution: Iceland would have to curtail its hunt or risk a ban on the import of Icelandic fish to the U.S. Such sanctions would cost Iceland much more than the revenue gained from its small whaling industry. Iceland responded by saying it would locally consume 51 percent of all the whale products. Whale meat recipes were published in Icelandic newspapers, but most of the meat will still be fed to minks and other animals in fur ranches. It is not clear yet whether the U.S. will agree to let Japan import any meat from Iceland without banning Icelandic imports if it does. Iceland will reap an impressive profit. Due to the reduced supply, Japanese whale prices are now skyrocketing to a minimum of $10 per pound for whale meat. Prime cuts are selling for up to $56 per pound—"but we had realized on "scientific" whaling."

The bitter irony of all this parading around the "scientific whaling" concept is that no whales need to be killed at all for true scientific study. Reliable, cost-effective techniques in the study of live whales are much more promising and have the potential to advance our knowledge in ways far more meaningful than sacrificing precious whale stocks.

Since the Icelandic government has refused to yield and the U.S. and the IWC are at an impasse, The HSUS has launched a boycott of Icelandic fish products. We hope that imposing economic hardship on the Icelandic fishing industry will move the nation to abide by its earlier promise to halt whaling.

Within days of verifying that Norwegian whalers had started hunting in violation of the moratorium, U.S. Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldridge certified Norway under the Pelly Amendment, granting Norway ninety days to react before facing the strong possibility that President Reagan would order a ban on the import of Norwegian fish products. Rather than get involved in acrimonious negotiations with the U.S., Norway's Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland announced that she would undertake a scientific whaling at the end of the 1987 season. If the Japanese and Soviet whalers have decided to halt their whaling at the end of the 1988 season, the Japanese and Soviet whalers would undertake a scientific whaling program to assess the status of whale populations around Norway. The HSUS and other groups continued to press for U.S. sanctions unless Norway promised to withdraw its official objection to the IWC moratorium and pledged to conduct only nonlethal research. But, when President Reagan let Norway off the hook, no sanctions were to be imposed—for now.

The HSUS Vice President Patricia Forkan (standing) observes a tense moment at the IWC meeting during negotiations between Dr. Roger Payne (seated center), IWC Chairman I.L.G. Steward (right), R. Delpeche of the Seychelles, and Elizabeth Kemf of the World Wildlife Fund.

It took some time for U.S. concerns about Korea's suspect research whaling program to reach the right ears in the Korean government; but once the realization dawned that the bogus research project (killing 160 whales per year) was jeopardizing the country's multi-million-dollar fishing allocation in U.S. coastal waters, the "scientific" hunt came to a screeching halt. Korea has now begun negotiations with the U.S. that should end Korea's kill. The HSUS and other groups had pinned their hopes on shutting down the Japanese whaling industry by winning a lawsuit they had filed against the U.S. government for making a deal with Japan that permitted it to keep whaling until 1988 without incurring U.S. fisheries' sanctions. The Supreme Court, unfortunately, sided with the government in a 5–4 ruling on June 30. Its basic argument was that, since the Packwood-Magnuson Amendment did not specify what criteria should be used to determine when a nation was "reducing the effectiveness" of the IWC, the secretary of commerce acted within the law by putting aside sanctions if Japan agreed to halt whaling by 1988.

The task of whale-protection groups is now clear. The law must be changed to stop the IWC's decision—that a nation that voluntarily violates a whaling quota is reducing the effectiveness of the IWC and should be subject to automatic sanctions. Until then, the U.S./Japan bilateral deal will stand. Japan has formally notified the IWC of the dates it will withdraw its objections to the commercial moratorium for different aspects of its whaling, but it has not abandoned its maneuvers to continue whaling in some form.

Although the moratorium seems intact on paper, turning it into reality is the immediate problem. That will mean getting tough with Iceland and Korea and reshaping the IWC scientific permit process to close this loophole so that Japan, Norway, and others will not study whales to death.
NAAHE Adopts New Strategy Against Biased Materials

Traditionally, the National Asso­ciation for the Advancement of Hu­mane Education (NAAHE) has de­voted its efforts to locating and publicizing appropriate animal-rel­ated educational materials and prac­tices. Recently, however, NAAHE has found it necessary to alert its members and others in the educa­tional community to the publica­tion of materials that may perpetu­ate inaccuracies and/or negative attitudes and behavior toward ani­mals.

To help disseminate this impor­tant information, NAAHE has added a special "Beware" section to the "Beware" page in its Children & Animals magazine. Recent "Be­ware" segments have alerted teach­ers and other educators to the biases and inaccuracies in the Proj­ect WILD curriculum guides and to a new filmstrip designed to pro­mote hunting.

