JOIN THE THOUSANDS OF TELEVISION VIEWERS WHO LOVE “LIVING WITH ANIMALS”

“Living With Animals” is The HSUS’s own television program, seen on almost 100 public broadcasting system stations across the country. Every week, it brings the world of animals into your home through lively interviews, up-to-date pet care information, and in-depth discussions of controversial and timely humane issues.

We think “Living With Animals” is the best series on animals on television—and we think you’ll agree.

Check your local television listing for day, time, and PBS station.

H. I. “Sonny” Bloch is host of “Living With Animals.”

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
Thank You, Mr. Chairman

On the occasion of the annual leadership conference of The Humane Society of the United States held in Saddle Brook, New Jersey, in October of 1968, Coleman Burke was elected chairman of the board of directors. He has served The HSUS in that capacity for the past nineteen years with great distinction, having tendered his resignation from that position at the recent annual conference of The HSUS held in Phoenix, Arizona.

Motivated to become personally acquainted with The HSUS by reason of a major legacy provided The HSUS by one of his clients, Mrs. Luella Jeffery, this unsuspecting lawyer from New Jersey and New York discovered that this organization he had come to evaluate was soon to lay claim to him. Though it was his intention to be the instrument through which The HSUS might benefit from the bequest of a gracious lady, it was she who became the instrument for giving to us Coleman Burke.

One needs to remember that The HSUS was a small and struggling organization in the late 1960s to appreciate the significance of this senior partner of the law firm of Burke and Burke of New York City becoming chairman of its board of directors. It was, as many have testified, the advent of The HSUS's coming of age and flowering into one of the leading animal-protection organizations in the world. For, in Coleman Burke, The HSUS discovered a humanitarian and a leader whose vision, dedication, and generosity were to open up vistas for this organization it had hardly imagined possible.

I am personally indebted to Coleman Burke for providing me the opportunity to serve as president of this organization for the past seventeen years. Having learned through a mutual friend of my desire to extend what was then a ministry to people to embrace the animal kingdom as well, he invited me to come to Washington and help The HSUS become a vibrant and potent force furthering the protection and rights of animals. I eagerly responded. It has rarely happened in the animal-protection movement, or any other movement for that matter, that a chairman of the board and an executive officer have endured together for almost eighteen years. Yet not only have we endured, we have remained good friends and mutually supportive colleagues even unto this day.

Though he has resigned his position as chairman of the board, Coleman Burke has not departed from The HSUS. Indeed, he remains a director of this society and was, by acclamation, designated chairman emeritus by his fellow directors. Thank you, Coleman Burke, for having led us so well in the past and having provided so many of us an opportunity for service and an example of unqualified dedication.
Chimps Championed

The HSUS hosted a ground-breaking workshop on the psychological well-being of captive chimpanzees at its Washington, D.C., headquarters from December 1 through 3. Sponsored by the HSUS and the Jane Goodall Institute, the workshop was conceived of and chaired by Dr. Goodall, a world-renowned chimpanzee observer and new member of The HSUS board of directors. The workshop’s purpose was to formulate recommendations to aid the federal government in drafting regulations to promote the psychological well-being of chimpanzees in laboratories. These regulations were mandated by 1985 amendments to the Animal Welfare Act. Although The HSUS believes that no chimpanzees at all should be used in biomedical research and testing, it recognizes that, as long as the animals are being used, it is man’s duty to treat them as humanely as possible, and therefore supports these guidelines.

Dr. Goodall assembled an international panel of primate experts for the workshop, including representatives of the research and zoo communities, the government, The HSUS, and other animal-protection organizations. The participants discussed various suggestions for satisfying some of the psychological needs of chimpanzees in laboratories, including housing infant chimpanzees with their mothers; housing individuals of all ages in compatible groups in spacious enclosures; training laboratory personnel to care for chimpanzees properly; providing antiboredom devices; and planning for the retirement and rehabilitation of animals no longer used in research.

Dr. Goodall discussed the workshop recommendations with Senator John Melcher, who authored the amendment to the Animal Welfare Act that requires that the psychological needs of non-human primates used in laboratories be provided for. On December 8, Sen. Melcher submitted the recommendations to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), the agency responsible for enforcing the regulations under the act. The USDA is expected to issue its standards for the psychological care of primates in February.

As well as monitoring the treatment of captive chimpanzees, The HSUS is also concerned about the plight of chimpanzees in the wild. These beautiful and highly intelligent animals—our sibling species—are now increasingly in danger of extinction.

Habitat destruction, due to agricultural land development, human population increases, and natural resource exploitation, has changed the face of equatorial Africa, with serious consequences for chimpanzees. Another threat to chimpanzees is local hunting for meat, which has escalated due to the introduction of technologically sophisticated methods of hunting and trapping.

The most wasteful and destructive practice is the cruel international trade in infant chimpanzees. In order to capture live infants, which are usually still nursing, hunters kill their mothers and other members of the family groups protecting the infant. Experts estimate that from five to ten adults die in the process of capturing and shipping one live chimpanzee baby to an overseas buyer.

Many infants die or are seriously wounded during their capture, and many more die during transport to overseas markets. Many of the infants were still nursing when captured, and suffer and die due to starvation and dehydration. They are shipped in tiny cages, with no adequate food or care. This deplorable international trade in infants for the biomedical market may lead to the extinction of chimpanzees within our lifetime.

In 1976, The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service listed the chimpanzee as threatened. At that time, insufficient data was available on the status of chimpanzee populations throughout Africa. The Convention of International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) has listed the chimpanzee under Appendix I, which means that they are in danger of extinction due to trade and cannot be traded commercially by signatories to CITES. The HSUS has petitioned the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to upgrade the status of the chimpanzees to endangered, in order both to recognize how much in danger of extinction it is and to afford it greater protection.

Africa Bound

The Humane Society of the United States is sponsoring two safaris to Kenya for its members. One departs March 11, 1988, and returns March 25, 1988; the other departs June 17, 1988, and returns July 1, 1988. The cost is $3,395, inclusive. If you would like to receive a descriptive brochure, including itinerary, please write to HSUS Safaris, The HSUS, 2100 L St., NW, Washington, DC 20037.
New Twist to NAAHE's Adopt-a-Teacher Program

The National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education's (NAAHE) popular Adopt-a-Teacher program, featured in the Fall 1987 HSUS News, has recently been changed. To better serve the needs of local humane societies and shelters around the country, NAAHE has decided to create a special label for each bundle of Kind News sent to a classroom as a result of a local humane society's participation in the Adopt-a-Teacher program. As of September, new labels will inform the adopted teacher and the class that "this bundle of kindness was brought to you courtesy of (blank) Humane Society." In this way, NAAHE hopes to encourage more local animal-welfare organizations to participate in the Adopt-a-Teacher program and provide such organizations with the credit they deserve for bringing humane education into our nation's classrooms. Individual adopters are recognized in the same manner.

Individuals and animal-welfare agencies wishing more information on NAAHE's Adopt-a-Teacher program should write to NAAHE, P.O. Box 362N, East Haddam, CT 06423.

NAAHE is proud to announce that it is now into the third printing of its informative brochures for teachers and students advocating alternatives to dissection and invasive experimentation on animals in the classroom and science fairs. The student's brochure is Does the Idea of Experimenting on Animals in Biology Class Disturb You? The teacher's version is called The Living Science. To date, more than forty thousand of the brochures have been distributed to teachers and students nationwide. According to the September 1987 edition of The Science Teacher, a national magazine for science-education professionals, "Many teachers have abandoned dissection on principle, believing that the science of life cannot be taught through death." Students are also fueling this national trend away from dissection by voicing their ethical objections in ever-increasing numbers.

Due to rising production costs, the prices and quantities of NAAHE's two biology-related brochures will be increasing as of May 30, 1988. Prior to that date, the brochures can be ordered at the current rates: 25 for $4.00, 100 for $7.00, and 500 for $25.00. Orders soon, and please specify if you are requesting the student's brochure or the teacher's brochure. Send orders to NAAHE, P.O. Box 362, East Haddam, CT 06423.

The HSUS Establishes New Division

The establishment of the Center for Respect of Life and the Environment (CRLE) at the HSUS Washington, D.C., headquarters reflects the society's recognition of the need to break new ground by linking the concerns for animal welfare and rights with a broader ethical and spiritual concern for life and the environment. The attitude that animals are without feelings and nature, no more than a resource for mankind's use, has been responsible for both animal suffering and species extinction as well as the desecration of the environment and the future of creation.

One of the goals of the CRLE will be to help change these kinds of destructive perceptions and attitudes. We will work particularly with those organizations that may be receptive to our concerns but neither familiar with them in detail nor aware of the relevance of animal welfare and rights to their own agendas.

The CRLE is organizing a colloquium, to take place in April, in conjunction with Wesley Granberg-Michaelson of the New Creation Institute, to present the ethical, environmental, and animal-welfare concerns of genetic engineering before a participatory audience of religious leaders and theologians. We are also collaborating with the World Council of Churches' program on "Peace, Justice, and the Integrity of Creation" to place our concerns about the plight of the animal kingdom on its agenda.

The CRLE's director, Dr. Michael W. Fox, presented a new program at the Boulder County Humane Society's annual meeting in January entitled "Animals, Nature, and Religion." This lecture is being made into a 35mm tape-cassette slide show and video film. HSUS members will be notiﬁed when these materials are available.

The CRLE now has copies of the new book, Tree of Life: Buddhism and Protection of Nature, compiled by conservationist Nancy Nash, available at $6.00 each. Write to Ellen Truong, assistant to the director, CRLE, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037 to order.
Be a P.A.L.—and Get an Award
The HSUS will recognize top shelter programs

The HSUS “Be a P.A.L.—Prevent A Litter” campaign, our most comprehensive spay/neuter effort to date, is in full swing. With resolutions introduced in Congress declaring April “National Prevent A Litter Month,” and NBC “Today” show personality Willard Scott as our honorary chairman, we’re off to a great start.

Now, in an effort to help individuals and groups spread the word about their effective spay/neuter programs, The HSUS is delighted to announce its “Be a P.A.L.” awards program. This incentive program will enable us to learn about the most effective spay/neuter programs in the country while, at the same time, sharing such information with other groups and individuals working to reduce pet overpopulation in their communities. The “Be a P.A.L.” awards program will make it possible for The HSUS to recognize formally those individuals and organizations that have created and carried out these worthwhile programs.

Just who is eligible? You are. The contest is open to all individuals, humane groups, and municipal and nonprofit animal shelters that have developed unique, effective programs—either public-awareness campaigns or sterilization programs—to combat pet overpopulation at the community level.

Because The HSUS is interested in involving organizations and shelters in towns and cities of all sizes, we will be judging group efforts in five separate population categories. One award will be presented to an organization serving a community with a very large, urban population, while others will be awarded to shelters and societies in smaller cities. In this way, groups will be competing against other organizations from communities of the same size.

A sixth category exists for an individual who, working without the assistance of an organization, has mounted a pet-overpopulation campaign in his or her community. (Individuals will be judged in a single category, regardless of community size.) HSUS judges will be looking for projects or campaigns that promote the spay/neuter message. These could be educational efforts directed to the general public or those reaching out to specific groups such as schoolchildren, pet owners, or even pet-shop operators. They could be programs that actually result in the sterilization of large numbers of dogs and cats or efforts that prompt legislation mandating the sterilization of adopted animals or creating low-cost programs in your community.

Many worthwhile programs have recently come to The HSUS’s attention. The Washington (D.C.) Humane Society, for example, recently convinced a major grocery store chain in the area to run a spay/neuter message on milk cartons. That organization, and the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, have produced excellent spay/neuter posters featuring famous athletes. The October, 1987, issue of The HSUS’ newsletter for shelter professionals, Shelter Sense, commended the Humane Animal Welfare Society of Waukesha County (Wisconsin), for the fine billboards it produced to educate the community about the pet-overpopulation problem.

All programs initiated after January 1, 1986, are eligible as contest entries. The deadline for entries is December 15, 1988, and awards will be presented the following spring.

Judging will be conducted by the HSUS Companion Animals staff in Washington, D.C., after consultation with HSUS regional offices. Winners will receive an HSUS certificate suitable for display. Even better, however, your project will be featured in a future HSUS publication, with a story explaining the way in which you conceived and implemented your idea and the results you’ve obtained.

