Getting The Facts Straight

I have chosen to use this column to share with you the letter I have written to Reader's Digest in response to an article by Dr. Robert J. White entitled "The Facts About Animal Research," printed in the March 1, 1988 edition of that magazine. Rarely, if ever, have I been more outraged by an article purporting to be the "factual" published by a magazine purporting to be responsible.

If you have not read this article, I urge you to do so immediately and join the many others who have revolted their outrage to the editor of this magazine. I also encourage you to ask Reader's Digest to publish a rebuttal article that has been prepared by The HSUS in response to Dr. White's biased opinions and distorted "facts." If possible, please send me a copy of your letter in order that we may gauge the magnitude of the response from HSUS members.

Mr. Kenneth Gilmore, Editor-in-Chief
Reader's Digest Association, Pleasantville, NY 10570

Dear Mr. Gilmore:

The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), the nation's largest animal-protection organization, is outraged over the article entitled "The Facts About Animal Research," which appears in your March issue.

Instead of "the facts," the author—Dr. Robert White—provides readers with distortions, misrepresentations, anecdotes, and, ironically, emotional propaganda of the sort that the article itself deplored.

Ostensibly, the article is a critique of "the animal-rights fanatics." In reality, the piece is a broadside against the entire animal-protection community. Even reforms championed by scientists who themselves conduct animal research are ridiculed. The immediate aim of the article seems to be to undermine pending federal legislation that would help prevent former pets from winding up in laboratories. In addition, the piece ridicules the numbers of animals used in research (and this percentage is decreasing), and (2) many scientists believe that shelter animals make poor research subjects.

The federal legislation that so offends Dr. White is supported by hundreds of humane societies that can hardly be characterized as "the radical elements of the animal-rights movement...." Reader's Digest cannot plead ignorance for publishing "The Facts About Animal Research." Various editors conducted The HSUS when fact-checking earlier drafts of the manuscript. From what we learned of the manuscript through talking with the editors, we concluded that the piece was highly biased and misleading.

We followed up our conversations with our editors with a four-page letter. Our letter addressed not only the article's content but also its author. Dr. White is internationally infamous for conducting bizarre and macabre head-transplant experiments on nonhuman primates. In published interviews, he has made such outrageous statements as, "It would appear that this pre-occupation with the alleged pain and suffering of the animals used in medical research may well represent, at the very least, social prejudice against medicine, or, more seriously, true psychiatric aberrations."

Dr. White's views seem to represent those of a highly reactionary fringe of the research community. The HSUS disowns that Reader's Digest could not come up with a more credible and mainstream spokesperson for researchers. Because "The Facts About Animal Research" makes a mockery of journalistic ethics and legitimate animal-welfare concerns, the HSUS urges you to allow the animal-protection community to express its views in the pages of Reader's Digest. The HSUS would be happy to write such an article.

Sincerely,

John A. Hoyt
President
The HSUS’s ‘Be a P.A.L.—Prevent A Litter’ campaign is in full swing. We have a wide variety of materials available to promote the spaying and neutering of pets year-round. Many of these materials are found in our new ‘Be a P.A.L.’ packet, a full-color assortment of brochures, reproducibles, ads, and novelty items designed to alert the general public to problems of pet overpopulation.

Each kit is $5.00. Orders yours now!

Please send me __________ “Be a P.A.L.” packets at $5.00 each. I enclose $ ________

Name ____________________________________________ 

City ___________________ State __________ Zip _______

Make all checks or money orders payable to The HSUS and send this coupon to HSUS “Be a P.A.L.” Packet, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.

---

**Tragic Roundup**

Forty-eight wild horses died a horrid death on Bureau of Land Management land in Nevada last fall. As part of a research experiment conducted by the University of Minnesota to control wild-horse populations through the use of contraceptives, one hundred and fifty horses were rounded up by helicopter and herded through several breaks in a fence. After the mares were implanted with a hormone, all the horses were released.

Tragically, forty-eight of the horses became disoriented and were unable to relocate the breaks in the fence. Cut off from their herd and unable to reach a source of water, the agitated and frightened animals died of dehydration.

The HSUS has met with those responsible and has called for prompt punitive action.

---

**Film Available**

“A New Leash on Life,” a recently completed HSUS film that depicts the responsibilities that accompany ownership of a dog or cat, is now available on a free-loan program to any broadcaster or nonprofit organization.

“ ‘A New Leash on Life’ emphasizes the importance of spaying and neutering, regular health care, proper diet, exercise, and loving care and attention. Its running time is fifteen minutes. To order the film, contact Walter J. Klein Company, Ltd., Distribution Department, 6311 Carmel Rd., P.O. Box 2087, Charlotte, NC 28221. Thirty days’ advance notice is required and the film must be returned within twenty-four hours of showing. The film is also available for purchase.

---

**Seafirst Bucks Stampede**

In response to pressure from The HSUS and other national and local humane groups, Seafirst Bank, in Seattle, Wash., has announced that it will no longer be a sponsor for the Omak Stampede Suicide Race, held in Omak, Wash., every summer (see the Fall 1987 HSUS News). The Suicide Race, in which twenty horses and riders plunge down a steep incline at breakneck speeds, is a cruel rodeo spectacle. One horse died as the result of injuries it sustained in the 1987 race and others were injured.

Other sponsors have denied their involvement with the Suicide Race in response to letters from concerned humanitarians. However, The HSUS has supporting documentation that Coca-Cola USA, Adolph Coors Co., and Pepsi-Cola and its local bottler in Wenatchee, Wash., continue to be sponsors of the Omak Stampede Rodeo, with which the Suicide Race is associated.

---

**Photographer Joins Staff**

The HSUS is pleased to announce that world-renowned wildlife specialist and photographer Mr. Richard L. Randall, of Rock Springs, Wyo., has joined the HSUS staff as a consultant. In addition to making his photographs available for our use, Mr. Randall will be helping HSUS staff investigate wildlife issues, giving workshops, and consulting on a variety of wildlife topics including predator control, wild horses and burros, and wildlife protection on public lands.

---

Dick Randall has photographed everything from coyotes to cougars in his distinguished career. Formerly associated with Defenders of Wildlife, Mr. Randall will work on a book on coyotes in addition to consulting for The HSUS.
When Children Are Concerned

“I’m mad at the people that throw away pets by letting them have too many babies.”—Second Grader, California

The National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE) often receives letters such as this. Young people around the nation have strong feelings about many animal issues, especially the pet-overpopulation tragedy. In order to give children the chance to turn their feelings into positive results and as its contribution to the HSUS’ “Be a P.A.L.—Prevent A Litter” campaign, NAAHE has developed a new teaching packet. “Pet Overpopulation: From Concern to Action” packet is a valuable resource for assisting teachers in this effort and particularly appropriate for use during April, National “Prevent A Litter” Month. The kit contains projects and skill-building activities, including special plans for a Happy No-Birthdays Party, a press release “Draft” program, and a colorful poster. The packet also includes this song, sung to the tune of “The Twelve Days of Christmas”:

1 Quit!  
By the time she was a year old my doggie gave to me,  
A new litter in a basket.  
After two years together, my doggies gave to me,  
142 pups. After three years together, my doggies gave to me,  
36 mutts. After five years together, my doggies gave to me,  
108 wagging tails. Next time I’ll spay so my dogs won’t give to me,  
2,496 pups in seven years.  
After last verse, all shout, “1 Quit!”