NAAHE has also started send­ing an "action letter" that explains the problems with specific mate­rials to NAAHE members and urges them to write to the publisher in­volved. So far, the program has met with considerable success. Earlier this year, for example, an article/teaching unit on the Old West ap­peared in Instructor, a national mag­azine for teachers. The article indi­ce­trically promoted rodeo and other current exploitive, animal-related practices. An action letter was im­mediately sent to NAAHE members to alert them to the article and urge them to write to the editor of In­structor. The editor responded very positively to the concerns NAAHE members expressed and subse­quently printed three letters under the heading "Readers Against Ro­deo." This issue also included a teaching activity designed to help students question rodeo from an ethical perspective. The activity linked The Humane Society of the United States as a resource for stu­dents and teachers.

Action letters have also been sent in response to articles appearing in Highlights magazine and National Geographic World.

Publications, Testimony Are Highlights of Institute’s Summer

This summer, The HSUS In­stitute for the Study of Animal Prob­lems has been working to complete editing and publication of the third annual volume of Advances in Ani­mal Welfare Science, to be avail­able later this year. Written by Dr. Michael Fox, has writ­ten a new textbook critical of the care and use of laboratory animals. This volume, Laboratory Animal Husbandry, has been published by State University of New York Press. The institute plans as well to pub­ish a detailed study, recently com­pleted under its auspices, on the worldwide impact of the cattle in­dustry on the ecology and wildlife of tropical and deciduous forests.

Institute staff presented testi­mony to the House Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry on June 11, 1986, on the impact of genetically engineered bovine growth hormone on the health and welfare of dairy cows (see the Spring 1986 HSUS News). The subcommittee demanded that the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) prepare an environmental impact statement on this product, which gave support to our petition to the Food and Drug Administra­tion to do the same. Other testi­mony, undertaken in conjunction with Jeremy Rifkin and the Foun­dation on Economic Trends concern­ing the USDA’s research on farm animal productivity (including the insertion of human growth genes into pig and sheep embryos), has had a setback in U.S. District Court. Judge Charles R. Richey’s ruling that this research does not have signifi­cant impact is being appealed.

The institute is recording cases of pesticide poisoning in compan­ion animals, a problem little publi­cized but frequently documented, especially in cats treated for fleas and in companion animals whose horse and garden environments have been sprayed with pesticides. The Delta Society, a non-profit public service organization, awarded Dr. Fox the Delta Society Distin­guished Service Award for 1986 for his contributions to the understanding of relationships be­tween people and animals at its in­stitutional meeting in Detroit, Mich., on November 18. The United Egg Producers (UEP), which accounts for approximately 60 percent of the egg industry in the U.S., has solicited the insti­tute’s input in its drafting of hu­mane husbandry codes of practice for its member producers. Dr. Fox was invited to speak at the UEP’s annual meeting in Scottsdale, Ariz., where his topic was the welfare of laying hens and the scientific and humane concerns in the raising of these hens.

Finally, Dr. Fox addressed hu­mane groups in Ronske, Va., on dog behavior and socialization, and Detroit, Mich., on factory farming and animal rights.

Monitoring the Pribilof Subsistence Seal Hunt

On July 21, Frantz Dantzler, The HSUS’s former director of investiga­tions and current Midwest regional di­rector, flew to St. Paul Island, off the coast of Alaska, to observe the 1986 subsistence hunt of North Pacific fur seals conducted by native peoples. This was the second annual subsistence­only kill since the huge commercial hunt was halted in 1985. Exhaustive efforts by animal-protection groups, led by The HSUS, had brought about the demise of the treaty that governed the large-scale hunt, and only a small subsistence hunt now remains (see the Fall 1985 HSUS News). Mr. Dantzler was accompanied by a top HSUS observer of the subsistence kill and the government inspectors supervising it. Here is Mr. Dan­tler’s report of his observations.

Upon my arrival in St. Paul, I was struck by how conditions had changed during the last two years. In 1980, to observe the large—scale com­mercial hunt. Most notable were the deteriorating condition of the buildings, the installation of a small telephone system, and the use of all—terrain ve­hicles, which has caused widespread environmental damage.

Seals were killed each weekday, be­ginning at approximately 2:00 p.m. Although a schedule of hunt locations had been made available in advance, no one directed me to the hunt, the schedule was not always followed, so I had to call officials to determine the precise location of each day’s "harvest." I then followed the "harvest" crew to the designated kill site.

In form, this year’s hunt was con­ducted similarly to previous hunts I have observed. Experienced crews, with representatives from the Marine Fish­eries Service, would round up seals from the rookeries and drive them to the killing area. The seals would then be divided into groups of 8 to 10 and driven to where stunners waited with clubs. Each seal was clubbed one to three times. I recognized some of the natives acting as stunners, stickers, skinners, and collectors from my visits last year.

In short, in the last two years we have saved more than 28,000 seals from bru­tal destruction and completely elimi­nated the commercial use of these seals.