We will interview you so we can share with our readers details on relative expense and effort needed to operate your program, changes you would make, and suggestions you might have for those wishing to implement your program in their communities. We will also notify local press contacts in your community of your honor.

For a “Be a P.A.L.” award entry form, write Companion Animals, Dept. EF, HSUS, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037, or send $5.00 for the HSUS “Prevent A Litter” campaign kit (available in late February). Along with the “Be a P.A.L.” award entry form, this packet includes a variety of educational materials for use during April “Prevent A Litter” month, and year-round.

Each year more than 15,000 dogs and cats must be destroyed in the District of Columbia.

Everyone Wins when your pet is spayed or neutered at the D.C. Low-Cost Spay/Neuter Clinic.

This poster, featuring Washington Redskins player Mark May, is part of the Washington (D.C.) Humane Society’s spay and neuter campaign.
A New Day in Ogden
A Utah shelter is built through collaborative efforts

I
n Utah, the Ogden-Weber County Humane Society and Ogden City have created an innovative partnership that has made it possible, in these times of shrinking city budgets, to build a state-of-the-art animal shelter. The partnership and the process these organizations went through serve as a model for humane societies throughout the country. How did this partnership develop and how does it work?

Ogden City had never made animal welfare and control a priority. The city pound was so inadequate that the Rocky Mountain Regional Director of the American Humane Association was quoted in the Ogden Standard-Examiner of August 31, 1949, as saying, “I have never in all my travels visited a dog pound as disgraceful as Ogden’s.” In 1974, the society asked the Ogden City Council if it might take over the shelter operation. The council rejected this request but did appoint a citizens’ committee to advise the Ogden City Council on animal-welfare and -control issues. Dr. Carol Browning, currently a director of The HSUS, was appointed chairman and Mrs. Rosemary Benning, a former director of The HSUS, was appointed vice chairman. Composed of representatives from the Ogden-Weber County Humane Society, Ogden Kennel Club, interested citizens, and a member of the City Council, this committee worked in cooperation with Ogden City on animal-welfare and -control policies and issues. The city ordinances on animal welfare and control were rewritten; shelter policies were revised; a shelter manager position was created, and a new manager selected, with the help of the committee; animal control was moved from the city Finance Department to the Department of Community Services and renamed Animal Services; and hearings were conducted on citizens’ complaints. The committee slowly built a positive relationship with the City Council. Gradually, the society was perceived as an ally rather than an adversary.

A priority recommendation to the City Council was a new animal shelter facility. Each year, this request was considered but rejected due to more pressing needs for the limited tax dollars. Although the City Council agreed that a new facility was needed, it did not have the money to build one, and it did not want to raise taxes.

Mayor Robert A. Madsen, the Ogden City Council, City Manager Cowles Mallory, Department of Community Services Director Ken Miller, and Division of Animal Services Manager Jay Eakle struggled with this dilemma and finally came up with a creative solution. Each year, the city would appropriate $100,000 towards a new shelter, which would be built in six stages. Thus, in 1982, a master plan was designed for an entirely new facility, including an adoption center, a humane education room, and an office for volunteers. The following year, the first two stages of this shelter were completed at a cost of $275,000. These included a solar-heated area with sixty-five kennel runs and sixty-seven cages.

Unfortunately, the next year was a very lean one for Ogden City and the $100,000 appropriation for the shelter seemed likely to be cut. Even with such appropriations each year, it would take at least eight years to complete the shelter, and, if the appropriations were cut in some years, the momentum to build the whole new facility might fade. Thus, the Ogden-Weber County Humane Society proposed a challenge to Ogden City. If, over the next three years, the city would appropriate $300,000 for the new shelter, the society would match that amount, dollar for dollar. This challenge was the incentive the City Council needed in order to complete the new facility, for it was an offer that could not be refused.

From 1983 to 1987, the society raised $300,000, most of it from local individual donors and foundations. To many people, it was an appealing campaign because each dollar donated would be matched by a tax dollar, because the new shelter project was not an on-going cause so a donation could be considered a “one-time gift,” and because the city-society partnership was stable and appropriate. Neither organization could build a shelter without the other, and all recognized the need for a new facility. An adoption center, a humane education room, and a volunteer office were more than Ogden City could afford; yet, the society insisted that these be part of an effective shelter. The partner-
If...the city would appropriate $300,000 for the new shelter, the society would match the amount...

ship made it possible to include these areas in the new building.

On September 11, 1987, the Carol Conroy Browning-Ogden Animal Shelter was dedicated. HSUS President John A. Hoyt was the keynote speaker at the ceremonies. He stated:

...It is far more than bricks and mortar that have been put into place on this site....In having chosen not to consider this facility completed until providing for an adoption area and humane education room, you have demonstrated an awareness that it is not only the animals that need care and attention, but also people who are responsible for their being here in the first place...

The city-society partnership has increased the credibility of the society. Donations continue to come in despite the end of the capital campaign. Many donors are new society members. In a recent editorial, the Ogden Standard-Examiner commented:

The dedication of the new Carol Conroy Browning-Ogden Animal Shelter was more than just a ceremony; it was a milestone....It also reflects a community commitment by the private sector to an important public facility.... Although it has taken a thirteen-year effort by the city and the humane society to reach a common goal, it has been reached and surpassed....It shows that Ogden citizens are aware of the growing needs of the city and are willing to do what is needed to meet them.

Ogden City now has one of the finest animal shelters in the country. Plans are already being made for the new shelter to serve the entire county. Perhaps most importantly, thousands of unwanted, neglected, and abused animals now have a humane shelter, and the entire county is being exposed to pet-ownership responsibility and humane ethics programs. Indeed, because of this innovative partnership, the quality of life for animals and people in this community will become more humane.

We salute Mayor Madsen and the Ogden City Council, City Manager Mallory and his staff, Ken Miller, and Jay Eakle, for the faith they have shown in this partnership. Congratulations, too, to Valere McFarland, President of the Ogden-Weber County Humane Society and the board of directors of the society for creating this effective partnership.

For further information on how to form a city-society partnership, please contact: Dr. Carol Browning, 6182 South 2855 East, Ogden, UT 84403.

Reflect for a moment...

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

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

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

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

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

Please send: Will information

Name _____________________________

Address ____________________________________________________________

City __________________________ State ______ Zip ______

Mail in confidence to: Murdaugh S. Madden, Vice President/General Counsel, The Humane Society of the United States, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.
Closing in on Cockfighting
A deadly blood sport is the target of The HSUS

The bird’s left wing had been broken, and blood was flowing freely from its beak. Exhausted and unable to stand, it lay panting on the floor of the pit. The crowd roared with delight as the bird’s opponent, a large speckled rooster, dug its steel gaffs into the loser’s chest and continued to peck away at the victim’s eyes with its beak. Twenty minutes later, the battle was over. The loser lay motionless on the dirt floor.

As bets were paid off and beer cans opened, a young boy entered the ring and picked up the dying rooster by its bloodied feet. He tossed it into a trash can, where it spent its last moments lying on top of beer cans, cigarette butts, and other debris from the evening’s entertainment.

Cockfighting: it’s a repugnant blood-sport that’s illegal in forty-six states. Fourteen states have declared it a felony offense; thirty-two states have made it unlawful even to attend a fight. Yet, in Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Louisiana, cockfighting is not only an openly practiced activity, but also a legal form of entertainment for the entire family.

Although cockfighters claim that their birds are naturally aggressive, contenders are specially bred, trained, and often drugged to ensure that they fight to the death. Only by tampering with nature, only by breeding birds for maximum aggressiveness, has man succeeded in creating a bloody spectacle staged merely for his own sadistic enjoyment.

A Typical Cockfight
Cockfights usually take place on the dirt floor of a “pit”—a small arena enclosed by canvas or wooden walls. Cradling the birds in their arms, handlers deliberately antagonize the roosters by thrusting the birds at each other, encouraging them to peck at their opponent’s head. The birds are then released in the pit, flying into the air and coming down on each other, cutting and slashing with their steel gaffs. Gaffs, 1½ to 3 inches long, are curved hooks resembling small ice picks. Fastened over a bird’s natural spurs, gaffs severely injure an opponent, often tearing open its breast, puncturing its lungs, breaking its wing and leg bones, and gouging out its eyes.

If both birds are still alive after fifteen minutes of battle, they are moved to a “drag” pit to continue fighting for hours on end. Each time the birds collapse from injuries or exhaustion, handlers revive them by pouring water over their heads or blowing on the back of their necks. The fight only ends when one bird is dead or is so severely injured that it is unable to move. Should the loser survive, it has its neck wrung or its head smashed against a wall. Casualties are simply tossed atop a heap of dead and half-dead birds.

Often, even the winning bird has sustained such serious injuries that it, too, must be destroyed. If not, however, an evening’s crop of maimed winners are entered in a “Battle Royale” at the tournament’s end. These “victorious” birds are placed together in one pit to kill each other off; the sole survivor at the contest’s end is declared the winner. (Another variation of the wounded-winners contest is the “Blinker Derby”—a fight restricted to birds that have lost eyes during earlier fights.)

What is BLOODY, BARBARIC, AND STILL LEGAL IN ARIZONA?
IT’S COCKFIGHTING, and it’s illegal in 46 states. Now a coalition is determined to outlaw this abusive sport in Arizona. If you wish to help in this effort, contact us.

The Humane Society of the U.S. and Arizonans Against Cockfighting
1861 East Speedway #411
Tucson, AZ 85712

(Top) Gamecocks clash in a flurry of feathers and blood. (Above) The HSUS has placed ads in cooperation with local groups to call attention to cockfighting’s cruelty.
Just a Good Ol’ Time

Gambling is heavy at cockfights, as spectators place bets on their favorite birds. With tens of thousands of dollars changing hands, it’s not surprising that weapons—especially firearms—are commonly seized during cockfight raids. Drugs—both to stimulate animals and for spectators’ enjoyment—are another common element of these events.

Even more disturbing is the presence of children at cockfights. Parents not only bring youngsters along to watch but also encourage them to raise and fight their own birds. Involvement in cockfighting teaches youngsters total disregard for the law and exposes them to cruelty to animals in a violent and bloody arena.

Game-Fowl Breeders

While it’s rare to find someone who will own up to his involvement in cockfighting, it is not in the least bit unusual to find “game-fowl breeders” who enjoy “showing” their animals. Although a few breeders legitimately raise fowl for show, the majority of individuals who use that nomenclature keep up their breeding activities as a cover for their true interest—fighting birds.

When is a Bird not an Animal?

How can dogfighting be illegal nationwide while, in some states, birds are not even recognized as animals, let alone protected under animal-fighting laws? Historically, chickens have been viewed in some areas as incapable of feeling pain. Consequently, in several states, chickens do not exist as sentient beings in the eyes of the law.

Cockfighting will never be stopped unless tough legislation is passed that includes protection for fowl. And, because cockfighters who live in states with strong anti-cockfighting laws travel to neighboring states that have weak or nonexistent laws, strong animal-fighting laws must be enacted in all fifty states.

What is the Solution?

We need not only strong laws, but also vigorous enforcement if we are to halt this barbaric activity. Because security precau-

Cockfighting across the Country

Overview

Today, cockfights are most often conducted in rural areas, particularly in Appalachia, the southern United States, and the Southwest. Cockfights also commonly crop up in urban areas that claim large Hispanic populations. Once an individual is plugged into the “cockfighting underground,” it’s not difficult for him to locate a fight anywhere within a two- to three-hour drive.

Recent raids have verified The HSUS’s long-held claim that dogfighters and cockfighters often participate in both activities. A recent bust on a major dogfighter’s property turned up scores of fighting roosters. Two of the nation’s most prominent dogfighters were recently arrested at a cockfight raid, evidence that such people dabble in other forms of animal abuse.

—Bob Baker, HSUS Investigator

Midwest

Cockfighting is generally isolated in southern and eastern Kansas. Our most recent reports indicate activity in the southern regions of Kansas along the Oklahoma border. While Kansas does not have a specific law prohibiting cockfighting, chickens were afforded protection from cockfighting exploitation when the state’s anti-cruelty laws were strengthened in 1977. Despite this and the fact that the Kansas attorney general ruled that all animals, including fowl, shall receive equal protection against all acts of cruelty, including fighting, the activity is widespread across the state, where it operates without intervention from law-enforcement authorities.