Patty Finch has influenced attitudes toward wildlife and adults by presenting “I Quit” as a comical skit, complete with props and lots of action. “I have had wonderful results with the song in terms of conveying the message about pet overpopulation,” she says. “It brings home the seriousness of the problem in a non-confrontational, non-threatening way.”

The “Pet Overpopulation: From Concern to Action” teaching packet is available for $2.00 from NAAHE, P.O. Box 362, East Haddam, CT 06423.

Increasing Protection for Marine Mammals

Victory, action, and a fight in the making

After years of wrangling with the government, The HSUS and the entire animal-welfare community celebrated a sweet victory when, earlier this year, the U.S. government officially announced it was banning the commercial slaughter of harp seal pups. For decades, animal-welfare leaders fought a slaughter which amounted to more than 70,000 baby seals annually. This slaughter was largely ended through a concerted effort by the U.S. government and the European Economic Community. In both Europe and the United States, the stimulus for seal protection was the moral outrage felt by citizens about the brutal commercial slaughter of these animals. However, in both the United States and Europe, the tool used to halt exploitation was economic pressure of a boycott.

In 1972, when the U.S. government passed the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), Congress included a boycott on the importation of any skins of marine mammals which were less than eight months of age or still nursing when they were killed. Because the skins of infant seals are the most commercially desirable, this action effectively stopped the importation of seal skins from Canada. Similarly, a number of years later, the European Economic Community took action to ban importation of seal skins. Like the United States, its action was a boycott. This time the ban was only against the importation of baby white-coat seal skins. However, the combined effect of economic boycotts from the United States and Canada effectively destroyed Canada’s sealing industry. Thereafter, the Canadian government struggled to make the slaughter of baby seals economically viable. Its efforts, however, were to no avail. Finally, the market collapsed as it became increasingly evident that Canada’s insistence on killing seals was doing its image far more harm than its economy any good through the sale of skins. Thus, Canada’s ban on the slaughter of seal pups may be viewed as nothing more than a recognition of an accomplished fact. Nonetheless, the victory is now complete.

In many ways, the U.S. government, with the Marine Mammal Protection Act on the books, has been a world leader in the effort to protect marine mammals. Last year, when the dolphins were dying off the east coast of the United States, our government service will be required to make major efforts to halt the population decline and restore the population.* However, despite our continuing efforts to have the government keep the seal ice depleted, it has consistently refused. For that reason, The HSUS, represented by Davis, Graham, and Stubbs and joined by Friends of Animals, filed suit on December 12, 1987, in U.S. District Court to force the National Marine Fisheries Service to lose its northern passengers such as the National Marine Fisheries Service...
Too Many Deer? When deer and suburbanites collide, conflict follows

Sport hunting, in this way, increased populations rather than controlled them, as hunters claimed.

When large deer populations come into contact with increasing human populations, the resulting conflicts are inevitable. These include not only the damage to crops and gardens, but also the increased risk of traffic accidents. When local officials recommend sport hunting (or more hunting) to control the population, animal activists are trying to find more rational, effective, humane, and ecologically sensitive solutions.

At the Crane Memorial Reservation in Massachusetts, The HSUS objected—and proposed a number of alternatives—to a sport hunt on private conservation land. At the White Oak Naval Surface Weapons Center in Maryland, D.C., we and other animal-protection groups objected to a proposed sport hunt, now cancelled pending the recommendations of animal activists on alternative approaches.

In Pennsylvania last fall, we testified in a lawsuit filed by several local groups in rural areas. We hope this more humane and sensible approach will lead to calling off the hunt.

A few years ago, the mayor and town council of New Jewish, N.J., were concerned about deer/car collisions and deer consumption of ornamental and other plants. We were asked if there was anything we could do. We recommended a sport hunt, The HSUS pointed out that hunting would not help. We cited examples such as another recent report in which the hog population had increased while the number of deer/cars collisions decreased.

To promote greater knowledge and acceptance of these alternatives, The HSUS will sponsor a one-day workshop on April 13, 1988, "Deer Management in an Urbanizing Region: Problems and Alternatives to Traditional Management." To be held at The National Conference Center in East Windchapel, New Jersey, the workshop will bring together wildlife biologists, zoologists, ecologists, sociologists, animal and human safety agencies, and animal activists, with a goal of creating solutions for the future.

At the center of all this interest are the exotic animals. These animals are held throughout the United States. These depressurizing and abusive sales are often held in out-of-the-way places and small towns. Unfortunately, most, if not all, of the miserable conditions found at such auctions are legal, as well as humane, and can continue to flourish where data on which to base the decision do not exist.

Problems exist throughout the country. Large areas of relatively undisturbed open space that attract local wildlife because they are surrounded by developed or developing areas. They may become urbanized.
cages; lion and cougar cubs are packed into cramped airline travel crates designed for much smaller animals. Peacocks are literally wrapped in chicken wire, their tails protruding from their cages, in order to guarantee that they cannot struggle and damage themselves. No one wants them to lose their monetary value!

Pick-up trucks with crudely manufactured wooden crates are used to transport exotic birds. Other trucks, tightly packed with dozens of chicken-wire and small metal cages, are used to transport bobcats, silver and arctic foxes, black bear cubs, and even primates. Animals suffer tremendously from fear and stress during these trips. When loaded trucks reach the auction site, they must wait in long lines, in all types of weather, until they are admitted to the selling area. Cages with foxes, squirrel monkeys, and wolves, for example, will sit side by side, unprotected, for three to four days. The only care or attention the animals receive is when the owner chooses to bring food and refill empty water dishes. Our investigators often found food or water absent from the cages for the entire auction period. Such conditions are not illegal if they occur while the animals are “in transport” and, since the auction is technically a transport stage, nothing can be done to protect the animals under present regulations.