Since my presence seemed to cause con­siderable tension to the workers, but, aside from a few catcalls and insults, I experienced no problems in my role as an observer. Beyond everything else, I was pleased in many ways to have been a part of this program: this is a great example of where diligent effort has succeeded in making significant ad­vances in the humane treatment and welfare of animals.

Skinners butcher seeds killed during 1986 hunt.
First Step for Alternatives

The HSUS has joined with the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (MSPCA) to seek legislation to promote the use of non-animal alternatives in toxicity testing, which determines levels of irritancy, carcinogenicity, and corrosiveness. This move is particularly timely because the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has been under pressure from Congress to complete testing of the tremendous backlog of substances already on the market and because non-animal alternatives to toxicity testing offer the greatest opportunity to relieve immediately the suffering of the largest number of animals in research. Current toxicity testing is almost universally conducted on whole animals and is so inefficient that more than 20,000 potentially toxic substances and more than 3,500 new pesticides are now in use that have never been adequately tested for human safety. Such testing is often unreliable in its results, time consuming, and costly. It would take many decades to test all the untested substances currently on the market. These untested substances pose an immediate danger to human health whose impact will not be fully understood for years to come. With all the new substances flooding the marketplace every year, current testing methods will never be adequate to evaluate safety, but, in haste to comply with congressional demands, EPA may turn to its traditional testing methods unless we encourage it legislatively to utilize non-animal alternatives.

According to a report commissioned by Congress and issued by the Office of Technology Assessment, the number of animals used in research, testing, and education is estimated to be between 17 million and 60 million animals each year in the U.S. alone. One-third are estimated to be used each year in painful toxicity tests. As a result of persuasion by The HSUS and the MSPCA, the House Appropriations Subcommittee, which funds EPA, has urged this agency to accelerate its non-animal testing.

"The Committee is aware," the subcommittee wrote, "that EPA is attempting to reduce reliance on the use of live mammalian species (whole animals) in their test requirements and research. The Committee strongly encourages EPA to continue and enhance these efforts to develop and validate alternative test methods that do not require the use of whole animals or that minimize the numbers of whole animals used in testing. These alternative test systems should include chemical-marker methodologies, in vitro cell tests, and the use of modeling techniques and structure–activity relationships." Thanks to subcommittee members Reps. Bob Traxler of Michigan and Bill Green of New York, the initial step has been taken in establishing such a program at EPA.

We urge you to let your representatives and the key individuals listed below know that you want to see an alternatives program at EPA: The Hon. David Durenberger, Subcommittee on Toxic Substances, 410 Dirksen Bldg., Washington, DC 20510; The Hon. H. Bay Baucom, Subcommittee on Toxic Substances, 410 Dirksen Bldg., Washington, DC 20510; The Hon. Michael Barnes, Subcommittee on Natural Resources, 821 House Annex I, Washington, DC 20515; and The Hon. Claudia Schneider, Subcommittee on Natural Resources, 821 House Annex I, Washington, DC 20515.

Pound Seizure Bill Battered

Rep. Robert J. Mrzake's Pet Protection Act (H.R. 4871), which would save an estimated 300,000 shelter animals from being used in biomedical research projects funded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH), has prompted a flood of mail on Capitol Hill. If H.R. 4871 is enacted, it will establish a virtual ban on pound seizure by prohibiting the use of NIH funds for the purchase of dogs or cats obtained directly or indirectly from animal shelters.

"We are aware that shelter animals account for only 1 percent of the total number of animals used in research, the scientific community is extremely threatened by the Mrzake bill. Researchers fear that accepting any regulation of their experimentation on animals—however small—would lead to other, more serious restrictions. For this reason, the biomedical research community has launched a vocal lobbying campaign against H.R. 4871, flooding congressional offices with mail and visits from medical college deans, researchers, and representatives of breeders of laboratory animals. A dean of a well-known medical school even wrote Congress arguing that the death of shelter animals in biomedical research is preferable to the "inhuman euthanasia" administered in animal shelters!

The research industry has also taken its attacks against the Mrzake bill to the Washington press, criticizing the legislation in an article by actor Charlton Heston in The Washington Post and in another in The Washingtonian magazine.

Because researchers have pulled out all stops to fight H.R. 4871, it's imperative that Congress hear again from you, the taxpayer footing the bill for this research. The only way to stop pound seizure is to let your congressmen know of your support for the Mrzake bill. H.R. 4871 has 39 co-sponsors, listed below. If your representative's name does not appear, please encourage him or her to join the growing number of representatives who support an end to pound seizure. If your representative's name is on the list, please write a note of thanks to your congressman who supports an end to pound seizure.

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.

ESA Stalled

As we went to press, reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), one of the nation's most important wildlife-protection laws, was stalled in Congress. In July of 1985, the House passed a strong bill that reauthorized the ESA for three years and provided even more funding than the house bill. Both the House and the Senate successfully rebuffed hunters' efforts to amend the ESA to decrease protection for such threatened predators as the wolf and grizzly bear. However, new, S. 725 must find its way to the Senate floor before being sent into a conference committee to reconcile its differences with the house bill. After that, ESA reauthorization goes to President Reagan for signature.