In 1985, the Missouri Supreme Court struck down the state’s anti-cockfighting law, calling it unconstitutional and too vague. Activity now appears to be rampant in that state, with most of the fighting concentrated in southern Missouri. (An animal-fighting bill was introduced during the 1987 legislative session, aimed at clarifying the law to satisfy the Supreme Court. The bill should pass during the 1988 legislative session.)

While Iowa currently has misdemeanor laws against animal fighting, felony laws are recommended. There is a strong possibility that the Iowa Federation of Humane Societies will push for such legislation during the 1988 legislative session.

According to our reports, there is a considerable amount of cockfighting activity in eastern Nebraska. However, there have been no recent arrests or convictions. Last year, a felony fighting bill was introduced in the Nebraska legislature, but it was delayed by some necessary clarifications. We look forward to that bill’s passage in 1988.

—Wendell Maddox, HSUS Midwest Regional Director

Mid-Atlantic

The mid-Atlantic states boast the strictest cockfighting laws in the country. In Pennsylvania, fight spectators can receive up to seven years in prison and a $15,000 fine. The passage of that law last year has diminished cockfighting activity throughout Pennsylvania. While some fighters are giving up their pastime, others are simply moving to states with more lenient laws. For instance, Hispanic people from Philadelphia have reportedly traveled to south Jersey’s rural areas, where cockfighting is still a misdemeanor offense. (Efforts are underway to increase penalties in New Jersey.) There have also been reports of fighting in Delaware, another “misdemeanor” state. In New York, where a felony law is in effect, a cockfighting problem still exists in the rural mountain areas and in New York City, where Hispanics gather to fight their birds.

—Rick Abel, HSUS Mid-Atlantic Regional Program Coordinator

Gulf States

Cockfighting in Texas is growing in popularity. Pits can be found in almost
Recent raids have verified...that dogfighters and cockfighters often participate in both activities.

every community, with cock housing units and gamecocks visible in virtually every town. Most cockfighting takes place in the south and southwestern part of the state. Scores of pits are located along the Texas/Mexico border, where law-enforcement officials are sympathetic to the cockfighting culture.

While local police departments have pulled off a few raids in central and northern Texas—with assistance from The HSUS—cockfighters in this part of the state travel to Louisiana where the bloodsport is a legal activity.

The HSUS will continue pushing to ban cockfighting in Oklahoma, but our efforts are impeded by the fact that several influential members of the legislature are cockfighters themselves.

—Bernie Weller, HSUS
Gulf States Regional Investigator

Great Lakes

Cockfighting is widespread in Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, and West Virginia. A severe problem exists in the southern counties of Ohio. While driving through any given locale, it is not uncommon to view yards with up to one hundred roosters tethered in front of individual houses.

While cockfighting is illegal in all four states, the lack of enforcement—stemming from lenient laws—is appalling. In Ohio, the crime carries a misdemeanor charge with a penalty of a $250 fine and a prison term of up to thirty days. So insignificant are these penalties that, during raids in Ohio, people from Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and other neighboring states have been arrested.

—Tina Nelson, former
HSUS Great Lakes Regional Program Coordinator

West Coast

In addition to participating in as many as ten cockfight raids each year, the continued on following page
COCKFIGHTING ACROSS THE COUNTRY

West Coast Regional Office spends considerable time gathering information for dissemination to local humane and law-enforcement agencies within and outside the five-state region. Although cockfighting is illegal in California, Nevada, Idaho, Washington, and Oregon, it is only a misdemeanor crime in each. Unfortunately, indications are that the number of cockfighters in the western states is growing, due to poorly enforced and lenient laws.

So long as cockfighting is legal in a few remaining states such as Arizona, we cannot say our job is complete. Recent undercover visits to cockfighting pits in Arizona have shown that up to 80 percent of those attending or participating were from California. Shoveling dirt from one place to another isn’t cause for celebration.

—Eric Sakach, HSUS West Coast Regional Investigator

New England

While cockfighting is not as widespread in New England as it is in other parts of the country, it does exist. Connecticut, where cockfighting is a misdemeanor, is a large poultry-breeding state and has had problems in the cities of New Haven, Hartford, and Bridgeport. Rhode Island officials report a decrease in the activity, due in large part to the state’s felony law. Cockfights reportedly take place in New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine, but it is difficult to obtain information on these activities. And, despite Massachusetts’s felony law, cockfighters have reportedly turned up in Boston, Worcester, and Lawrence.

—Frank Ribaudo, HSUS New England Regional Program Coordinator

Southeast

A new era has dawned in Florida since the 1986 enactment of a strong cockfighting felony law. Until the law’s passage, cockfighting had been legal. We’ve seen several fights raided and numerous people arrested in Dade and Broward counties and in Hialeah.

Fortunately, in Georgia, where cockfighting is a misdemeanor, the Georgia Bureau of Investigation has initiated a campaign to abolish cockfighting from the state entirely.

—Marc Paulhus, HSUS Southeast Regional Director

North Central

Cockfighting in The HSUS’s North Central Region has undergone some changes over the past ten years. Activity in the larger cities has, by most accounts, remained at a steady level. This is particularly true in Chicago, where cultural influence seems to dictate the degree of activity almost exclusively. Cockfight investigations are especially difficult in such cities because the numbers of participants are limited by the urban setting (basements and garages of residential areas), and the smaller the gatherings, the more difficult law enforcement becomes.

The level of rural cockfighting has declined slightly during the past ten years, although the presence of large, successful breeders has not. The general decline has resulted from stronger laws and a change in attitude that is expected to continue. The presence of successful breeders, however, indicates a need for improved laws that would more effectively govern the breeding and selling of game fowl for fighting purposes.

—Frantz Dantzler, HSUS North Central Regional Director

Outside the Regions

States that stand out for their illegal cockfighting activities include Kentucky, Virginia, Tennessee, Alabama, Hawaii, and Mississippi. Hawaiian officials have recently vowed to crack down on fights that are reportedly being conducted openly.

—Marc Paulhus, HSUS Southeast Regional Director

Outside the Regions

States that stand out for their illegal cockfighting activities include Kentucky, Virginia, Tennessee, Alabama, Hawaii, and Mississippi. Hawaiian officials have recently vowed to crack down on fights that are reportedly being conducted openly.
Today, law officers are cracking down more aggressively on cockfighters and their supporters.

Workshops conducted by HSUS investigators. Today, law officers are cracking down more aggressively on cockfighters and their supporters. Police officers are turning up evidence of gambling, conspiracy, and narcotics offenses traditionally associated with organized crime. Increasingly, law-enforcement agencies are realizing that cockfighting is anything but a harmless sport practiced by a misunderstood few.

Still, success cannot be measured solely in terms of numbers of arrests made or convictions won. As long as cockfighting is tolerated in parts of this country, a network of participants will continue to stretch into every state in the union.

HSUS Efforts

Cockfighting is hardly a new issue to The HSUS. Our investigators have been instrumental in hundreds of raids over the last thirty-three years. We struggled unsuccessfully to make cockfighting illegal under the federal Animal Welfare Act and have successfully worked to gain enactment of the many state laws that currently exist. What’s more, HSUS investigators have crisscrossed the country, training law-enforcement officials and testifying in court against cockfighters.

Now, we are intensifying our efforts in an attempt to outlaw this abusive sport in Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Louisiana. We’ll also be working to strengthen legislation in Kansas, Missouri, and Virginia, where current anti-cockfighting laws are ineffective.

In September, The HSUS joined forces with activists in Arizona to establish a coalition to outlaw cockfighting in that state. Already, Arizonans Against Cockfighting has secured a senate sponsor for anti-cockfighting legislation. The coalition anticipates passage of a cockfighting felony bill in 1988.

Of course, even when we win our Arizona fight, our job won’t be done. Real success will come only when people no longer have a desire to watch and bet on the bloody outcome of these staged combats. Such a victory will require responsible legislation, stiffer penalties, aggressive enforcement, and an ongoing educational effort to encourage the humane treatment of all animals—including fowl.
BY ANN SMALLEY

Getting to Know You
When New Pet Meets Old Pet

Susan was heartbroken. At first, getting the little kitten to keep her other cat, Whiskers, company had seemed like such a good idea, but it obviously wasn’t going to work out. From the first moment Susan had brought Tibs into the house and shown him to Whiskers, Whiskers’s behavior had been just awful. He had hissed and growled at the little newcomer and scratched Susan. Even worse, although Whiskers had been housebroken for years, Susan found a puddle on her bed that Whiskers had left, and then Whiskers, a neutered male, started spraying in the house. Susan sadly decided Tibs would have to go back to the shelter.

Pet owners may find this story all too familiar. Most of us who love animals like to have more than one around—for some, the more the merrier. But it can be difficult to introduce a new pet into a household where there are already cats or dogs. Fights, behavior changes, and housebreaking mistakes are all common consequences of upsetting the status quo. Too often, pets adopted from shelters as “company” for resident pets find themselves back at the shelter because “they just didn’t get along.” In some cases, the second pet is adopted to help “cure” the resident pet of bad behavior, perhaps barking or chewing. When this effort fails, both animals find themselves without a home.

When a new pet is introduced into a household, a period of stress and adjustment is inevitable—for both humans and animals—but there are ways to help make the transition a little easier on everyone. What kind, sex, and size of new animal you choose to bring home makes a difference, and how you stage the initial introduction is also important. Your own behavior for the first few weeks will influence how the resident regards the interloper, whether as friend or foe. For this reason, if you’re considering adding another pet to the family, it’s important before you bring home Number Two, Three, or Four to assess the situation, and decide if you’re ready to cope with the problems that might arise.

People acquire more pets for many reasons. They love them and like having them around. They want to do the best thing for a pet they already have and get another one to keep the first one company while away at work all day. An abandoned animal at a shelter wins their hearts and they know they can’t say no to it. And there are advantages to having more than one pet. Dogs love company, and having a companion can cut down on destructive or annoying behavior. Cats may play together and amuse themselves while left alone for long periods. But getting a second pet as company for the first does not mean that the animals will require less time from people. All companion animals need to develop and enjoy strong bonds with people, so another animal actually means a larger time commitment from the owner.

Someone considering bringing home another pet should also be aware of the potential problems that may develop. The introduction of a new animal is always going to be stressful for a resident pet, and stress has a way of finding an outlet. In dogs, it may lead to fighting, housebreaking mistakes, and jealous behavior.
Cats may also fight—even cats that have been best buddies for years. They become more susceptible to illness and disease when under stress. Cats, too, may become unhousebroken, and, in some cases, direct aggression towards their owners, as well as towards the newcomer.

Animals are extremely territorial and need enough space to call their own. Problems may arise from, or be aggravated by, forced proximity. Is there enough money to pay for vaccinations, veterinary care, food, toys, and all the other expenses of owning a pet? Every pet adds a little more responsibility.

I f one has made the decision to add another pet, there are ways to stack the odds in favor of easier acceptance, fewer problems, and more harmonious multi-pet relationships. Some combinations are more likely to succeed than others. The best scenario is to start with two from the beginning. Littersmates are ideal, either puppies or kittens. (Puppies require a bigger time commitment, for housebreaking and later training.) Getting a puppy and a kitten at the same time is good, too, although a very small kitten could be harmed by a rambunctious puppy. A good time to introduce the puppy to the household is when the kitten is about six or seven months old and better able to defend itself and teach the puppy some manners.

When introducing a new pet to an already established resident animal, the less threatening the newcomer is, the better the chances it will be accepted. To animals, non-threatening means younger, smaller, and usually a different sex. For instance, a seven-year-old spayed female cat would probably feel intensely threatened by another adult female, even if it were also spayed. Chances that the two would ever get along are slim. On the other hand, it would probably accept a male kitten, which would pose no initial threat and would be young enough for the older cat to “train.” Keep in mind, however, that a youngster can be very stressful on an elderly pet, since animals, as they age, become increasingly less able to cope with change.

Animals also tend to get along better when they are all spayed and neutered. Dr. Randall Lockwood, director of higher education programs at The HSUS and a nationally known expert on canine behavior, notes, “Male aggression is fairly familiar, but I have also seen intact female dogs be extremely aggressive towards other intact females. Since territorial and dominance behaviors are affected by hormones, spaying and neutering naturally reduce these aggressive impulses.”