During one recent auction, several primates were packed together in a cage that was too small for one. Exotic birds were jammed in cages stacked several high, which allowed waste to spill from the top cage to the bottom ones. Injured animals are common at auctions and, when they occur, receive no mandatory veterinary attention. Our investigators found a three-legged deer with a bloody stump; animals with cuts and abrasions on their bodies are not uncommon. A dead adult male blackbuck antelope was found tossed in the corner of a temporary stall already occupied by others of its species. A solitary ring-tailed lemur (Lemur catta), an endangered species, was found in a bird cage being fed pieces of a styrofoam cup by insensitive members of the public. It is common to see large baboons in a cage too small for one. Often, the only relief for the animals is to fight among themselves. Some species, particularly those as intelligent as primates, are in a constant state of anxiety and stress. An African hippopotamus was found isolated in a small cage with only a small amount of water. The inside of the cage had exposed bolts facing the cage. The hippopotamus had scraped its head against these bolts and opened deep gashes above its eyes and nostril. There was barely enough room for the animal to turn around.

Ungulates (deer, elk, and antelope) face particular problems. Large numbers of them are purchased at these auctions and end up on exotic-game ranches. Axis deer, Blackbuck antelope, fallow deer, and sika deer, among others, are bought by ranchers to establish breeding herds. The ranchers charge exorbitant prices to people who wish to hunt exotic animals. Such “safari hunts” are becoming increasingly popular and require additional animals to fill their needs.

Beside the obvious cruelties, exotic-animal auctions can create serious disease problems, since diseases potentially can be transmitted from animals passing through the auction yard to domestic livestock, poultry, or humans. Mycobacterium bovis, Exotic Newcastle's disease (VND), avian influenza, rabies, orf, tuberculosis, hepatitis, tularaemia, and salmonella fall into this category. The cramped conditions and abysmal health conditions of auctioned animals contribute to the serious potential of epidemics posed by auctions.

Auctions of exotic animals carry the threat of severe environmental damage. Should animals either escape or be released into the wild, they could become established in areas where there would be no controls over their population growth. Such circumstances could ultimately threaten native species. Scientists have found that some exotic ungulates, such as the sika and axis deer, are more adaptable than our native species of white-tailed deer; if they escaped into deer habitat, native deer would surely suffer.

The HSUS has been stymied in its efforts to end exotic-animal auctions or ensure humane treatment for the unfortunate animals. The regulations that exist to control intrastate and interstate movement of exotic animals are splintered among numerous state agricultural agencies, state wildlife agencies, state public health agencies, or the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and Interior. The USDA is responsible for licensing and inspecting research facilities, animal exhibitors, animal dealers, and people who transport animals. The USDA enforces the guidelines of the Animal Welfare Act (AWA). The Office of Management Authority of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is in charge of permits for activities relating to endangered and threatened species. In each state, there are different wildlife laws and permit procedures that also must be followed. These can be regulated through the state's fish and game department, department of wildlife, department of environmental protection, department of conservation, and other state agencies. With regulations shared among all these agencies, it is not difficult to see why animal-welfare problems at exotic-animal auctions don't get solved.

Variations in regulations also affect the legality of some transactions at auction sales. In the state of California, for example, it is illegal to maintain axis deer on a hunting preserve, while in Texas it is perfectly legal to do so. With such a wide discrepancy in law, it is not surprising that animals simply “slip” through the cracks.

Unfortunately, the AWA provides too little protection and there is too little incentive to improve conditions or enable USDA inspectors to cite violations. Even when the USDA can be provoked to cite a violator, the person is rarely, if ever, forced to stop his or her activity or face any substantial fine or sentencing.

The HSUS is working with appropriate government officials and pushing for stricter permit regulations and enforcement of the AWA. We would like to see birds included in AWA regulations, since they are frequently sold at auctions.

The HSUS is working to close down roadside menageries and researching the possibility of having endangered and threatened species. We oppose sport hunting of any kind, including that taking place on game ranches. When these kinds of operations are gone, they will take the need for exotic auctions with them. We are firmly committed to working for the end of all exotic-animal auctions and the commercial exploitation and abuse of wildlife they represent.
For most of us, it's difficult to do two things at once—pet one's head and rub one's stomach, for example, or stand on one's head and whistle "Dixie." But while, with a little concentration and practice, these tricks can be mastered, no one has yet figured out how to be in two places at one time. In the 1980s, this is what dog owners who work full time would probably like to be able to do more than anything else. As more people work full time, more pet dogs are also becoming nine-to-fivers—dogs that are left alone from 9:00 (or earlier) in the morning to 5:00 (or later) in the evening every weekday and whose time with their owners is limited to weekday evenings and weekends. Faced with these inevitable limitations, many dog owners find themselves struggling to fit it all in: feeding, grooming, exercising, and just spending time together, strengthening the bonds of companionship that are so rewarding and make owning a dog such a joyous experience.

Sometimes it seems as if it would be impossible to do everything recommended by manuals, magazine articles, animal behaviorists, and dog trainers to produce a happy, well-adjusted pet even if one devoted twenty-four hours a day to it. Where once a household may have had someone at home all day, now it's likely that the house will be empty, except for the dog, from early morning to evening. Although many dogs, fortunately, can adjust to a life alone during the day, others may be lonely, bored, or frustrated. They may turn, as a result, to destructive or undesirable behavior: digging craters in the garden; barking incessantly; or chewing up the newest oriental rug. The dog's behavior, in such cases, creates an unhappy owner who dreads unlocking the door each evening and viewing the latest disaster but who isn't home enough to cope with the problem.

Frustrated by an apparently unsolvable dilemma, the owner may decide he cannot keep the dog and give it up to a shelter. Aside from problems such as barking, digging, and chewing, other problems may arise for the nine-to-five dog. The dog may have housebreaking problems or be so full of energy by the time its owner gets home that it's rambunctious and uncontrollable. It's not surprising that such problems cause dog/owner relationships to sour.

Does this mean a person who works full time should not own a dog? Not at all. It is possible to have a mutually satisfying, rewarding relationship with a nine-to-five dog. One way is to recognize how the dog is going to behave and then arrange things so that its behavior will not upset you.

Choosing the right dog can start you off with an important advantage. Since your time with your dog will be limited, don't choose a dog that will force you to spend that time doing things you'd rather not. If you dislike grooming, for example, choose a pet with a short coat that requires a minimum of care. If you dislike vacuuming up after dogs that are heavy shedders, choose a dog that will have minimum shedding.

Dogs should not be nine-to-fivers until they are at least six months old. Puppies less than six months of age need to be fed four times a day and have not yet developed the muscle strength for urinary control. They should not be left alone for extended periods. If you are already working full time when you decide to get a dog, take advantage of the opportunity to adopt an older dog from a shelter.

Some dogs need more exercise than others, so only think about a high-energy breed if you can meet its needs. The point is to choose a dog that has a good chance of fitting in with your lifestyle from the start.