A handful of powerful senators has halted S. 725, which also reauthorized the ESA for three years and provided even more funding than the house bill. Both the House and the Senate successfully rebuffed hunters' efforts to amend the ESA to decrease protection for such threatened predators as the wolf and grizzly bear. However, new, S. 725 must find its way to the Senate floor before being sent into a conference committee to reconcile its differences with the house bill. After that, ESA reauthorization goes to President Reagan for signature.

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.
Good News for AWA

In July, members of the House Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies—after being deluged with letters from animal protectionists—voted to ignore President Reagan’s recommendations to cut funds for animal-welfare programs and material which will assist in planning a will. We will be happy to send information about our animal programs and material which will assist in planning a will.

Strong Suit for Animals

H.R. 4535, which would allow individuals and animal-protection groups to sue the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) to enforce the AWA, needs cosponsors. The bill was introduced by Rep. Charlie Rose of North Carolina and Rod Chandler of Washington last spring (see the Spring 1986 HSUS News). The AWA, which requires standards of care for animals in laboratories, puppy mills, circuses, and zoos, is necessary even in lean economic times. It also proves, once again, that let’s not carry clout with public officials.

Now, we must apply the same kind of pressure to make sure the Senate Agriculture Subcommittee follows the House’s lead. Write the Honorable Thad Cochran, Chairman, and the Honorable Quistin N. Hurdick, Ranking Minority Member, Senate Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies, SD-140, Dirksen Office Building, Washington, DC 20510, and urge them to match the House’s funding for the AWA.

A-Luring

On August 12, Rep. Robert K. Dornan of California introduced H.R. 5402, legislation that could conceivably bring an end to the use of live animals as lures in the training of racing dogs. H.R. 5402 would ban the interstate sale and shipment of animals intended for use as lure dogs and prohibit dogs trained on live lures from being transported across state lines for racing purposes.

The HSUS opposes dog racing. Because the overwhelming majority of greyhounds aren’t fast enough to race, they are generally destroyed (often inhumanely) or shipped off to laboratories to become research subjects. Another 100,000 small animals used as lures are torn to pieces by greyhounds in training every year. This brutality and waste will only end when greyhound trainers are forced by law to stop. In the past, whenever such legislation has been introduced on the state level, trainers have vigorously lobbied against it. We will need the support of every federal legislator to withstand such pressure at the national level. Please urge your representative to support and cosponsor this much-needed legislation.

Between Gravy Train and Dogfood Can

For the second year in a row, Rep. Bill Green of New York has assured that no money is available in the house Interior Appropriations bill for the continued massive roundups of wild horses and burros until the animals now in holding pens have been adopted. As usual, the Senate dumped millions more into its version of this bill to hold more roundups, even though homes haven’t been found for the horses previously captured.

For fiscal 1987, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has requested $15.2 million to round up and care for 3,500 animals. Although the House deleted $2.4 million in new-roundup money from its appropriations bill, the Senate not only kept the $15.2 million BLM asked for in its version but added another $29.8 million, for a total cost to taxpayers of $18.1 million!

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: Murdough S. Madden, Vice President/General Counsel, The Humane Society of the United States, 2100 I Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.
Fair Events Are Foul
Kurt Lapman, program coordinator for the Great Lakes Regional Office, was busy all summer attending horse, pony, mule, and pit-bull-dog pulls and grease pig contests held at fairs throughout the region. He observed horses with blood coming from their mouths as they were forced to pull heavy weights and pigtails, and he attempted to escape from crowds of teenagers trying to capture them in crowded enclosures. In a close call at the Meigs County Fairgrounds, two pit bulls nearly came to blows during a polling contest in front of the grandstand.

These events have no redeeming value beyond the entertainment provided ignorant or callous spectators. The Great Lakes Regional Office plans to persuade organizers to exclude such contests from future fairs.

Good-bye, Bad Zoo
After fighting a losing battle to improve conditions at the Glen Miller Park Zoo in Richmond, Ind., for over four years, the Great Lakes Regional Office was delighted to hear that a committee studying the zoo had recommended that it close down.

Regional Director Sandy Rowland first visited the zoo in 1982 after receiving numerous complaints. At that time, she found a run-down, poorly kept facility: rusty food and water bowls; small cages; flies and odors; and little concern for the safety of the zoo’s visitors and animals.

She reported these conditions to the USDA, which, until then, had found nothing wrong with the zoo. In the months to come, the Great Lakes Regional Office and the Humane Society of Tampa Bay will redouble their efforts to ensure that all Florida pounds and shelters provide unwanted animals a painless death by humane euthanasia instead of a one-way ticket to a research facility.