Timing is also important. Since introducing a new animal is stressful to the residents, it makes sense not to do it at a time when they are already under stress—when they have just moved to a new house or apartment, for instance, or when one is recovering from an illness or injury. Cats, in particular, are very routine-oriented; they like things done in the same way, at the same time, every day. Any disruption in their routine is stressful, so it’s wise not to add the stress of a new animal at the same time a cat may be feeling stressed from another cause. This can work to an advantage, too; keeping to a familiar routine can help reassure a resident cat and help minimize the stress of the newcomer’s presence once it is in the house.

The decision is made—or perhaps it was made for you when those big brown eyes looked into yours. However you’ve arrived at the decision to bring home another pet, your first responsibility is to the ones you already own. You must protect their health. Make sure their vaccinations are up-to-date; take them to the veterinarian for boosters, if necessary. The newcomer must have all its shots, be dewormed, deflea-ed, if necessary, and kept in quarantine, either at the veterinarian’s or at a foster home, for two weeks, which should be enough time for any infectious diseases to appear. Once it’s certified in good health, you can bring it home.

Since “you never get a second chance to make a good first impression,” how you stage the initial introduction is important. You can help dogs start off on the right paw together if you introduce them on neutral territory, perhaps in a park, instead of at home, so that your resident dog first regards the stranger as a possible friend rather than as a threat to its territory and dominance. Have someone else bring the new dog, so that your dog has no immediate reason to feel jealous, either. Let the dogs get to know each other, and play together, before you take them home.

Once together, adjustment is mostly a matter of coping with feelings of jealousy and sibling rivalry. “I believe dogs are capable of jealousy and resentment,” says Dr. Lockwood, and these feelings can lead to undesirable behavior. Lots of reassurance and attention are in order. Make a fuss over your resident dog and downplay the presence of the newcomer. Dr. Lockwood suggests using the new dog as a cue for doing nice things with the resident dog; when you pat the new dog, pat the resident. When you take the new dog for a walk, take the old-timer. When you give the new dog a toy, give one to the resident. This trains the resident to have positive feelings about the new dog, since when it sees the new dog being patted or walked, it knows it will also enjoy these pleasures. “If the quality of life for the resident dog improves as a result of the arrival of the newcomer, if now there are more pats, more walks, more toys, the resident, one hopes, comes to feel ‘Hey, maybe this isn’t so bad.’” says Dr. Lockwood.

If the resident dog displays any inappropriate aggressive behavior towards the newcomer, it should be quickly and firmly corrected, since the dogs must learn what is acceptable and what isn’t. But do not force the animals to be together if they do not get along. “Their way of resolving differences and establishing a relationship may be by avoiding each other,” points out Dr. Lockwood. “They may rotate their activities, sleeping, eating, and playing at different times.”

Extra supervision is called for if the new dog is much smaller than the resident dog. A large dog can easily injure a small one in play or overtire it. But, on the whole, dogs will work things out on their own, and, given a carefully chosen pair that has been properly introduced, probably become friends.

With cats, many of the same principles apply. Cats are very territorial and will resent the presence of an intruder, so the trick to cat introductions is to give them the opportunity to become familiar with each other and each other’s scents without giving them a chance to slug it out. Dr. Lockwood suggests having a neutral third party bring the new cat into the house in a cage. Put the cage in a room
where the resident cat can come up to it and smell the newcomer and leave the new cat in the cage for about an hour.

After all the cats have had a good sniff, let the newcomer out. Expect a certain amount of chasing, hissing, spitting, and growling—it's natural. But there's not much you can do to help the adjustment process, except referee and step in if it looks as though any cat could get hurt. One way to stop a fight is to throw a blanket on the combatants or spray them with water. Unless you are certain that the cats will not fight, put them in separate quarters when you are away from home.

It may take six to eight weeks or longer for cats to settle down. The same rules apply as for dogs: try not to give the resident cats cause to be jealous and don't force the animals to be together if they do not get along. Cats, like dogs, will rotate their schedules to accommodate the presence of another cat if they're not particularly fond of each other. Don't be disappointed if they never seem close. It may be necessary to provide separate litterboxes, separate food bowls, and separate toys and beds to maintain a harmonious household, and give the cats separate individual time with you, too.

Inter-species introductions follow the same basic rules. For a successful match, choose a younger and smaller animal of the opposite sex. Usually, supervision is very important, as a resident dog can easily hurt a new kitten or resident cats, frightened by a playful puppy, can scratch the pup's nose or eyes. It's also likely that a cat, particularly a kitten, will trigger the "chase response" in a dog—its instinct to chase and catch an animal running away from it. It's safer to get a slightly older kitten, perhaps six or seven months, if there is already a resident dog, since it will be better able to defend and protect itself.

Companion animals bring so much happiness and pleasure into our lives, it's not surprising that many people choose to have more than one. If it is possible, a careful choice of animals and proper introductions will help minimize problems and maximize chances for a harmonious household. While the adjustment period may be hectic, once the fur settles, most multi-pet families live in loving accord, every member the happier for having friends, playmates, and companions.
More than 200 million years ago, long before any mammals, birds, lizards, or even crocodiles, had evolved, there were turtles. These ancestors of today's tortoises walked the earth with the earliest dinosaurs. In the face of a turtle, particularly a large tortoise, we see the face of a distant, primeval age. What are these armored reptiles—these relics from an early age—and why, particularly now, should we be concerned about their welfare?

All turtles are toothless shelled reptiles, termed chelonians by scientists. Their vertebrae and ribs are fused together to form a carapace, or upper shell. There are 240 species of turtles worldwide; they are found on all of the continents except Antarctica and in all the world's oceans. The largest turtle is the leatherback sea turtle, which can grow a carapace length of over six feet. Tortoise is the common name for land-dwelling turtles belonging to the family Testudinidae.* All tortoises are exclusively vegetarians. The world's largest tortoise is the Aldabra Giant tortoise, which can grow more than four feet long. Many tortoises can live more than 100 years; the oldest documented in captivity is 152 years. Scientists estimate the age of individuals by counting the growth rings on their plastron, or lower shell, though after about 25 years the accuracy of this method decreases.

There are only forty-one species of tortoises living today, four of which are found in North America. All forty-one species are listed as threatened under Appendix II of CITES (Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora), except for those five species that are listed as endangered under Appendix I. Appendix I status denotes the species is in danger of extinction due to trade, and all commercial trade is prohibited (see the Fall 1987 *HSUS News*).

Many species of tortoises, particularly giant tortoises, have become extinct due to human activities; others are extremely endangered for the same reason. Though some tortoises dig burrows into which they can escape, for most of these gentle, non-threatening creatures, their shell is their only means of defense. Evolving over millions of years to protect a tortoise from attacks by predators, the shell provides no protection against human predators, and, in many cases, has actually been the reason for tortoises being slaughtered.

Tortoises have been slaughtered for food and artifacts and captured for pets. Their habitats have been destroyed. In many formerly remote areas, particularly islands, the introduction of pigs, goats, and rats that compete with adult tortoises and prey on their young has caused tremendous reduction in tortoise numbers. Tortoises are particularly susceptible to becoming endangered: because they live so long; take such a long time to reach sexual maturity; and have a very low reproductive rate, their populations often cannot recover from fragmentation, habitat destruction, and human predation.

Each of the four North American tortoise species is unique and fascinating and is particularly in need of our help and protection. The desert tortoise lives in the deserts and open woodlands of the American Southwest. The gopher tortoise lives in sandy and wooded habitats in the southern United States, from Texas to Florida. The Texas tortoise, or Berlandier's tortoise, lives in near-desert and wooded areas of Texas and northern Mexico. The least known and most endangered North American tortoise, the Bolson tortoise, is limited to isolated areas within Mexico's Chihuahua Desert.

**NORTH AMERICAN TORTOISES**

* A TALE OF FOUR SPECIES

BY DR. SUSAN S. LIEBERMAN

The Gopher Tortoise is the only North American tortoise found east of the Mississippi River. It survives in small, isolated populations in Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia, Alabama, and South Carolina. These tortoises usually live on well-drained, sandy...
soils in forest and grassy areas. In Florida, they can be found mostly in pine flatwoods and sandy pine-scrub oak areas. It is important not to disturb their extensive burrows, which are about fourteen feet long and six feet deep. The burrows provide them with shelter and protection from extreme temperatures, predators, and fire. Gopher tortoises are very slow growing and range in size from six to fourteen inches. They can live for up to fifty years and are found in colonies of between ten and twelve individuals.

Gopher tortoises were once much more abundant in the southeastern United States, and their populations are declining rapidly. The greatest threats to all gopher-tortoise populations are urban development, clearing for agricultural crops, pasture practices, mining, hunting, human predation, and the pet trade. More than 90 percent of all gopher tortoises live in Florida, where, unfortunately, a limited hunting season still exists. Though the gopher tortoise is considered a "species of special concern" in Florida, commercial hunting is banned only in a few areas within the state. The western population of the gopher tortoise, from western Alabama to Louisiana, was declared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to be a threatened species in August of last year. The western habitat for the gopher tortoise has been reduced by more than 80 percent due to urbanization and agricultural practices. In Florida, the gassing of gopher-tortoise burrows to get rattlesnakes is now illegal, though the cruel practice of "gopher races" is still allowed.

The Texas tortoise, or Berlandier's tortoise, is the smallest North American tortoise, with a maximum size of about nine inches. It is found in southern Texas and the Mexican states of Coahuila, Nuevo Leon, Tamaulipas, and San Luis Potosi.

Unlike the other North American tortoises, the Texas tortoise does not build substantial burrows. Instead, it digs a shallow, temporary depression which usually provides protection for the head and forelimbs only. More often than not, it will seek shelter in cactus patches. The Texas tortoise is most abundant in the coastal areas around Brownsville, Texas, where

---

* More common in the United States are the pond and river turtles belonging to the family Emydidae, which includes box turtles, sliders, pond turtles, and terrapins. Members of this turtle family are chiefly carnivorous and semi-aquatic. Other turtle families found in the United States are the sea turtles, mud and musk turtles, and softshell turtles.
it is closely associated with the prickly pear cactus for both food and shelter. In fact, the relationship between the prickly pear cactus and the Texas tortoise is symbiotic; each is benefited by its relationship with the other. Tortoises eat the cactus and its fruits and use it for refuge when disturbed. The cactus benefits from the fact that seeds that pass through the digestive tract of a tortoise have a better chance of germinating than others that do not.

The Texas tortoise is considered a protected nongame species in Texas and cannot be legally killed, possessed, transported, or sold, although it is not considered endangered. Unfortunately, enforcement is a major problem, and colonies are often killed, dried, varnished, and sold as tourist souvenirs or taken for the pet trade in the United States.

Major factors limiting the abundance of the Texas tortoise are the pet trade and habitat alteration, for both agricultural and grazing purposes. The species is not in immediate danger of extinction, partially because much of its range is in areas which are inaccessible to pet suppliers, where few roads exist, and little land modification has occurred.

The Desert Tortoise, California's state reptile, lives in the desert regions of southeastern California, southern Nevada, southwestern Utah, western Arizona, and parts of northwestern Mexico. It is found from below sea level in Death Valley to elevations of about six thousand feet, though it prefers slopes between mountain ranges. Its shell ranges in size from six to fifteen inches. It requires firm ground to build its burrows and prefers desert oases, riverbanks, washes, dunes, and, occasionally, rocky slopes. Desert-tortoise burrows can be from three to thirty feet long and are used for shelter, aestivation (or spending the summer), and hibernation. These burrows are important components of the desert ecosystem. In some parts of Utah, extensive tortoise dens have been estimated to be more than five thousand years old. Indeed, the desert tortoise is considered a "keystone" species for its ecosystem: every potential factor of concern for its long-term survival also impinges on the environmental quality of the deserts of the Southwest. Any efforts to protect tortoise populations and habitat will benefit all of the animals and plants in the desert ecosystem.

Desert-tortoise populations are all declining; they are threatened by off-road vehicle activity, road construction, oil and gas exploration, agricultural and real estate development, overgrazing, and the pet trade. All too often, desert tortoises are victims of "sportsmen" who consider it fun to shoot the creatures or chase them down with their vehicles. In California, nearly 70 percent of the remaining areas with high tortoise populations are subject to off-road vehicle use.