Training a nine-to-five dog is a must. Dogs are happier and more relaxed when their behavior is directed rather than left up to them. They can be very anxious if they feel that they must make all the decisions. Training can strengthen the pet/owner bond and help each understand the other better. Basic training can also improve the quality of your time together. You will not be frustrated—and perhaps angered—by your dog running away, not coming when called, or pulling your arm out of its socket when walked on a leash. Although your time together may be limited, investing fifteen or twenty minutes, four or five days a week, will help you get the most out of every minute you do spend together. You may be encouraged to take your dog out for a long, leisurely walk in the park or a run by the river if you know it will be a pleasant experience.

One crucial element in a nine-to-five dog/owner relationship is how the dog behaves when it is alone and how the owner reacts to this behavior. "Eighty percent of the people who turn dogs in at shelters are doing it because they didn't think things through when they got the dog," says Phyllis Wright, HSUS vice president for companion animals. "You cannot expect a dog to be able to do things you cannot do." For example, it's unfair to expect every dog to be able to control its habits of elimination all day. If you have a dog that cannot be confined alone all day, you need to arrange things so that it's OK for the dog to do what it has to do. A dog...
T
tor where you live and/or work. So you can go for a walk during your lunch hour and walk the dog and spend a little time with it. When Carol Gronewald, an editor at The HSUS, moved to Washington, D.C., from Connecticut, she purposely sought an apartment within walking distance of HSUS headquarters so she could see her dog, Anya, during the day. Hire a dog-walking service to walk the dog during the day. Your dog will get some exercise and it will enjoy the company of other dogs if taken out in a group. Pet-sitter services may also tailor a daily visit to meet your dog's needs—exercise, company, practice on its obedience training.

Get another dog. Two dogs can keep each other company, play together, and exercise each other. If you have a secure dog kennel adjacent to the house, consider installing a dog door for your dogs to use. Giving your dog a variety of environments and allowing it to choose where it wants to be will go a long way toward alleviating boredom and the consequent destruction that might ensue as your dog seeks ways to pass the time. Gronewald says she would be “willing to pay” for a dog-walker who will take her yard dogs for a run. She even has the door installed in her yard so that her dogs can safely have some exercise and run together.

Be sure your dog is equipped with a sturdy leather collar and a lead with a strong bolt snap, and that its tags are up-to-date. There are other ways to put more human companionship into your dog's life. Two ways are to arrange your situation and schedule so you can be with the dog as much as possible. Another alternative is to put other people into your dog’s life, so you won't be there full time. Following are a few suggestions to help you start thinking creatively.

Having a nine-to-five dog takes flexibility, adaptability, and, above all, creativity.

The horse used to be king in this country. Horses plowed the fields, carried the mail, bore soldiers into battle, and took us where we had to go. They were our power and our transportation. We depended on them and took their presence and their willingness to work so hard for us for granted.

Times have changed. The horse is no longer king, having lost its crown to the internal combustion machine and the automobile. The need for their power and skills became obsolete, and horses were literally out of a job. Like other displaced workers, horses moved into a new niche. Although in many ways they are still animals in transition, horses have one important new role as recreational animals. From necessities, horses have become luxuries, used for sport and recreation, except for the few kept on farms and in other working roles. Unfortunately, education in their care has not kept pace with their move to a new class of owners. Horse owners, not faring well in this new world, humane agents and organizations across the country report that horses have been kept for pleasure, recreation, and small breeding operations. They are being starved, neglected, improperly housed or protected from the elements, and improperly exercised and cared for in ways that amount to cruelty and abuse—and the owner is often unaware that anything is amiss. These problems probably have more cruelty perpetrated on them than the average dog, simply out of ignorance,” states Phyllis Wright, HSUS vice president for companion animals, pointing out that, while the basics of dog and cat care are widely known among pet owners, there is little if any common knowledge that pertains to horses.

The situation is grim across the country. From Cape Cod to California, from Ohio to Texas, humane groups report case after case of suffering. In Racine, Wisconsin, an Arabian mare flipped and fell into the old bathtub her owners used as a watering trough. Unable to get out and left un­checked all day, she spent the night crying. Although eventually rescued, she died that night. In Brevard, Massachusetts, a family's horse was discovered emaciated, dehydrated, and living in filthy conditions with no access to food or water. Although its owners had plenty of money, they said they "just got tired of taking care of it." The humane investigator describing this case called it “typical.”

In Rockwell, North Carolina, a man tied his pony outside with a chain around its neck. By the time humane investigators discovered the pony, the chain had cut into its flesh approximately three inches deep. The pony was unable to move beyond the twenty-foot chain's reach and had been left without food, water, or care. These are just three of the hundreds of cases encountered each year. Sandy Rowland, director of the HSUS Great Lakes Regional Office, describes horse cruelty and abuse in that region as a very serious problem. Cindy Steele, the shelter manager of the York County, Pennsylvania, SPCA shelter, estimates that horses account for at least 10 percent of their investigations and says the figure may be even closer to 15 or 20 percent. The Hooved Animal Humane Society in Barrington, Illinois, a corporation that was chartered to help large animals that are victims of neglect or abuse, keeps its fifty volunteers very busy, continue to live as companions and provide companionship into your dog's life, too. Perhaps it can be a reliable teenager in the neighborhood would visit your dog after school to check on him, giving your pet exercise as well as company more acutely than do other pets, such as cats. Naturally pack animals, dogs miss companionship into your dog's life, too. A nine-to-five dog's role in its family's life has changed dramatically. Instead of sharing its owner's daily routine, a nine-to-five dog is a leisure-time activity—an activity that must be planned. A dog isn't the same as a set of dumbbells. It can't just be taken down for a few hours for an hour or so for its owner's amusement and then put back until wanted again. It's a living, feeling creature with needs of its own. It needs company, it needs exercise, it needs companionship. It may take a little ingenuity, but these needs can be met. Having a nine-to-five dog takes flexibility, adaptability, and, above all, creativity. The nine-to-five dog's role in its family's life has changed dramatically. Instead of sharing its owner's daily routine, a nine-to-five dog is a leisure-time activity—an activity that must be planned. A dog isn't the same as a set of dumbbells. It can't just be taken down for a few hours for its owner's amusement and then put back until wanted again. It's a living, feeling creature with needs of its own. It needs company, it needs exercise, it needs companionship. It may take a little ingenuity, but these needs can be met.

Having a nine-to-five dog takes flexibility, adaptability, and, above all, creativity. The nine-to-five dog's role in its family's life has changed dramatically. Instead of sharing its owner's daily routine, a nine-to-five dog is a leisure-time activity—an activity that must be planned. A dog isn't the same as a set of dumbbells. It can't just be taken down for a few hours for its owner's amusement and then put back until wanted again. It's a living, feeling creature with needs of its own. It needs company, it needs exercise, it needs companionship. It may take a little ingenuity, but these needs can be met. Having a nine-to-five dog takes flexibility, adaptability, and, above all, creativity.
according to its president, Donna Ewing. The Humane Society of Wichita County, in Wichita Falls, Texas, recently built a third corral in addition to the two it already has to help cope with the number of horses it rescues from inhumane conditions.