In the months to come, the Southeast Regional Office and the Humane Society of Tampa Bay will redouble their efforts to ensure that all Florida pounds and shelters provide unwanted animals a painless death by humane euthanasia instead of a one-way ticket to a research facility.

Oklahoma Victory
A major victory for Oklahoma in June! A mandatory spay/neuter law requiring spaying and neutering of unclaimed adopted from humane societies and animal-control agencies passed into law. The HSUS Gulf States Office helped in the writing of this bill and had worked for its passage for several years.

Border Patrol
Gulf States investigator Bernie Weller traveled extensively this summer tracking the shipment of goats and sheep from the United States into Mexico. He found many sick and injured animals being transported by truck, often for several days, without proper care. We are cooperating with the World Society for the Protection of Animals to try to find solutions to this problem.

And Then There Was One
Until just recently, four Florida pounds in the state (S.O.S.) is an effort introduced through the Florida Humane Society to ensure that unadopted pets for research. This practice, called pound seizure, has now been banned by local ordinances in three of the jurisdictions served by these facilities.

Only Hillsborough County Animal Control still allows pound seizure. Under its own policy, it sends its proclaimed dogs and cats to the University of South Florida.

Forty-five persons representing twenty-two law enforcement agencies in Southern California attended the day-long seminar; “Investigation of Illegal Animal Fighting Ventures,” hosted by the Riverside County Sheriff’s Department in June. The seminar was conducted by HSUS investigator Eric Salach.

Unfortunately, similar measures in San Bernardino County and Mendocino County, Calif., failed when they were put to the voters in June. The issue created a great deal of public attention in both places, and media interest was high. Despite the losses, it is obvious that many voters want pound seizure prohibited.

Help Wanted
The West Coast Regional Office is seeking information about how animal-control programs are conducted on Indian reservations. Recently, it received citizens’ complaints referred by the Caddo County Humane Society in Washington State concerning capture and killing of wild animals held for redemption by owners, and methods used to destroy unclaimed dogs at the Neah Bay Indian Reservation near Port Angeles.

West Coast Regional Investigator Char Drennon, at the Malahat Indian Tribal Council in Neah Bay regarding the complaint and offered any assistance we could provide on humane animal-control solutions.

We invite members and local agencies with any information to contact the West Coast Regional Office if they have had experience with or observed animal-control procedures on Indian lands. Contact HSUS/West Coast Regional Office, 1713 J St., Suite 211, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Fighting the Trap
Working in cooperation with the Vermont Federation of Humane Societies and independent humane activists, the New England Regional Office is providing resources and guidelines to ban use of the steel-jaw leghold trap in the Green Mountain State.

According to Vermont State Senator William Doyle’s 1986 poll, Vermonters favor prohibiting the use of the cruel devices in the state.

Our S.O.S. Needs Help
The California Fish and Game Commission has approved an open hunting season on squirrels from September 13, 1986, until January 1, 1987, in the San Bernardino Mountains, and a group of San Bernardino citizens has formed Save Our Squirrels to the use of the cruel devices in the state.

The West Coast Regional Office recently participated in two separate raids: one at the residence of a cock-fighter, the other involving a cock-fighter. Officers in both raids had previously attended HSUS workshops.

S.O.S. Focus on Racing
The Midwest Regional Office sponsored a conference June 27 and 28 in St. Louis, Mo., whose purpose was to organize a campaign against a statewide referendum on horse racing. The referendum, designed to strengthen the horse racing industry in Missouri, would take away from voters important decisions on where racing is allowed and whether it should continue.

A constitutional amendment approved by Missouri voters in 1964 allowed pari-mutuel wagering on horse racing, but it also granted...
Trap Ban Trial Ends

The court battle to test the constitutionality of New Jersey’s law banning use of all steel-jaw leghold traps has finally ended. A week before the ban was to go into effect, southern New Jersey trappers sued the state fish and game council asking that the spiked steel trap—a trap sometimes called the soft-clutch trap—be permitted. They claimed the original legislation did not include the padded trap. The trappers’ action caused considerable confusion; the fish and game council at one point actually wrote regulations to include this device.

The state attorney general was called upon to uphold the law as written and to defend the fish and game council’s action. The Mid-Atlantic Regional Director Nina Austenberg of Animals quickly joined the suit against the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection and the Fish and Wildlife Service of the United States in defense of the fish and game council. The HSUS and Friends of Animals quickly joined the suit to defend the fish and wildlife service. The state attorney general was made its way to Macy’s to protest the world’s largest department store’s sale of animal performing acts if, next year, it plans to hold a second annual fair.

Housing Surprise

Since, according to Ann Church, HSUS councilor of state legislation, pets-in-housing bills have been working to improve the deplorable conditions at the Vernal City, Utah, HSUS activists were delighted to see S. 1484 pass the state senate in July.