Most desert-tortoise habitat is on federally managed lands. Livestock grazing occurs on over 90 percent of existing desert-tortoise habitat in California and Arizona. The desert-tortoise population on the Beaver Dam Slope in Utah is considered threatened by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, due to past exploitation by the pet trade, overgrazing, and fragmentation. Due to conflicts with local grazing interests, the listing of this and other populations has been controversial.

The Bolson Tortoise is a temperate North America's largest terrestrial reptile and most endangered tortoise. It was not even scientifically described or named until 1959. The Bolson tortoise can have a shell length of fifteen inches, though fossils are known to have shells as long as three feet. In evolutionary terms, it is most closely related to the gopher tortoise. It inhabits only the desert grasslands of remote regions of Mexico's Chihuahua Desert, the Bolson de Mapimi (within the Mexican states of Coahuila, Chihuahua, and Durango), which, until recently, were virtually unknown to science. These desert grasslands contain many unique species of lizards, snakes, mammals, birds, and insects. Extreme temperatures within the Bolson de Mapimi range from -16°C in the winter to summer highs of 45°C, with most of the rainfall occurring from June through September.

The Bolson tortoise is an ecologically significant element within the Chihuahua desert. It digs very deep, long burrows (up to twenty-five feet long and six feet deep), providing shelter from predators and temperature extremes. An individual will

What Can You Do?

- If you live in one of the eleven states with tortoise populations, write your state Fish and Game Department or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and urge it to increase conservation measures for tortoises.
- Work to end the hunting of tortoises and their commercial exploitation, both for food and pets.
- Help educate others about these unique and fascinating animals.
- If you would like further information, or would like to get involved with tortoise conservation in your area, contact: The Gopher Tortoise Council, Route 1, Box 1367, Anthony, FL 32617; The Desert Tortoise Council, 5310 Cerritos Avenue, Long Beach, CA 90805; Dr. David Morafka, Bolson Tortoise Conservation Foundation, California State University, Department of Biology, Dominguez Hills, CA 90747.
use its burrow for many years; hatchling and juvenile tortoises often dig their own burrows but also use unoccupied rodent burrows. These burrows also provide shelter for many small vertebrates and arthropods.

Scientists estimate that this unique, beautiful species may be extinct within fifteen years unless serious, effective conservation action is implemented. It is estimated that only approximately nine thousand of these tortoises remain. The Bolson tortoise, like the desert tortoise, is severely threatened by use as a human food source, habitat degradation by livestock and agriculture, and illegal trade for pets. It is listed as an endangered species by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Though the species is protected by Mexican law and CITES, these laws and regulations are inadequately enforced.

Due to human influences, the species has an extremely fragmented distribution; it remains subject to very heavy exploitation. Some of the factors contributing to this beautiful species' demise are human predation, habitat degradation and destruction due to agricultural practices, overgrazing by cattle and goats, land reform, railroad development, the pet trade, and lack of protection of most populations. Since railroad construction started in remote regions of Mexico in the 1940s, human predation has increased significantly; tortoises were either eaten directly by construction workers or loaded onto freight cars to be shipped and sold as a culinary delicacy. The remains of a turtle barbecue were discovered recently where pipeline workers illegally raided burrows within a protected area.

Yet all is not hopeless for this fascinating species. It is protected at the Mapimi Biosphere Reserve in the state of Durango, which is part of the UNESCO Man and Biosphere program. This reserve is maintained and operated by the Mexican Institute of Ecology. Adequate protection within this Biosphere Reserve exists due to excellent collaboration between the Ecology Institute and the residents of local ranches and ejidos, cooperative farms of the Mexican Government Resettlement Program. Protection for other Bolson tortoise populations is basically nonexistent.

I have been fortunate to have been involved with scientific studies of the species at the Mapimi Reserve. This cooperative effort, maintained and operated by Mexican scientists and staff, has resulted in hope for the Bolson tortoise, at least within the Mapimi Reserve. An operational hatchery incubates more than one hundred eggs per season, an outdoor nursery houses fifty to one hundred hatchlings and juveniles, and a grassland enclosure contains juveniles in transition for reintroduction. This effort, funded largely by the World Wildlife Fund and the National Science Foundation, has been very successful. The HSUS supports such efforts to increase populations of endangered species without taking any individuals from the wild.

Mapimi remains the only site where Bolson-tortoise protection is actively enforced and a husbandry program is in effect to increase the population. A second preserve is critical to the species' survival and is currently being considered elsewhere within the Chihuahua Desert. An optimal habitat with high tortoise density has been found and is currently for sale for $45,000; if it is not purchased for wildlife preservation, it may be used for intensive cattle ranching. The region is the most natural desert grassland remaining within the Chihuahua Desert and has not yet been subjected to overgrazing. Efforts are currently underway, both by American scientists and Mexico's Department of Urban Development and Ecology, to procure the land for a wildlife preserve.

TORTOISES should never be taken from the wild and should not be kept as pets. If you are fortunate enough to be able to observe these beautiful animals in the wild, you will truly be able to appreciate their grace and unique qualities. They should never be disturbed; even picking up a desert tortoise can cause it to empty its bladder, and, later, die. The ancestors of today's tortoises shared this earth with the dinosaurs, yet our species has extirpated them over large areas and is in the process of precipitating their extinction. Tortoises are silent remnants of an ancient age. If they could speak, perhaps they would ask us to be left alone and to be given some protected areas within which they could prosper and increase their numbers, in compensation for all the suffering we have caused them.

Dr. Susan S. Lieberman is associate director of wildlife and environment for The HSUS. She received her PhD in ecology, based on her studies of tropical rain forest amphibians and reptiles and has done research on desert tortoises in Mexico and California.
ANNUAL CONFERENCE
Making a Difference... for Animals

In October, The HSUS took its annual conference to Arizona for the first time in its thirty-three year history. Against the backdrop of Phoenix's magnificent desert, our four hundred conferees met to chart the achievements of the year past and, in the words of HSUS President John A. Hoyt, "gain a renewed sense of commitment and dedication to the cause of humane education and animal protection."

The National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE) acted as host to an overflow crowd of more than 170 on Wednesday, October 14. NAAHE's all-day seminar, co-hosted by the Western Humane Educators Association, had as its centerpiece a four-part marathon of sixteen workshops. This ambitious format gave participants the opportunity to learn more about innovative projects in the art, summer-school, volunteer, preschool, and higher education fields.

On October 15, formal conference activities began. HSUS Secretary Dr. Amy Freeman Lee exhorted those gathered to "Care Enough to Make a Difference" in her keynote address, and her audience responded with a standing ovation at its close. Dr. Tom Regan offered particular insights on "The Discipline of Animal Rights" from his unique perspective as philosopher, educator, and author. NAAHE's "Happy No-Birthday Party," complete with balloons, cake, and singing schoolchildren, celebrated a lowered birthrate of unwanted animals, the result of the spaying and neutering of pets.
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HSUS President John A. Hoyt (left) presents journalist Paul Harvey (second from left) with the inaugural James Herriot Award as Mrs. Harvey (center), Mrs. Edward M. Boehm, and the Harveys' son, Paul Aurant, offer their congratulations.

HSUS President John A. Hoyt (left) and Chairman Emeritus of the Board of Directors Coleman Burke (right) present the Joseph Wood Krutch Medal to Dr. Tom Regan, the highlight of Saturday's banquet ceremonies.

HSUS conference participants shout, “Good Morning, America!” for the television show of the same name during a break in conference activities.

(Opposite) “No-Birthday” cake awaits conference participants following the “Happy No-Birthday Party,” held on Thursday.
World Society for the Protection of Animals Regional Director John Walsh (center) addressed the animal-welfare problems found in Latin America during Friday's general session and in a Thursday workshop, where he was joined by members of his international staff.

HSUS Director of Data and Information Services Guy Hodge (seated) and Arizona trapping opponent Larry Sunderland (center) enjoy HSUS Vice President John W. Grandy's demonstration of a trap's hold on a pocket comb during their trapping workshop.

Barbara Westerfield (standing) leads a teacher education workshop, part of Wednesday's humane education seminar.

(Above, right) NAAHE Director Patty Finch (standing) spoke to participants in Wednesday's session and those involved in Friday's humane forum.
On Friday, general addresses by John Walsh, regional director of the World Society for the Protection of Animals, and Dr. Randall Lockwood, director of higher education programs for The HSUS, preceded an afternoon spent exploring aspects of “Being, Becoming, and Staying Humane.”

Twenty different workshop sessions, held on Thursday and Saturday, brought conference participants face-to-face with those “bread-and-butter” issues that make up the animal-protection movement, including animal fighting, animal abuse in school systems, and improved shelter operations. Our cockfighting seminar proved to be such a popular draw that several supporters of the activity (which is still legal in Arizona) were part of the audience.

At this year’s annual banquet, President Hoyt inaugurated The HSUS’s James Herriot Award, “to be given to an outstanding agency or individual who, through communication with the public, has helped promote and inspire appreciation of and concern for animals.” Named in honor of the world-famous author and veterinarian, the award, a porcelain figurine created by the Edward Boehm Studio, was presented to noted radio commentator Paul Harvey. Speaking on behalf of the entire Harvey family, Paul Aurant, son of Mr. and Mrs. Harvey, gave an eloquent response of appreciation and presented to President Hoyt a generous contribution in support of our work and program.

Dr. Tom Regan was 1987’s recipient of the Joseph Wood Krutch Medal, in recognition of his work on behalf of animal rights. His moving acceptance remarks brought our conference to an inspiring close.

1987 RESOLUTION

Proposed and adopted at the 1987 Annual Conference by voting members of The HSUS.

Whereas, the fighting of birds, commonly referred to as cockfighting, is a “blood sport” that has no place in a civilized society; and

Whereas, it is a national disgrace that several states within the United States of America, including Arizona, have not, by state law, made this torture illegal; and

Whereas, sanctioning torture, and cruelty to animals in this blatant form is fostering an attitude that living creatures can be forced to injure and destroy themselves merely for the purpose of human entertainment. This attitude can only lead to disrespect and disregard for all living entities; and

Whereas, cockfighting is unofficially sanctioned in many other parts of this nation by the lack of enforcement of current laws forbidding the practice of cockfighting, and by the existence of weak laws, it is hereby

RESOLVED, that this 1987 annual conference of The Humane Society of the United States, meeting in Phoenix, Arizona, dedicates itself to the abolition of the “blood sport” of cockfighting throughout the United States, through the strengthening of the language and enforcement of current laws, and the enactment of new statutes prohibiting cockfighting in all states where none presently exist.

CONFER IN THE CAPITAL

This fall, The HSUS will welcome you to our own backyard, when the 1988 annual conference comes to suburban Washington, D.C., October 13-15. We’ll have more details in upcoming issues of the NEWS.
Drs. Randall Lockwood (left) and Michael Fox speak frankly during their session on "Being, Becoming, and Staying Humane."

HSUS Secretary and keynote speaker Dr. Amy Freeman Lee congratulates Dr. Tom Regan on his address, "The Discipline of Animal Rights," after Thursday's morning session.

HSUS Director of Animal Sheltering and Control Barbara Cassidy (center) chats with Bill Brothers of California and Samantha Mullen of New York.
CHANGING THE SHAPE OF TRADITION

The Humane Society of the United States has long opposed unnecessary cosmetic surgery on dogs—the grisly practice of trimming ears and docking tails to create a fashionable "look."

"Why should we subject animals to pain and suffering just for our own vanity?" asks Phyllis Wright, HSUS vice president for companion animals. It's inhumane; it's of no benefit to the animal; and it leads to the mutilation of thousands of dogs each year—not only the purebreds destined for the show ring (the only place dogs are required to display such alterations) but countless house pets as well.

Changing the custom is an uphill battle, however, so accepted has it become and so familiar is the altered appearance of certain breeds. Doberman pinschers and Great Danes can blame human interference for their sharp, pointy ears, as can spaniels and Old English sheepdogs, with stubs where their tails used to be.