The same themes run through these investigators' and organizations' stories—crude and abuse often stem from ignorance; that people get a horse with no idea of the responsibility they are taking on; and that education is the key to preventing so much of the suffering that occurs.

Many owners are unaware until it is too late that horses are specialized animals with special needs. They cannot just be turned out into a pasture and left to fend for themselves. Nor can they be treated as house pets.

Horses need protection from external parasites, too—flies, gnats, and other biting bugs—and need several vaccinations administered by a veterinarian at least once a year, possibly more. Equine teeth need regular check-ups by a veterinarian or equine dentist and must be " floated"—filmed down—when they become too sharp. Horses must be fed at least twice a day, preferably three or four times, and given grain and hay every day. It all adds up to knowledge, time, and money for feed, and the horse begins to starve.

Toni White, the shelter manager for the Cape Cod branch of the Animal Rescue League of Boston, sees this scenario, too. "When people move from an urban to a rural area, they think a horse would look nice in the backyard," she says. "Later, they find out there's more involved than they thought, and they also realize they can't afford it." This is a problem in developing areas that are making the transition from rural to suburban.

Even people who know better will let horses suffer and die for lack of money rather than seek help. Ms. Stoff reports starvation and neglect cases all too common throughout the country.

Horsemen who have access to good medical and veterinary facilities can often avoid being of enormous help to overburdened shelters. They can also volunteer to serve as expert witnesses in cases that are prosecuted. Often local animal-control personnel do not have expert witnesses that they can turn to when the need arises. 

Horses were once an integral part of our lives in a way they will never be again. They served us so well for so long. Many of our lives have changed circumstances. It's our responsibility to do what we can to help those who served us so well for so long.

not neglected horses in California are impounded by humane agents. Many shelters lack the facilities to handle equine cases. They need to learn how to properly care for them. Concerned citizens, whether they have any interest in owning a horse or not, can also help simply by learning to recognize a healthy horse and proper horse care, then reporting local humane agencies any situations that appear to need investigating. Every horse should look nice in the backyard," he says. "When people move from an urban to a rural area, they think a horse would look nice in the backyard," she says. "Later, they find out there's more involved than they thought, and they also realize they can't afford it." This is a problem in developing areas that are making the transition from rural to suburban.

Even people who know better will let horses suffer and die for lack of money rather than seek help. Ms. Stoff reports starvation and neglect cases all too common throughout the country.

Horsemen who have access to good medical and veterinary facilities can often avoid being of enormous help to overburdened shelters. They can also volunteer to serve as expert witnesses in cases that are prosecuted. Often local animal-control personnel do not have expert witnesses that they can turn to when the need arises. 

Horses were once an integral part of our lives in a way they will never be again. They served us so well for so long. Many of our lives have changed circumstances. It's our responsibility to do what we can to help those who served us so well for so long.
It is late afternoon on the African savannah. A family of elephants moves towards a water hole. An old matriarch stands silhouetted against the setting sun. Suddenly, the silence is broken by machine-gun fire. One by one, the family is gunned down. The roar of gunfire and the screams and bellows of terrified elephants shatter the twilight silence.

Tens of thousands of elephants are slaughtered this way every year to feed the greed of the ivory trade. Most people have an idealized image of African elephants living in splendor and tranquility against the backdrop of Africa's vast spaces. For years, the reality has been far different—a panorama of terrible animal suffering, rotting bodies of slaughtered elephants, and mountains of ivory, the consequences of man's desire to create luxury trinkets. The African elephant is a powerful symbol of the urgent need to protect wild animals from needless death and exploitation.

The African elephant, *Loxodonta africana*, is the world's largest land mammal; large males can weigh up to twelve tons and stand more than thirteen feet at the shoulder. Found in the savannah grasslands and forests of Africa, the species can boast few truly large elephants in the wild since they have been the most sought after by poachers.

All elephants live in tightly knit female-led groups, with very strong family bonds. With a life expectancy of approximately sixty years, they are extremely intelligent animals and exhibit complex social behavior. But it is the elephant's unique physical feature, its tusks, that has caused its exploitation and may lead to its demise. These tusks, raw ivory, are really elongated upper incisor teeth that grow throughout an animal's life. An elephant uses its tusks for feeding, tearing bark, digging for roots, defense, and social display. Mankind has a more frivolous use for them; tusks of dead elephants are turned into ivory jewelry, trinkets, and expensive carvings.

Most elephant populations in Africa are declining, with the possible exception of those in Zimbabwe, South Africa, Botswana, and Malawi. Elephants are virtually gone in West Africa, where a few remaining survivors in relict populations are still threatened by poaching. Many protected areas and parks have also seen declines in their elephant populations as the result of poaching. For example, in 1984, only eighty elephants remained in the Niokola-Koba National Park in Senegal. Elephant populations on the Ivory Coast have been reduced by more than 80 percent, with an annual decrease of 10 percent due to poaching. Many protected areas and parks have also seen declines in their elephant populations as the result of poaching. For example, in 1984, only eighty elephants remained in the Niokola-Koba National Park in Senegal. Elephant populations on the Ivory Coast have been reduced by more than 80 percent, with an annual decrease of 10 percent due to poaching. Elephant populations have declined 80 percent in the Central African Republic since 1981 for the same reason. In Zaire, there has been a 60 percent decline in elephants within the national park; surrounding areas are experiencing worse conditions. Uganda has lost 90 percent of its elephants in the last five years. In unprotected areas, Kenya has lost 91 percent of its elephants; even the protected
The only truly effective way to stop the slaughter of elephants is through the complete elimination of the ivory trade.

parks visited by so many tourists have lost 72 percent of their herds. (The tourists, of course, never see the decaying bodies of poached elephants.) Central Africa contains the majority of Africa's remaining elephants, since the forest density protects the elephants from people and their guns. As soon as development schemes reach those tropical forests and formerly remote areas become accessible, then forest elephants will also die to feed the ivory trade.

Anti-poaching efforts are underway in some African countries, though enforcement efforts are rudimentary and underfunded. Sadly, many ill-equipped wildlife officers have been killed by poachers. In many countries, military and government officials have been implicated in poaching.

While habitat destruction is also a problem, recent scientific studies have shown that poaching for ivory is the most immediate threat to the future of elephants. Rising ivory prices, political instability, and the spread of automatic and semiautomatic rifles throughout Africa have contributed to widespread killing of elephants. The only truly effective way to stop the slaughter of elephants is through the complete elimination of the ivory trade.