The so-called Jackman bill permits tenants who presently have dogs and cats to keep those animals, but it does not provide for future pet owners. “Naturally, we had hoped for a more comprehensive bill,” Ms. Austenberg said, “but, we are practical and are happy to protect some pets and pet owners for the time being.” Senator Christopher Hill of Utah has been uttering in his efforts to help tenants, and we are extremely grateful to him.”

Next step for this important housing issue is the state assembly.

Utah Supreme Court Upholds Constitutionality of Fur-Castration

In an important decision, the Utah Supreme Court has upheld the spaying of raccoons in Utah (HSU) to urge economic boycotts against those cities or counties that failed to provide for humane facilities and treatment of animals that are impounded there. The victory marked the end of a nearly ten-year court battle between HSU and several resident business interests, including the Vernal City, Uintah County, Utah.

Following five unsuccessful years of attempting to persuade officials to improve the deplorable conditions at the Vernal City—Uintah County pound, HSU conducted a media campaign, including a hard-hitting billboard posted in Salt Lake City, aimed at increasing public awareness of the cruelty and unhealthiness of the treatment and at publicizing the condition of the animals in the pound.

The court battle to test the constitutionality of New Jersey’s law banning use of all steel-jaw leghold traps has finally ended.

South African Billboard Case Ended Successfully

The cosmetic-marketing firm Beauty Without Cruelty has been sued in South Africa by a Cape Town furrier for defamation because of a sponsorship of a controversial animal rights campaign. The poster prominently displayed on a billboard, showing a woman dragging a fur coat dripping with blood, with the caption, “It takes up to forty dumb animals to make a fur coat. But only one to wear it. If you don’t want animals tortured and killed in leg-hold traps, don’t buy a fur coat.”

We are pleased to note that the whole case was dismissed prior to trial on the purely legal grounds that the billboard itself contained no real identification of this particular plaintiff, and, therefore, under the South African law on defamation, the suit for damages could not be entertained.

Law Notes are compiled by HSUS General Counsel Murla Madsen and Associate Counsel Roger Kindler.

The court recognized the validity of this member’s claims under the National Environmental Policy Act and directed that the government must prepare evaluations of environmental impact of new hunting programs on individual refugee opened to hunting since 1980.
Thousands of Wild-Caught Birds Perish during Capture and Transport

BY ANN CHURCH

Parrots are famous for their ability to talk, but if these exotic birds could recount their adventures, they would tell a horrifying tale of capture and transport from far-flung jungles to pet store cages in towns across the country.

Many of the gaily colored parrots, cockatoos, and other birds in pet store cages or people’s homes are lucky survivors of a system that kills a huge percentage of its merchandise before it even gets to the consumer. For every wild bird you see in a U.S. pet shop, another 4 have died a miserable death during their harrowing journey. For some delicate species, the survival rate plummets to 1 in 11.

In order to meet the worldwide demand for 7.5 million live birds, 30 million birds—four times that number—must be captured. Dr. Donald Bruning, curator of birds at the Bronx (New York) Zoo, estimates an even higher mortality rate. He has stated that from 1 to 100 birds may die for each that actually ends up a pet. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, of more than 809,000 wild birds brought into this country in 1983, a staggering 40,000 of them were dead on arrival. Another 90,000 died in quarantine or were refused entry because of disease. All totaled, from some 809,000 birds that survived capture in their countries of origin, over 133,000 died before leaving quarantine.

More birds died during shipment from quarantine to various cities around the country before ever reaching a pet store.

In her 1981 book, The Bird Business,* Greta Nilsson documented the many horrors and inherent problems of the commercial cage–bird trade. Her factual accounts have enabled many concerned with the welfare of wild birds to work for the end of this senseless exploitation.

Capture: A Worldwide Cruelty

Some parrots, macaws, cockatoos, toucans, and other species live a beautiful life of freedom in South America, Central America, Africa, and Indone-

sia. Unfortunately, their market value is so great that a major industry has developed to capture and export the birds for sale in countries such as the United States. The capture methods utilized are so grossly inhumane that they cause injuries, shock, and death. Rarely are the birds treated in a manner that takes their welfare into account. The goal is to catch as many birds as possible and ship them out. If some die, it is no great loss because the ones that live will be sold at a large enough profit to make up for their higher mortality rate.

The methods of capture vary from country to country and according to species hunted. Trappers may set a leg snare, using a previously captured decoy bird to lure other victims to the area. Once a bird is caught, it may be left to dangle helplessly for an extended period of time while the trap pursues other victims. Another technique uses decoy birds to lure hordes of other wild birds to a designated area where nets have been set. Trappers suddenly raise the nets, capturing hundreds of birds at a time. As the netted birds thrash about in a frenzy, their captors expertly seize and stash them into crowded crates where their dreadful journey to “civilization” begins. In other instances, trees are simply cut down in the hopes of seizing young birds unable to escape this destructive trap. Not only are many birds injured or killed, but the trees are also lost for use by other birds and animals. Some species are simply shot in the wing in the hope of slightly wounding them so that they may be caught and sold. More than a few birds are killed in this fashion. Each of these is shot only to escape injured, but that is of little concern to their hunters.