Breed clubs cling stubbornly to their standards, refusing to recognize that not only are the puppies they are breeding and registering suffering from having their delicate ears cut at a young and very sensitive age, but the show ring standards they set also lead to the mutilation of countless other dogs, not necessarily purebreds, whose owners wish to make them look like fancy showdogs. The American Kennel Club (AKC) continues to condone the practice, allowing associations to keep it in their breed standards if they wish to. Thirty-four breeds take advantage of this, including in their official breed standards either a docked tail, cropped ears, or both.

While breeders marshal arguments and rationalizations to defend this archaic and cruel practice, nothing justifies putting a young animal through pain for no reason other than human vanity and to satisfy arbitrary standards as to what looks "right."

Tail docking is done at the age of only two or three days. Without any anesthesia, the tail is twisted or cut off. Some people convince themselves that, at that age, the puppies are too young to feel the pain, but one breeder who wishes he didn't have to dock his boxers' tails in order to meet the breed standards tells a different story. "The first time I held a pup for the vet, it screamed and yelped when he cut off its tail. You can't tell me they don't feel the pain."

Ear cropping is an even more traumatic procedure. It is done when a puppy is approximately three months old, usually an age when it is frolicking happily with people, learning to love and trust them, and forming impressions and attitudes toward people that will shape its behavior for its entire life. One day, it is taken to the veterinarian's office and anesthetized. When it wakes up, it is whimpering in pain—its soft and sensitive ears have been partially cut off and the raw edges stitched up. The healing process is a long, painful ordeal, as the ears are daily rebandaged, taped, and propped in order to achieve the fashionable erect position. Such treatment can sour a dog's disposition for life. "We find more snappy and bad-tempered schnauzers among the ones that have had their ears trimmed, and this can be directly related to experiencing pain during their socialization period," asserts Lawrence Giebel, D.V.M., of Gaithersburg, Maryland, who refuses to crop ears and who would like to see ear cropping prohibited throughout the United States. "I'm very opposed to ear cropping that's done for purely cosmetic reasons. I
don't think that’s a good enough reason to put a puppy through pain."

While no reason will ever be "good enough" to justify a painful operation that's of no benefit to the animal, arguments and rationalizations abound. "Tradition" is one of the more often cited ones. Some of the breeds involved have had their bodies restyled for hundreds of years, and to change their look now is anathema to many breed fanciers, even though it means maintaining an attitude that dogs are unfeeling objects and that man has the right to impose physical deformities on them if he wishes. Working dogs had their ears cut to prevent them from catching on things. Hunting dogs had their ears cut so that aggressive quarry, such as wild boars, could not grab an ear and incapacitate a dog. Smaller dogs, bred to chase even smaller animals down into holes and dens, had their ears cut to allow them easier access into tight places. Dogs used as guard and protection dogs—Doberman pinschers, Great Danes, and boxers—had their ears shaped into sharp points to make them appear more aggressive and frightening.

A popular reason for perpetuating such atrocities is, ironically, that cutting a dog's ears is actually healthier for the dog. Long ears catch on things, breeders say, and are constantly injured. Trimmed ears are much cleaner, they say, and less prone to infections. Such arguments are dismissed by veterinarians. "The idea that uncropped ears lead to infection is totally false," says Dr. Giebel. "I’ve seen lots of Dobermans and schnauzers with uncropped ears that have no more incidence of ear infections than dogs with cropped ears." Neil Wolff, D.V.M., of Greenwich, Connecticut, and a founder of the Association of Veterinarians for Animal Rights, concurs, and adds, "Cutting a dog’s ears off because they might catch on things is about as logical as cutting your leg off because you might stub your toe. It’s a fashion whim of no value to the dog."

Nature designed floppy ears with a reason—to protect the sensitive inner ear. Without their natural cover, cropped dogs may be miserable in warmer months, plagued by flies and gnats. Their ears may actually be prone to more infections, since dirt and dust have easier access. Cosmetic surgery has been the norm for so long that breeders who defend it honestly believe that an uncropped dog (of a breed that’s usually cropped) is ugly. But clinging to an idea of beauty and fashion that necessitates pain and mutilation is also ugly. To anyone who objects to unnecessary pain being inflicted on animals, an uncropped dog is not ugly.

Breeders’ attitudes might change if they could see the mutilated and butchered ears of those dogs whose owners wanted to follow the fad but decided they could do it themselves. Some dogs are left with no more than stubs, and the pain they must have endured, with no medical attention, is totally unjustifiable. There are humane breeders who realize that they are hurting their puppies and who support a change in the arbitrary standards, which would enable them to show their dogs without tampering with their bodies. They encourage people who buy purebred dogs as pets not to crop. "Unless you’re going to show the dog, there’s absolutely no reason to do it," says a Virginia boxer breeder. That’s no reason, either, as England, where ear cropping is illegal, has recognized. Ear cropping is also illegal in West Germany and several Canadian provinces; and in other European countries, it is at least optional.
to show those breeds affected either cropped or uncropped.

These attitudes need to be encouraged. Anyone seeking a purebred dog of a breed that is customarily cropped should look for breeders who do not crop those dogs to be sold as pets. Local breeders need to know they are supported in their efforts to change their breed’s standards. Breeders who insist on cropping and docking all their dogs need to be challenged, and perhaps educated as to why the standard is cruel.

Such encouragement has to come from the dog-loving public, because the national breed clubs and the AKC cling firmly to their Dark Age customs. Yet even they must think there is something unsavory about it, for they exhibit an extreme reluctance to speak openly about the issue. National breed clubs we tried to contact in connection with this article either would not talk to us or did not return our calls. One breed club said its entire board of directors would have to meet in order to issue an official statement on why it keeps ear cropping as part of the standard. Many breeders discourage non-breeders from attempting to see a pup through a cropping, preferring to do it themselves before letting the pup go to a new home. They admit it is too unnerving for the uninitiated to experience.

It’s time everyone, not just the breeders, knew the ugly truth behind this custom. Educate your friends, neighbors, and local breeders and veterinarians about the real cruelties of cosmetic surgery. We can put pressure on the national breed clubs and the AKC to change their ways. Write to your legislators, too, asking for the outlawing of cosmetic surgery in this country, as it has been in other, enlightened countries. Perhaps soon we’ll see the day when “the natural look” is the dominant look for all dogs.
SOMETIMES IN OUR LIVES, we are inevitably confronted with the suffering and killing of animals that are a consequence of human actions. No matter how insulated we are from the reality of what some now call the Holocaust of the animal kingdom, we cannot ignore it. One new member of The Humane Society of the United States who attended our annual conference last autumn in Phoenix confided that she was ignorant of this holocaust until she saw on television stolen videotapes taken of lightly sedated baboons at the University of Pennsylvania having their skulls crushed in the name of medical progress. She realized that something was wrong; this kind of thing should simply not be happening. Yet, it was.

My own rude awakening—or at least my first, since there have been many—occurred when I was about five years old. I was playing around one of the ponds in my neighborhood, a favorite place full of the surprises of aquatic life, when I saw a sack floating in the water.

"Treasure," I thought as I pulled it to the bank with a long stick. But when I opened it, I found a litter of dead kittens. So soaked and bloated were they, their eyes not yet open, that I didn't quite realize what they were at first. Then, I realized that someone had deliberately, one by one, put them into the sack and had then thrown them into the pond to die. I learned that other people—grown-ups—must have a different attitude toward animals than I had, for I could never have drowned a litter of kittens in an old sack.

Around this same pond the following springtime, I had another rude awakening. I discovered the burst remains of several frogs, easily caught in their vulnerable breeding season, strewn along the muddy bank. I knew no wild creature could cause such wholesale destruction. Then, I saw the hollow, broken straws of thick grass stems that had been thrust into the frogs' mouths. Boys—my peers and sometime playmates—had blown up the frogs; blown them up into four-legged, eye-bulging, yellow-green balloons until they burst apart. I realized then that it was not just adults, but also children like myself, who could be cruel in their indifference toward animal life and animal suffering.

Rude awakenings can come at any time in one's life. The first awakening can leave an indelible scar or an open wound that never heals as one bleeds with others' suffering. More often, the scar seems to fade, not with the waning memory of the first awakening, but with the acceptance of human cruelty toward animals, if not indifference toward animals' suffering, as a social norm.

When the social norm or status quo is within the law, yet seems at odds with one's own feelings and ethical sensibility, a deep rage at the injustices of the world arises. It seems as though there are two worlds, one in which those who care for frogs and kittens can never belong, and the other where there is respect for all life and an ethical consistency in our relationships with those other living beings that are an integral part of the community of moral concern. In the latter, animals are protected by laws of the land, which rarely need to be enforced, because human ac-
tions are governed by ethical sensibility and guided by empathetic sensitivity.

This world of peace, justice, and respect for the integrity and future of creation seems to be disappearing before our very eyes. Even my wonder-filled playground ponds of aquatic life's diversity are now all gone, filled and paved over beneath a labyrinth of suburban housing developments.

The rude awakening can also evoke feelings of alienation and despair. These emotions, along with anger, are neither unnatural nor unhealthy. Such feelings, along with the overwhelming sadness over the tragedy of reality, have to be worked through. The reality created by people's perception of animals and all natural creations as mere "things," devoid of inherent worth and thus unworthy of moral consideration, is a cause of deep concern for those who do not share this perception.

How ironic it is that those who do hold the well-being of creatures and the beauty and mystery of creation close to their hearts should suffer as a consequence! Yet, in their rude awakening, lies hope beyond the burdening emotions of sadness, anger, alienation, and despair.

There is hope when, like the urban family who saw on television how veal calves are raised on factory farms, there is responsible action. Following their rude awakening, they decided overnight never to eat veal again. Then, after further investigations into other factory farming practices by one of the children, a high school student, several family members and close friends are now exploring vegetarianism.

I knew another student whose rude awakening was the callously conducted college physiology "dog-lab" class. This student went on to set up a campus-wide Students' Animal Rights Association and, after graduation, became involved in full-time animal-protection work.

Humanitarians can take heart from the fact that there are many instances of people making significant, even radical, changes in their lives following a "rude awakening." This emphasizes the value of public sensitization and education, which is underscored by the effectiveness of factual media coverage of animal-welfare and environmental issues. Public apathy and indifference are less of a problem, I believe, than lack of knowledge about such issues and what one can do to help.

It is a fact that many people confronted with animal cruelty and suffering simply tune out. For some, reality may be too painful. Others may have no rude awakening because they are alienated by a kind of protective indifference to the holocaust of the animal kingdom. This alienation is something that all humane educators need to consider. They should not be afraid of alienating an already alienated public, but rather, draw them into the circle of concern for creatures and creation, since, in the final analysis, altruistic concern is enlightened self-interest: the way to a better society and a world where peace, justice, and the integrity of creation may be better ensured for future generations to enjoy.

"The first awakening can leave an indelible scar or an open wound that never heals...."
Aiding the Endangered
The Endangered Species Act (ESA) reauthorization bills, S. 675 and H.R. 1467 have made considerable progress in the last few months. Both have passed complete review in the committee stage and should be sent to the floors of the House and Senate any day now. Both bills contain some increased funding, a system for monitoring species that are candidates for listing, and improved protection for endangered plants. The senate bill also includes increases in the fines paid by those who are convicted of killing or harming endangered species; assignment of those funds to recovery programs; and a provision for an automatic appropriation for grants to state endangered species programs, which should triple the small amount of funding currently available to these critically necessary programs.

The house bill contains an amendment settling the controversy between shrimp fishermen and environmentalists over the use of turtle-excluder devices (TEDs) which keep endangered sea turtles from drowning in shrimpers’ nets. The amendment implements regulations requiring the use of TEDs in offshore areas, where more turtles are caught, and delaying their use in inshore waters for two years while additional studies are performed.

The HSUS and the other members of the Endangered Species Act Reauthorization Coalition have kept amendments out of the bills that would weaken protection for threatened predators, such as the grizzly bear and wolf. However, Senator Alan Simpson of Wyoming has announced his intention to offer such an amendment on the senate floor, which would presumably allow for increased killing of these animals. This action, damaging enough on its own, may also jeopardize passage of the entire bill. Please write your senators and ask them to tell Sen. Robert Byrd, senate majority leader, to bring the bill to the floor for a vote as reported by committee, without allowing any further amendments. Sen. Simpson’s proposal strikes at the heart of the ESA, which is supposed to preserve, not kill, declining species.