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES; see the Fall 1987 HSUS News) instituted an Ivory Quota Control System that went into effect in January of 1986. It was designed to set export quotas and required member nations to mark tusks with punch dies. CITES also "amnestied" large stockpiles of raw ivory in an attempt to control the ivory-export trade. The system is designed to allow the export of ivory from countries that enforce anti-poaching laws and have reasonable conservation programs. Unfortunately, the ivory-quota system is a dismal failure. More than 90 percent of the ivory entering the United States comes in as worked ivory (jewelry and trinkets), and most of it arrives from Hong Kong. Importers in Asia buy raw ivory from Africa, with no apparent regard to where it came from or how it was obtained. The African Elephant and Rhino Specialist Group of the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources has estimated that in 1986, the first year of the quota system, 75 percent of all ivory traded worldwide was poached ivory, and this trade was operating totally outside of the CITES system. This represents the tusks of approximately 89,000 elephants in one year!

In 1985, 4.8 million pieces of worked ivory and 27,346 kilograms of carvings came into the United States, at a declared value of more than $24 million. But what is the declared value of the tens of thousands of elephants slaughtered for this ivory trade? No item of jewelry or decoration is worth the death of a single elephant.

Who is to blame for the wholesale slaughter now endured by Africa's elephants? Is it the village with an automatic weapon who is paid a few dollars to kill an elephant? Is it the wealthy Asian trader who imports raw ivory into Hong Kong and exports carved trinkets to the United States? Is it the consumer at the end of the line? When people stop buying ivory, the poachers will know that there is no market for their product, and they will stop killing elephants. The HSUS is actively working to stop the slaughter of elephants for ivory. Almost half of Africa's elephants have disappeared in the last ten years and, without our concerted efforts, the next ten years could, indeed, see their demise.

Anti-poaching efforts are underway in some African countries, though enforcement efforts are rudimentary and underfunded. Sadly, many ill-equipped wildlife officers have been killed by poachers. In many countries, military and government officials have been implicated in poaching.

While habitat destruction is also a problem, recent scientific studies have shown that poaching for ivory is the most immediate threat to the future of elephants. Rising ivory prices, political instability, and the spread of automatic and semiautomatic rifles throughout Africa have contributed to widespread killing of elephants. The only truly effective way to stop the slaughter of elephants is through the complete elimination of the ivory trade.

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES; see the Fall 1987 HSUS News) instituted an Ivory Quota Control System that went into effect in January of 1986. It was designed to set export quotas and required member nations to mark tusks with punch dies. CITES also "amnestied" large stockpiles of raw ivory in an attempt to control the ivory-export trade. The system is designed to allow the export of ivory from countries that enforce anti-poaching laws and have reasonable conservation programs. Unfortunately, the ivory-quota system is a dismal failure. More than 90 percent of the ivory entering the United States comes in as worked ivory (jewelry and trinkets), and most of it arrives from Hong Kong. Importers in Asia buy raw ivory from Africa, with no apparent regard to where it came from or how it was obtained. The African Elephant and Rhino Specialist Group of the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources has estimated that in 1986, the first year of the quota system, 75 percent of all ivory traded worldwide was poached ivory, and this trade was operating totally outside of the CITES system. This represents the tusks of approximately 89,000 elephants in one year!

In 1985, 4.8 million pieces of worked ivory and 27,346 kilograms of carvings came into the United States, at a declared value of more than $24 million. But what is the declared value of the tens of thousands of elephants slaughtered for this ivory trade? No item of jewelry or decoration is worth the death of a single elephant.

Who is to blame for the wholesale slaughter now endured by Africa's elephants? Is it the village with an automatic weapon who is paid a few dollars to kill an elephant? Is it the wealthy Asian trader who imports raw ivory into Hong Kong and exports carved trinkets to the United States? Is it the consumer at the end of the line? When people stop buying ivory, the poachers will know that there is no market for their product, and they will stop killing elephants. The HSUS is actively working to stop the slaughter of elephants for ivory. Almost half of Africa's elephants have disappeared in the last ten years and, without our concerted efforts, the next ten years could, indeed, see their demise.

International business interests are becoming wealthy as a result of the deaths of elephants, for ivory is seen as a hedge against inflation. Let us work to stop the ivory trade and the slaughter of elephants, not only to prevent species' extinction but also to prevent the widespread suffering of the slaughter causes.

Dr. Susan S. Lieberman is associate director of wildlife and environment for The HSUS.
**Spotlight on Congress**

The HSUS actively tracks all types of federal legislation that affects animals. Below are some of the more important bills now before Congress. Please support your representatives and senators and ask them to cosponsor this legislation. If you are already a cosponsor, be sure to thank him or her for his or her help.

**PROPOSED LEGISLATION**

**Companion Animals**

H.J. Res. 287 This joint resolution directs the secretary of agriculture to conduct a study to determine the effectiveness of current laws and regulations governing conditions in establishments where dogs are raised for later sale in retail pet stores. All states that ban or severely limit the breeding of animals at these breeding places are often found to be cramped, dirty, and unsanitary.

H.J. Res. 374 and S. Res. 197 These joint resolutions introduced by Representative Democrat Barney Frank of Massachusetts and Senator Mark Hatfield of Oregon, seek to eliminate the use of the Draize test by federal agencies (see above).

H. Res. 1708 The Research Accountability Act seeks to establish duplicate research on animals by establishing a national center for research accountability. This facility would be available for conducting full-text literature searches prior to the funding of grant proposals using live animals. This legislation was written by Rep. Robert Torricelli of New Jersey.

**Wildlife**

H.R. 138 Rep. Bill Emerson of Missouri introduced this bill to order to permit trapping in the Ozark, National Scenic Riverways area. Please be sure to write your legislators asking them to support it.

H.R. 2742 The Refuge Wildlife Protection Act, introduced by Representative Clifton B. Davis, Texas, would stop gassing and trapping in the National Wildlife Refuge System. This legislation was introduced by Rep. Charles Bennett of Florida.

H. Res. 39 and S. 804 Sen. William Roth of Delaware and Rep. Morris Udall of Arizona introduced companion bills to prevent oil and gas drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Drilling would upset the delicate ecosystem balance and only provide enough oil for the United States for less than one month.

**Laboratory Animals**

H.R. 778 and S. 1457 Pet Protection Act (See “Reader’s Digest Delivers Blow” on next page.)

H.R. 1635 Rep. Barbara Boxer of California introduced the Consumer Products Safety Act, an act to require the use of humane alternatives in the testing of hazardous or toxic substances. This bill would eliminate the Draize Eye Irritation Test (the injection of substances into the eyes of rabbits to determine toxicity of consumer products) and the LD 50 test (the forced ingestion of toxic substances to determine lethal doses of products in lab animals).

H.R. 125 and S. 852 Rep. Andrew Jacobs, Jr., introduced this concurrent resolution to encourage the use of humane alternatives in the testing of animals in federally funded research.