For many of the birds, subjected to these types of capture methods, the mortality rates range as high as 40 percent to 50 percent. The pet shop industry disputes these findings by insisting that these birds are too valuable to be mishandled, but, under the current system, it is easier to capture more birds than are actually needed in order to make the necessary number to the final destination than to lower mortality rates through improved methods of handling and transport. If a large percentage of birds die in the process, the loss is absorbed as part of the cost of doing business.

Journey of Death

After a bird is caught, its real ordeal begins. The stress of being jammed in a crate with dozens of other unfortunate victims is enough to kill some birds. Birds rarely have enough space, food, or water. They are first taken to a way station, then sent to an exporting city—perhaps hundreds of miles distant—to await shipment out of the country. (Few countries retain more than 40,000 birds for local sale than are shipped abroad.) The birds are supposedly held in quarantine for ninety days under the observation of a veterinarian prior to their importation into this country, but this may only rarely occur. Many birds arrive here with diseases that would have been detected had proper quarantine procedures been followed.

The mortality rate among wild birds is especially high during the first few days after capture. The birds often die of shock, overexertion, or injuries, and lack of food and water, since the local people overestimating the many species of birds sold for pets often lack the knowledge and financial resources to care for them properly.

Many birds are being caught in countries that forbid their capture and sale, and these birds are smuggled to other countries where capture is allowed. They are then shipped out as though they were “legal” birds—in effect, “lauded” in order to be sold elsewhere.

It is not unusual for all the birds in a crate to arrive dead at their final destination. The birds may have suffocated after being improperly packed in poorly designed crates, or have been severely tossed about in the cargo cabin, or subjected to extreme temperatures in the cargo holds. Some birds have been found in crates in which the water containers had tipped over soon after the trip began, effectively eliminating water for the stock. Other crates have been sealed shut for the entire journey. Because of stress, overcrowding, and lack of food and water, the animals often peck and chew each other unmercifully, causing severe injuries. In order to minimize injury, some larger birds are bound by straps so that their feathers can’t be damaged. Long-necked birds are packed in crates without sufficient headroom.

One typical case cited in The Bird Business is of a company that imported 30,000 birds in 1977 from Senegal to Los Angeles. Dead on arrival, having suffered from severe dehydration, 709 birds were found in the cargo cabin, or subjected to extreme temperatures. 56.8 percent of the birds had been without water for three days. Between the airport and the quarantine station, an additional 909 birds died, and of the remaining 13,382 birds to enter the quarantine station, only 6,470 survived the thirty-day period. The mortality rate for this shipment was 8,530 birds or 56.8 percent. That figure does not reflect the number of birds that died during capture and transport and before exportation.

*This book is available from The HSUS for $8.00.
Bird-Trade Toll

Removing birds from the wild to stock the wild-bird trade isn’t simply cruel. It has wreaked havoc on bird-population levels and habitats. The pet industry claims it is rescuing areas, but in reality, trappers frequently raid undisturbed-and even specially protected-areas, often cutting down high mortality rates and trapping management! The excessive profits it realizes on bird sales actually encourage the pet industry to maintain the status quo. When you consider that a bird selling for $2 in its native country may sell for as much as $1200 in the United States, it is easy to understand why the pet industry doesn’t want the current system to change.

Some countries have tried to stop the exportation of their native species; others are seemingly unconcerned about habitat destruction and population loss. Those last are, however, delighted with the financial rewards gained from the bird trade.

A Wild-Caught Bird Ban

A ban on the commercial sale of all birds caught in the wild and exported to this country must be passed at each state or at the federal level. Only by totally eliminating a market for these birds will they escape the hardships of capture and transport.

Once a market for high-priced exotic birds is eliminated, smuggling will be less likely to occur. Currently, bird smuggling continues across borders. Often, the animals are stuffed into suitcases, tennis ball cans, wheel wells, doors, panels, or under the seats, and their inordinately high mortality rates reflect this brutal treatment.

The inability to distinguish between smuggled and legally exported birds allows a black market to thrive. Any enterprise that can offer a steady supply of animals is likely to be easier to hunt smuggled birds than those that are caught in captivity and identified as such.

Consumer demand can be satisfied by captive-born-and-raised birds, which, since they are tame and bred for placid disposition, make better companions than wild birds.

New York State has been the first to recognize the wild-caught bird tragedy and act to remedy it. It enacted a law banning the sale of wild-caught birds that became effective on May 1, 1986. The law applies only to future sales; any birds currently in a home would not be affected. Other states are seriously considering similar action.