In a related development, The HSUS recently joined several other animal-protection and environmental groups in pushing for wolf reintroduction in the Yellowstone area of the Rocky Mountains. Part of a larger project that would reintroduce three separate wolf populations in the northern Rockies, the Yellowstone effort has been sidetracked by political objections from the Wyoming congressional delegation. In a letter to Donald Hodel, secretary of the interior, The HSUS and the other organizations strongly urged him to get the project back on track by preparing an environmental impact statement, the next step in the reintroduction procedure.

“Wolf reintroduction is important biologically to America’s oldest national park and of growing importance to the American public,” we stated. “[We] ask that you fulfill your obligation under the Endangered Species Act to recover the gray wolf in the northern Rocky Mountains.”

Animal-Patenting Update
Following the April 13, 1987, ruling issued by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) stating that patents could be issued on genetically engineered animals (see the Summer 1987 HSUS News), The HSUS joined twenty animal-protection, environmental, and agricultural organizations, as well as several religious leaders, in order to reverse the decision or delay its implementation. Representative Robert Kastenmeier of Wisconsin, chairman of the House Judiciary Courts Subcommittee, held four hearings on the issue and on H.R. 3119, the two-year moratorium on Patent Office action that Rep. Charlie Rose introduced on our behalf.

While the Courts Subcommittee has not yet acted, Chairman Kastenmeier has indicated he is leaning toward recommending legislative solutions to alleviate problems that may result from patenting rather than supporting the moratorium.

Sen. Mark O. Hatfield of Oregon has indicated he will introduce a moratorium bill, but, as of December, had not yet done so.

We have received support from thirteen other members of the House of Representatives who have cosponsored H.R. 3119, but we need more support in our effort to get the bill favorably reported from the House Judiciary Committee. Since it is possible that the Patent Office could be ready to issue patents on genetically engineered animals this spring, every member of Congress must be made aware of the seriousness of this issue.

Please contact your representative and senators to tell them about the potential consequences of the PTO’s decision and ask them to support the two-year moratorium. Whether animals should be patent-protected is a question that should be decided by Congress rather than by a single government agency. It’s up to us to see that Congress is given time to weigh its action.

Pet-Protection Progress
S. 1457, introduced by Sen. Wendell H. Ford of Kentucky, and H.R. 778, introduced by Rep. Robert J. Mrazek of New York, are moving forward in the legislative system. Both prohibit pound seizure, the taking of animals from shelters for use in research, by denying federal funding to any researcher who uses shelter animals.

S. 1457 currently has 12 cosponsors; H.R. 778 has 102. As more members of Congress support these bills, congressional action becomes more likely. Hearings may be held this spring.

Please write to your representative and senators and ask them to support a nationwide ban on pound seizure.
Under Seige
Home to grizzly bears, wolves, caribou, polar bears, ducks, geese, and many other species, Alaska’s pristine Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) has caused a pitched battle in Congress. At issue is whether ANWR’s coastal plain, an area of northeast Alaska bordering the Beaufort Sea, should be leased by the government for oil and gas development. Also the center of the refuge’s wildlife activity, this magnificent area, now an unspoiled wilderness, would be covered by acres of industrial facilities and inhabited by up to six thousand people and hundreds of vehicles, polluting its clear air and pure waters even if no oil were found. (Looking for oil, or “exploratory drilling,” calls for extensive facilities and does permanent damage in fragile arctic areas.) All this destruction would take place for an amount of oil that, at the most optimistic estimates, would supply the United States with enough oil for one month. There’s an 80 percent chance that nothing would be found at all, according to the Interior Department.

Congress must make the decision on whether to lease ANWR. Rep. Morris K. Udall and Sen. William V. Roth have introduced bills H.R. 39 and S. 1804 in the House and Senate, which would officially declare ANWR’s coastal plain a wilderness area, preventing any development and ensuring the preservation of its wildlife and wilderness values. But several bills have been introduced by other congressmen to open ANWR to development. Please write your senators and representative. Urge them to cosponsor H.R. 39 and S. 1804 and vote for protection of the ANWR.

Funding for the Future
Last fall, The HSUS joined a group of other nonprofit organizations to help get the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) reauthorized. Originally enacted by Congress twenty-five years ago, the LWCF is one of the most important funding sources for acquiring wildlife refuges and parks at the national, state, and local levels. On the premise that those who deplete natural resources should also pay to help preserve them, the fund receives a portion of the money collected by the federal government from oil companies as payments for offshore oil and gas leases. Millions of dollars over the last quarter century have bought conservation and parkland in all fifty states. The fund is important to animal protectionists because the land it preserves is often excellent wildlife habitat.

The LWCF coalition has designed a bigger and better fund, with more money, provisions for special funding for new or creative approaches to land preservation, and other improvements. We expect to see our bill introduced in Congress this year and will be working to ensure the continuation of this farsighted legislation.

Our Congressional “P.A.L.s”

The HSUS thanks Sen. Dole and Rep. Foley for taking the lead in this important campaign. Their efforts will help educate the public about the tragedy of pet overpopulation as well as the benefits of spaying and neutering pet animals.

Both Sen. Dole (shown with his wife, Elizabeth, and dog, Leader) and Rep. Foley (mugging with his dog, Alice) own formerly homeless pets. All seem proud of their involvement in “National Prevent A Litter Month.”
Clean Beaches

The Gulf States Regional Office invited all HSUS members in the Corpus Christi, Tex., area to be a part of the “Texas Coastal Cleanup” on September 19, 1987. Fifteen hundred participants turned out, and twenty-eight tons of garbage and debris, much of it lethal to wildlife, were collected.

Marine mammals, sea turtles, sea birds, and fish are often entangled in debris, leading to starvation, strangulation, and death. Certain animals, such as sea turtles, mistake the trash for food and die from eating it. Data on the trash collected is used to help convince local, state, and federal agencies of the action needed to correct the litter problems.

Race Promoter Guilty

The promoter of the “Oklahoma Spring Endurance Ride,” held in June in Rogers County, Okla., was found guilty of cruelty to animals by a Rogers County judge in October. Seven horses died from heat exhaustion in the race (see the Fall 1987 HSUS News). Bill McAnally, who offered $20,000 in prize money to competitors in the race, was placed on probation and fined $1,000. He allegedly collected $10,000 in bets and entry fees, which has never been recovered.

We Lost the Race

Texas animal protectionists lost a major battle at the polls on November 3, when Texans voted to legalize pari-mutuel dog and horse racing throughout the state. Despite a statewide campaign by the Gulf States Regional Office to educate the public about the cruelties inherent in dog and horse racing, the belief that gambling would be good for the economy allowed the issue to pass in referendum by a slim margin of only 5 percent.

We will continue to work for an effective statewide law prohibiting the cruel dog-training method known as “coursing,” in which live rabbits are used as lures and are killed by the dogs during training.

Humane Symposium

The Gulf States Regional Office will hold a “Humane Philosophy and Education Symposium,” May 27 and 28, 1988. Speakers will include HSUS President John A. Hoyt, HSUS Vice President for Farm Animals and Bio-Ethics Dr. Michael Fox, and the director of the Association for the Advancement of Humane Education, Patty Finch. For more information and registration materials, contact the Gulf States Regional Office (6262 Weber Rd., Suite 305, Corpus Christi, TX 78413).

Pit Bull Investigation

In the fall, the Great Lakes Regional Office was involved in a dogfighting investigation in Nichollsville, Ohio. After receiving a call from the Clermont County sheriff’s department, Program Coordinator Tina Nelson traveled to that county to review evidence which had been seized pursuant to a search warrant. The search warrant was obtained after officers responded to a complaint involving a pit bull allegedly trapped under a fence. Once on the scene, officers observed eight more pit bull terriers and dogfighting paraphernalia.

Ms. Nelson reviewed videotapes of the seizure and then met with the Clermont County prosecuting attorney and Clermont County detectives. Based upon the evidence, felony charges were filed against the dogs’ owner. The case was presented to a grand jury and the defendant was indicted. A trial is pending.

Dangerous-Dog Workshop

The HSUS and the Bloomington, Ind., Department of Animal Control hosted a timely workshop focusing on dangerous dogs and dangerous-dog legislation. The workshop was well attended, reflecting the current interest in this controversial subject.

The speakers included William Buckley, attorney and author of Indiana Animal and Wildlife Law; Marc Carmichael, Indiana state representative; Kate Rindy, HSUS research assistant; Sandy Rowland, Great Lakes Regional Office director; and Jim Lang, director of the Department of Animal Control, Bloomington, Ind. The workshop concluded with a tour of Bloomington’s animal shelter.

Coming Up

The Great Lakes Regional Office will sponsor a workshop entitled “Humane Solutions to Nuisance Wildlife Problems” in Columbus, Ohio, on March 24, 1988. Those interested should contact the Great Lakes Regional Office (735 Haskins St., Bowling Green, Ohio 43402-1696).
Cult Goes to Court

The Southeast Regional Office is gearing up for a legal battle over the sacrifice of thousands of animals, including pigeons, chickens, goats, and sheep, by religious cults. The Santeria church of Lukumi Babalu-Aye has filed a lawsuit against the city of Hialeah, Fla., for its banning of animal sacrifice within its corporate limits. The city council passed three such ordinances based on recommendations by Southeast Regional Director Marc Paulhus.

The church’s lawsuit contends the city is attempting to restrict its constitutional guarantee to practice freedom of religion. The HSUS is supporting the town in its stand against the practice of ritual sacrifice of animals by any individual, group, or cult. The Southeast Regional Office and some of the Hialeah council members are currently discussing granting The HSUS the status of a friend of the court on the city’s behalf.

Turnout for Seminar

More than eighty people turned out for Georgia’s first animal-rights seminar, held November 7, 1987, in Atlanta. Mr. Paulhus spoke to the group about hunting and wildlife refuges. He also took part in a panel discussion on getting people involved in animal-rights issues. The Georgia Earth Alliance sponsored the all-day seminar.

Dogs Shot

Reports of shootings of dogs by animal-control officers in Blountstown, Fla., have brought swift action by the state’s new governor. On November 14, 1987, Governor Bob Martinez ordered the Florida Department of Law Enforcement to investigate the incidents.

The uproar began with a citizen’s complaint to the Southeast Regional Office claiming that animals taken to the local pound were left without food or water, then shot. The Blountstown animal-control officer justified the shootings by saying the ones killed “are mangy, sick dogs, or old bitches that are hanging around in garbage cans and bringing more and more puppies into the world.”

Blountstown Police Chief Weston Deason’s own admission that his officers sometimes shoot strays as a way of disposing of them prompted the governor’s action. According to Mr. Paulhus, the practice violates Florida law. The only acceptable methods of euthanasia are by lethal injection or by bottled carbon monoxide gas, if the animals are over four months of age.

The Southeast Regional Office is concerned that the shootings are just the tip of the iceberg. Most northern Florida counties do not have animal-control programs, and reports of shootings of dogs and cats in these areas have surfaced in the past.

Auction Cruelties

Midwest Regional Director Wendell Maddox and HSUS Captive Wildlife Specialist David Herbet recently visited a wildlife auction in Macon, Mo., that was typical of auctions observed in the Midwest and elsewhere. They noted many instances of inhumane treatment, including transporting animals in the backs of pickup trucks, and inadequate cages. Some of the smaller mammals and birds had had chicken wire simply wrapped around their bodies to form cages. Many of the animals, particularly the hoofed stock, had sustained numerous minor injuries. The animals were kept in trailers, trucks, alleyways, and other makeshift accommodations at night and throughout the four-day auction. Plans to investigate other auctions are underway.

1988 Legislative Update

Representatives of humane groups throughout the region have established priorities for the 1988 legislative session. Groups in Kansas will continue to work for the passage of H.B. 2220, a bill that will require state licensing of animal-care facilities, workers, animal breeders, and brokers (puppy mills). In response to the many letters he has received, Kansas Governor Mike Hayden has expressed a strong desire to clean up puppy mills and improve the state’s tarnished image.

In Nebraska, twelve representatives of humane societies met in November, 1987, to organize a statewide legislative coalition and to set a legislative agenda for 1988. The meeting was organized by Bob Downey, executive director of the Capital Humane Society in Lincoln, Neb.; Kathy Reiber, executive director of the Central Nebraska Humane Society in Grand Island, Neb.; and Mr. Maddox. The coalition will be working for the passage of a felony animal-fighting law and a statewide ban on vicious animals.