**Reader’s Digest Delivers Blow**

One of the legislative priorities for this year has been the Pet Protection Act, H.R. 1257 and H.R. 778. This bill was introduced by Sen. Wendell Ford of Kentucky and Rep. Robert Mrazek of New York, prohibing the use of shelter animals in federally funded research. This bill was written by Rep. Charles Bennett.

S. 62 and H.R. 537 S. 62 and H.R. 537 were incorporated into H.R. 3674 and passed the House and Senate on December 29, 1987. The final bill, signed by President Reagan, constitutes one of the most pressing pieces of legislation to be passed this year.

**Wildlife**

H.R. 138 Rep. Bill Emerson of Missouri introduced this bill to order to permit trapping in the Ozark, National Scenic Riverways area. Please be sure to write your legislators asking them to support it.

H.R. 2742 The Refuge Wildlife Protection Act, introduced by Representative Clifton B. Davis, Texas, would stop gassing and trapping in the National Wildlife Refuge System. This legislation was introduced by Rep. Charles Bennett of Florida.

H. Res. 39 and S. 804 Sen. William Roth of Delaware and Rep. Morris Udall of Arizona introduced companion bills to prevent oil and gas drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Drilling would upset the delicate ecosystem balance and only provide enough oil for the United States for less than one month.

**Laboratory Animals**

H.R. 778 and S. 1457 Pet Protection Act (See “Reader’s Digest Delivers Blow” on next page.)

H.R. 1635 Rep. Barbara Boxer of California introduced the Consumer Products Safety Act, an act to require the use of humane alternatives in the testing of hazardous or toxic substances. This bill would eliminate the Draize Eye Irritation Test (the injection of substances into the eyes of rabbits to determine toxicity of consumer products) and the LD 50 test (the forced ingestion of toxic substances to determine lethal doses of products in lab animals).

H.R. 125 and S. 852 Rep. Andrew Jacobs, Jr., introduced this concurrent resolution to encourage the use of humane alternatives in the testing of animals in federally funded research.

S. 62 and H.R. 537 S. 62 and H.R. 537 were incorporated into H.R. 3674 and passed the House and Senate on December 29, 1987. The final bill, signed by President Reagan, constitutes one of the most pressing pieces of legislation to be passed this year.

**PROPOSED LEGISLATION**

**Companion Animals**

H.J. Res. 287 This joint resolution was introduced by Representative Manuel Lujan, Jr., of New Mexico. It directs the secretary of agriculture to conduct a study to determine the effectiveness of current laws and regulations governing conditions in establishments where dogs are raised for later sale in retail pet stores. All states that ban or severely limit the breeding of animals at these breeding places are often found to be cramped, dirty, and unsanitary.

H.J. Res. 374 and S. Res. 197 These joint resolutions introduced by Representative Democrat Barney Frank of Massachusetts and Senator Mark Hatfield of Oregon, seek to eliminate the use of the Draize test by federal agencies (see above).

H. Res. 1708 The Research Accountability Act seeks to establish duplicate research on animals by establishing a national center for research accountability. This facility would be available for conducting full-text literature searches prior to the funding of grant proposals using live animals. This legislation was written by Rep. Robert Torricelli of New Jersey.

**Wildlife**

H.R. 138 Rep. Bill Emerson of Missouri introduced this bill to order to permit trapping in the Ozark, National Scenic Riverways area. Please be sure to write your legislators asking them to support it.

H.R. 2742 The Refuge Wildlife Protection Act, introduced by Representative Clifton B. Davis, Texas, would stop gassing and trapping in the National Wildlife Refuge System. This legislation was introduced by Rep. Charles Bennett of Florida.

H. Res. 39 and S. 804 Sen. William Roth of Delaware and Rep. Morris Udall of Arizona introduced companion bills to prevent oil and gas drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Drilling would upset the delicate ecosystem balance and only provide enough oil for the United States for less than one month.

**Laboratory Animals**

H.R. 778 and S. 1457 Pet Protection Act (See “Reader’s Digest Delivers Blow” on next page.)

H.R. 1635 Rep. Barbara Boxer of California introduced the Consumer Products Safety Act, an act to require the use of humane alternatives in the testing of hazardous or toxic substances. This bill would eliminate the Draize Eye Irritation Test (the injection of substances into the eyes of rabbits to determine toxicity of consumer products) and the LD 50 test (the forced ingestion of toxic substances to determine lethal doses of products in lab animals).

H.R. 125 and S. 852 Rep. Andrew Jacobs, Jr., introduced this concurrent resolution to encourage the use of humane alternatives in the testing of animals in federally funded research.

S. 62 and H.R. 537 S. 62 and H.R. 537 were incorporated into H.R. 3674 and passed the House and Senate on December 29, 1987. The final bill, signed by President Reagan, constitutes one of the most pressing pieces of legislation to be passed this year.

**Reader’s Digest Delivers Blow**

One of the legislative priorities for this year has been the Pet Protection Act, H.R. 1257 and H.R. 778. This bill was introduced by Sen. Wendell Ford of Kentucky and Rep. Robert Mrazek of New York, prohibing the use of shelter animals in federally funded research. This bill was written by Rep. Charles Bennett.

S. 62 and H.R. 537 S. 62 and H.R. 537 were incorporated into H.R. 3674 and passed the House and Senate on December 29, 1987. The final bill, signed by President Reagan, constitutes one of the most pressing pieces of legislation to be passed this year.

**Wildlife**

H.R. 138 Rep. Bill Emerson of Missouri introduced this bill to order to permit trapping in the Ozark, National Scenic Riverways area. Please be sure to write your legislators asking them to support it.

H.R. 2742 The Refuge Wildlife Protection Act, introduced by Representative Clifton B. Davis, Texas, would stop gassing and trapping in the National Wildlife Refuge System. This legislation was introduced by Rep. Charles Bennett of Florida.

H. Res. 39 and S. 804 Sen. William Roth of Delaware and Rep. Morris Udall of Arizona introduced companion bills to prevent oil and gas drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Drilling would upset the delicate ecosystem balance and only provide enough oil for the United States for less than one month.

**Laboratory Animals**

H.R. 778 and S. 1457 Pet Protection Act (See “Reader’s Digest Delivers Blow” on next page.)

H.R. 1635 Rep. Barbara Boxer of California introduced the Consumer Products Safety Act, an act to require the use of humane alternatives in the testing of hazardous or toxic substances. This bill would eliminate the Draize Eye Irritation Test (the injection of substances into the eyes of rabbits to determine toxicity of consumer products) and the LD 50 test (the forced ingestion of toxic substances to determine lethal doses of products in lab animals).