The pet industry, led by the Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, is strenuously fighting these efforts and is proving itself to be an effective lobbying group. It has raised a large war chest for this fight and has apparently convinced local pet store operators that such legislation will bring economic ruin to their businesses.

Pet store owners are taking advantage of humane-minded bird lovers by scaring them into believing that, if such a ban were to be enacted in all the states, no one would be allowed to have a pet bird. This is totally false. Concerned citizens and groups only want to stop the suffering of wild-caught birds that will, by rights, be left undisturbed in their homeland. Some pet stores are passing out literature implying that no humane problems exist in the caged-bird trade or that, soon, no one will be allowed to have any kind of parrot. This is simply not the case.

Recognizing the devastating effect the trade in exotic pets, skins, and furs has had on their wildlife and natural environment, many South American countries have banned the export of either live animals or all wildlife products. These bans, however, are very difficult to enforce. Because a single rare bird such as the large hyacinth macaw can be sold to an American or European buyer for $5000, the incentive for smuggling is great.

Extensive, permissible trade in wild animals and wildlife products still exists in Peru, Guyana, and Argentina. I spent several weeks in northern Peru to get a closer look at the bird business there. I camped out with a group of six bird captors in a farm shack for several days, living on rice and salted mackerel. Each day, they rose before dawn and surrounded several fruit trees from hiding places, untangle the scrunching and struggling birds, and deposit them in holding cages. I saw three animals expire within hours from the stress of being captured and restrained in small cages in very intense heat. After several days, I decided the numbers were too large for our group to handle.
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A captured parrot squawks loudly and struggles to free its feet and wings snared in the fine nylon mesh. The catcher works quickly, but his hands are scarred from the bites of many terrified birds. From these birds, the catchers would take the birds used to attract other birds into the nets are called “callers.” Keep in cages at close quarters for months at a time, they sometimes peck each other’s feathers completely off.
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Removing birds from the wild to stock the wild-bird trade isn’t simply cruel. It has wreaked havoc on bird-population levels and habitats. The pet industry claims it is rescuing areas, but in reality, trappers frequently raid undisturbed—and even specially protected—areas, often cutting down high mortality rates and trapping management! The excessive profits it realizes on bird sales actually encourage the pet industry to maintain the status quo. When you consider that a bird selling for $2 in its native country may sell for as much as $1200 in the United States, it is easy to understand why the pet industry doesn’t want the current system to change.
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The pet industry, led by the Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council, is strenuously fighting these efforts and is proving itself to be an effective lobbying group. It has raised a large war chest for this fight and has apparently convinced local pet store operators that such legislation will bring economic ruin to their businesses.

Pet store owners are taking advantage of humane-minded bird lovers by scaring them into believing that, if such a ban were to be enacted in all the states, no one would be allowed to have a pet bird. This is totally false. Concerned citizens and groups only want to stop the suffering of wild-caught birds that will, by rights, be left undisturbed in their homeland. Some pet stores are passing out literature implying that no humane problems exist in the caged-bird trade or that, soon, no one will be allowed to have any kind of parrot. This is simply not the case.
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A captured parrot squawks loudly and struggles to free its feet and wings snared in the fine nylon mesh. The catcher works quickly, but his hands are scarred from the bites of many terrified birds. From these birds, the catchers would take the birds used to attract other birds into the nets are called “callers.” Keep in cages at close quarters for months at a time, they sometimes peck each other’s feathers completely off.
Birds are carried from the capture site in arid northern Peru back to town in a backpack cage. The birds clutch tightly to the side, but their food and water are jostled to the ground. They must then endure a long ride in the luggage hold of a hot bus before getting to the dealers’ holding cages in the main city.

days, we hiked out with more than twenty birds. In the off-season, the adult birds are usually sold to the wildlife market in Lima and other cities.

When the export quotas are issued in the hatching season, the men who have catching licenses (and many more who don’t) head for the hills. Their goal is to obtain whole clutches of young parrots just before they’re ready to fly. Some careful catchers will climb the trees and pull the birds out of the nesting hole. Since many trees have sharp thorns covering their bark, however, most young birds are obtained by chopping the trees down and hacking open the nesting cavities. In one forest area, the number of felled nesting trees far outnumbered the few that were still standing.

Peruvian dealers pay the catchers an average of $3 per bird for common parrots and sell them for about $11 to U.S. importers. These birds are then sold in U.S. pet stores for $100 or more.—Campbell Plowden, HSUS Staff

Wildlife markets in cities all over South America are way stations for birds, monkeys, and lizards that are too difficult to export. A survey of one market in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, over a two-month period revealed the illegal sale of over 200 species of live animals.

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.
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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.

| Name ___________________________ |
| Address ___________________________ |
| City __________________ State _______ Zip __________ |

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

Save Time!
- Affix label to wallet envelope or order coupons in magazine
- Use it to change your address
- Use it when writing about a membership problem

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

Postmaster: Address Correction Requested.