In Iowa, the board of directors of the Iowa Federation has included among its targeted issues mandatory rabies vaccinations for cats, a prohibition on the keeping of wild and exotic animals by non-exhibitors, and a ban on trapping. In Missouri, animal protectionists will continue to fight the passage of legislation to permit dog racing.
Traveling

Mid-Atlantic Regional Director Nina Austenberg and Program Coordinator Rick Abel recently attended the New York State Humane Association conference in New York City. The major themes, pet overpopulation and stray dogs and cats, were discussed by many speakers, including Barbara Cassidy, HSUS director of animal sheltering and control. Then, it was off to Pittsburgh for the sixty-fifth conference of the Federated Humane Societies of Pennsylvania, where Mr. Abel presented a workshop on community relations. Also attending was HSUS Investigator Bob Baker, who discussed the pit bull problem and vicious- and dangerous-dog legislation.

In response to recent public concern about vicious dogs, The HSUS's companion animal division, under the leadership of vice president Phyllis

From left: Mid-Atlantic Regional Director Nina Austenberg, actress and animal activist Gretchen Wyler, HSUS Director of Animal Sheltering Barbara Cassidy, and State Veterinarian for the New Jersey Department of Health Dr. Faye Sorhage gather together during the New York State Humane Association conference.

Wright, hosted a two-day conference in Allentown, Pa., on that subject. More than one hundred participants attended. Ms. Austenberg presented information on structuring legislation to help control this national problem.

WEST COAST

Update on Project X

In July, 1987, HSUS President John A. Hoyt wrote to Los Angeles County District Attorney Ira Reiner, requesting that an investigation be conducted regarding allegations of chimpanzee abuse in the making of the movie “Project X” (see the Summer 1987 HSUS News). The district attorney’s office asked the Los Angeles Animal Regulation Department to investigate the complaints. Animal Regulation recommended that a complaint be filed alleging eighteen felony charges of cruelty to animals against six animal trainers involved in the making of the movie.

On November 12, 1987, Los Angeles Deputy District Attorney Mike Carroll announced that the one-year statute of limitations on the most relevant criminal charges had passed. However, he felt that there was sufficient evidence to warrant prosecution under civil statutes.

Information gathered by West Coast Investigator Kurt Lapham on the importation of one of the chimps from West Germany may be applicable to the civil action. He has uncovered a loophole in the Federal Wildlife Permit Office’s issuance of import permits for endangered species, and it appears the chimp should not have been admitted into this country.

The HSUS has requested a meeting with the acting chief of the Federal Wildlife Permit Office to discuss how the chimpanzee was imported and why the trainer was granted a permit for the importation.

Conviction

In November, 1987, a Lamont, Calif., man was sentenced to perform one hundred hours of community service work and will not be allowed to own, possess, or be in control of any game fowl, in addition to a fine and probationary period of one year. Jurors found Ramon Gonzalez guilty of possessing gamecocks for fighting purposes after a lengthy trial in October.

Mr. Gonzalez was originally charged with the crime in May, after humane officers of the Bakersfield SPCA received information regarding cockfighting. They requested assistance from the West Coast Regional Office. That information led to search warrants being served at two locations, where approximately five hundred game fowl were seized, along with cockfighting publications and other paraphernalia. Subsequent information obtained by BSPCA’s officers led to warrants being served at five other Kern County locations, where numerous game fowl were seized, along with cockfighting publications, trophies, and more than $4,000 worth of illegal cockfighting implements. Trials are pending.

Clinics Saved

The first half of California’s 1987-1988 legislative session ended in victory for the West Coast Regional Office and its members. Two important bills were signed into law by the governor, and, as importantly, a third was dropped by its author.

S.B. 1623, authored by State Senator continued on following page
David Roberti and sponsored by the West Coast Regional Office, returns dogfighting to the status of a felony, punishable by incarceration in a state prison, and/or a fine of up to $50,000. Dogfighting is now a felony in thirty-six states.

A.B. 1560, authored by Assembly Member Phil Isenberg, imposes humane standards on the keeping of horses or other equines for hire. Riding stables and other such businesses, largely unregulated until now, have been a continuing source of horse-abuse complaints. Mr. Lapham helped write the bill and testified on its behalf. Violations of this law will result in a citation and fines of $100 per violation, per day, until deficiencies in housing, veterinary care, feeding, etc., are remedied.

Another milestone was passed when Assembly Member Nolan Frizzelle dropped his bill, A.B. 1358. This bill, sponsored by the California Veterinary Medical Association, would have made it illegal for humane societies to own low-cost spay/neuter clinics—those same clinics that have been so helpful in the fight to reduce California's growing pet-overpopulation problem. The CVMA has stated that it will take no further action on this issue without first conferring with all interested parties, including representatives of the humane community.

**Prison Cover-Up**

Upon learning that four California prison guards were merely docked in pay for performing a gruesome ritual in which cats, both stray and those befriended by inmates, were fed to a black pit bull terrier, the West Coast Regional Office immediately contacted the Department of Corrections and Mendocino County District Attorney Susan Massini. Since it has been two years since the incidents occurred at the Chamberlin Creek Conservation Camp, it is too late to file misdemeanor cruelty charges. Ms. Massini was looking into the possibility of filing felony charges. West Coast Regional Director Char Drennon has written a formal request to the California attorney general asking for a full-scale investigation into the original inquiry.

### Pulling-Contest Bill

Charging that many oxen and horses used in pulling contests are abused in training and during fair events, the Maine Animal Coalition, backed by HSUS investigative findings, has proposed legislation to establish new rules to regulate such competitions. A bill filed by Representative James Mitchell, of Freeport, would outlaw heavy blows on any part of the body, including the face; ban pulling contests when the temperature exceeds 88°F; and require owners to provide water for their animals before they are weighed in. The bill would prohibit animal owners from entering more than three fairs a year and would prohibit out-of-staters from entering Maine pulling contests. The bill would also require that a state veterinarian test all animals at contests for drugs, dehydration, and mistreatment. To monitor compliance with state regulations, a state agent would be assigned to attend every pulling contest.

New England Program Coordinator Frank Ribaudo, who has been conducting an extensive investigation into pulling-contest cruelties, met with coalition representatives to provide detailed information and technical assistance on the topic. HSUS members in Maine and their friends are urged to contact the Maine Animal Coalition for information on how they can help. The address is P.O. Box 7504 DTS, Portland, ME 04112.

### Zoo Closes

New England Regional Director John Dommers, HSUS Captive Wildlife Specialist David Herbet, and Mr. Ribaudo monitored an auction of hundreds of exotic animals, including several endangered species, when the New England Playworld Amusement Park and Zoo (formerly Benson's Animal Park) in Hudson, N.H., closed last October. The New England Regional Office has responded to complaints about the zoo for over ten years.

Mr. Dommers commented, "We're pleased that the zoo is finally closed, but not happy that an auction was chosen to dispose of the animals." At such auctions, animals are sold to the highest bidder without regard to the suitability of the buyer or the conditions under which the animal will be kept.

The New England Regional Office and HSUS's captive wildlife department are now tracking the animals to their new homes. Anyone who purchased endangered species must obtain special permits; this process allows The HSUS to comment upon any sales that appear detrimental to the animals' interests.

### Leghold-Trap Progress

The North Central Regional Office and other animal protectionists in Illinois made encouraging progress in their campaign to ban the sale and use of leghold traps in that state during the last legislative session, and work has already begun to make the trapping ban a major campaign in this year's session. We have more legislative support now than we have had in the past, but we still need assistance to achieve our goal. HSUS members and friends who are interested in this campaign may contact the North Central Regional Office (2015 175th St., Lansing, IL 60438), or Mr. Don Rolla, of Elsa-Illinois Animal Appeal (P.O. Box 675, Elmhurst, IL 60126).

### PETS Program

PETS (Professional Education and Training Services Program), a three-day program for managers and/or executive directors of animal-care and animal-control agencies, will conduct its first program in the North Central Region in Rockford, Ill. in June. The course will be taught by management-consultant experts and members of The HSUS staff. Enrollment is limited to the first thirty registrants, and the cost is $125.00. For more information, contact the North Central Regional Office.
Beluga-Whale Permit Protested

The HSUS, along with several other animal-welfare and conservation organizations, has objected strongly to an extension of a federal permit for the Minnesota Zoological Garden in Apple Valley, Minn., that would allow the zoo to capture Beluga whales for public display. In comments on the proposed extension submitted to the National Marine Fisheries Service by attorney Brian B. O'Neill, we documented the poor care and antiquated facilities suffered by two previous Belugas at the zoo. Due to inadequate veterinary care, insufficient food, inadequate food inspection, poor water quality, and insufficiently trained staff, one of the two previous Belugas became seriously ill, and both had to be moved to San Diego’s Sea World, where they are now doing well.

Our comments stressed that the Minnesota Zoo should not receive any new permit until it has built new facilities adequate to care for Belugas and has acquired new staff trained in the care of marine animals.

Refuge Suit Appealed

The HSUS has appealed the Washington, D.C., federal district court’s dismissal of our lawsuit challenging the Reagan administration’s policies favoring hunting on national wildlife refuges. The court had ruled that we did not have the right, or standing, to sue (see the Fall 1987 HSUS News). We have argued that the strong personal involvement of our members in the refuge system and our goals of protecting animals from cruelty, neglect, and suffering clearly qualify us to bring the lawsuit.

It is important that we try to reverse this decision on standing, because it might otherwise prevent The HSUS, and other organizations, from bringing similar lawsuits in the future.

Conscientious Student Sues

In June, 1987, trial attorney and HSUS board member O.J. Ramsey, representing Jennifer Graham and her family, brought suit against the Victorville, Calif., school board and other school district officials and teachers to uphold the right of Miss Graham, a student at Victor Valley High School, to undertake in biology class alternative work to dissecting animals. Mr. Ramsey, who spent much of the spring at-temping to negotiate with school authorities on this matter, proposed that Jennifer Graham be allowed to undertake a rigorous regimen of studies in lieu of dissecting earthworms and frogs—including working with detailed anatomical models, dissecting of complex plants, completing bio-review sheets, utilizing the “Operation Frog” computer program, and conducting a field study of animal behavior. School authorities refused to approve alternative work and lowered Miss Graham’s biology grade from “A” to “C” because she would not participate in the dissection labs. This decision caused the suit filed in U.S. District Court in Los Angeles.

Relying upon a bold legal theory, Mr. Ramsey hopes to demonstrate that Jennifer Graham’s deep respect for animal life and belief in the interdependency of life in all its forms, the bases for her refusal to dissect, are equivalent to religious belief, and therefore worthy of protection under the free exercise of religion clause of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. The suit asks the court to compel school officials to test Miss Graham on the alternative studies which she undertook in private tutorials and reform her biology grade accordingly.

Should the case go to trial, an underlying issue may well turn out to be one of educational quality, concentrating on the practice of dissection at the secondary school level. The HSUS, which is supporting Jennifer Graham’s suit, is hoping that the evidence will demonstrate that dissection not only contributes to the wasteful consumption of millions of animals each year in the nation’s high schools but is also an obsolete pedagogical exercise, and, therefore, not in the best interests of either science or the nation. Dissection, we believe, is not an experiment but rather a manipulation or investigation; it tests no hypothesis and does little to stimulate creative scientific inquiry. New teaching aids and course materials—e.g., models, transparencies, computer programs, and botanical dissection—have proven at least as effective as dissection in fulfilling the purported educational purposes behind dissection.

Many teachers nationwide have successfully taught high school, and even college, biology without animal dissection. Moreover, a new awareness among many educators highlights the inconsistency of the practice of using animals as dead specimens while teaching biology as the science of life. There is evidence that dissection is not so cost- and time-effective as other available teaching techniques. On balance, The HSUS feels that dissection is counter-productive to educational quality in many ways and has become a desensitizing ritual in the nation’s schools.

Mr. Ramsey’s litigation team has assembled many biologists and educators who will testify in support of these assertions if the case is allowed to go to trial.

The Law Notes are compiled by HSUS General Counsel Murdaugh Stuart Madden and Associate Counsel Roger Kindler.
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