H.R. 125 and S. 852 Rep. Andrew Jacobs, Jr., introduced this concurrent resolution to encourage the use of humane alternatives in the testing of animals in federally funded research.

S. 62 and H.R. 537 S. 62 and H.R. 537 were incorporated into H.R. 3674 and passed the House and Senate on December 29, 1987. The final bill, signed by President Reagan, constitutes one of the most pressing pieces of legislation to be passed this year.
Residents of Connecticut, and Sawyer of Virginia, are working to make the southeast region to adopt a dangerous-dog law. The bill has already passed the House of Representatives and the Senate. The House is considering dangerous-dog proposals that include a ban on the sale of dogs for fighting purposes. The bill faces heavy opposition from animal protectionists across Alabama. The Great Lakes Regional Office supports animal control agencies in the region. The Southeast Regional Office is working with twenty animal-control agencies in the state. The bill has already passed the Senate, and the House is considering it. The bill would require that any dog that has attacked a human or another dog be kept in an enclosure. The owner must register the dog with county authorities and provide proof of insurance. The dog must be kept in a kennel or post a bond for the same amount. The bill faces heavy opposition from some citizens who misunderstand the scope of the legislation and fear that the restrictions will apply to all dogs. Some of the dogs are not needed for such a law may be quietlyed by the recent tragic killing of dogs by a seven-year-old boy. The Florida and Alabama laws are being considered dangerous-dog proposals when their legislative sessions begin. Both of the states’ bills contain elements suggested by The HSUS. South Carolina legislators are in the process of reviewing their own vicious-dog bill.

Students Take Stand
Two senior biology majors at the University of North Florida are protesting the university’s requirement that they experiment on turtles, frogs, and rabbits as part of a physiology class. The students, Jan Murphy and Terry Powers, have offered to watch videos, films, or computer simulations of the experiments and do extra lab projects as alternatives to the experiments, but both have been turned down by the instructor. The students believe the experiments will mean a drop in their grades.

Dogfighting Workshops
Dogfighting is a great concern in the southeast. Southeast Regional Office Director Marc Powers and HSUS Director of Higher Education Programs Dr. Randall Lockwood lectured to almost one hundred South Carolina animal-control and law-enforcement officers at a dogfighting workshop in Columbia, S.C., in December. In January, Mr. Paulhus and Dr. Lockwood repeated the presentation in Puerto Rico, where there is a severe problem. The legislators and the legislature are working to make the sport illegal in that country.

Dangerous-Dog Laws
Georgia may become the first state in the southeast region to adopt a dangerous-dog law. Its bill would require that any dog that has attacked a human be kept in an enclosure. The owner must register the dog with county authorities and provide proof of insurance. The dog must be kept in a kennel or post a bond for the same amount. The bill faces heavy opposition from some citizens who misunderstand the scope of the legislation and fear that the restrictions will apply to all dogs. Some of the dogs are not needed for such a law may be quietlyed by the recent tragic killing of dogs by a seven-year-old boy. The Florida and Alabama laws are being considered dangerous-dog proposals when their legislative sessions begin. Both of the states’ bills contain elements suggested by The HSUS. South Carolina legislators are in the process of reviewing their own vicious-dog bill.

Dog Shootings
The shooting of stray dogs by a Blountstown, Fla., animal-control officer (see the Winter 1988 HSUS News) has apparently received tacit approval from top state officials. In its investigation of the incident, the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) states that it found no cruelty in the killings. However, in its investigation, the FDLE spoke only with the suspects and never with the original complainant. The animal-control officer in question shot a stray dog with a .22 rifle. His reason was that since the shelter was closed because of broken water pipes there was no place to keep the animals. The FDLE found no wrongdoing by the animal-control officer or the city of Blountstown. State law, however, allows the use of a .22 rifle for destroying an animal by means of gas injection or by the use of carbon monoxide gas. The shooting of a dog or cat is legal only if the animal is dangerous when the animal is found suffering and death is imminent.

The Southeast Regional Office is distressed by the FDLE’s findings. It is a concern when anyone violates animal-protection legislation. The Animal Control Academy in question shot unclaimed strays with a .22 rifle. The department also was closed because of broken water pipes, so there was no place to keep the animals. The FDLE found no wrongdoing by the animal-control officer or the city of Blountstown.

Spring 1988

AROUND THE REGIONS

The Great Lakes Regional Office has been working with the Alabamian Benevolence Fund for Animal Welfare Agencies to produce a newsletter that will be mailed to animal protectionists across Alabama. The Federation develops legislation and serves as a state-wide resource for information on animal issues.

Federation’s Services
The Southeast Regional Office has been working with the Alabama Federation of Animal Welfare Agencies to produce a newsletter that will be mailed to animal protectionists across Alabama. The Federation develops legislation and serves as a state-wide resource for information on animal issues.

Dangerous-Dog Workshop
The Great Lakes Regional Office sponsored the HSUS workshop “Dealing with Dangerous Dogs in Your Community” in Bowling Green, Ohio, on December 14-15. Nearly one hundred people attended. HSUS staff that participated included Phyllis Wright, vice president for companion animals; Dr. Randall Lockwood, director of higher education programs; Barbara Cassidy, director of animal sheltering and control; Tina Nelson, field investigator; Robin Weinach, program coordinator; and Sandy Rowland, Great Lakes regional director.

Legislative Lines
The Great Lakes Regional Office is currently working in the Ohio legislature for passage of a differential dog-licensing bill which would enable county commissioners in Ohio to reduce the license fees for allowed dogs and raise the fees for tile-dogs. The bill has already passed the Ohio House of Representatives and is being heard in the senate. Ohio has been working with the Alabamian Benevolence Fund for Animal Welfare Agencies to produce a newsletter that will be mailed to animal protectionists across Alabama. The Federation develops legislation and serves as a state-wide resource for information on animal issues.

Animal Control Academy
The University of Michigan in Ann Arbor will again be the location for the Animal Control Academy sponsored by the Great Lakes Regional Office on May 9-20. For information on this session contact the Great Lakes Regional Office (733 Hanks St., Bowling Green, OH 43402).

Refuges: The Next Step
Good news—we have won the appeal in our case that has been pending since 1983 in the federal district court for the Northern District of Wisconsin (see the Winter 1988 HSUS News). Although the federal district court denied Prelate’s motion, that The HSUS had no right, or “standing,” to sue and ruled against our claims about hunting programs on that basis, the appeals court recently cleared the way for us to go back to the district court for a hard look at NWRS hunting programs.

In a related development, H.R. 2724, the Refuge Wildlife Protection Act, continues to gain support from congressional representatives. The bill, which would prohibit sport hunting and recrea-
Olateh Improves With the help of the Midwest Regional Office, the newly formed Humane Society of Olateh, Kan., has made strides toward improving the animal-control facilities and programs in Olateh. An animal shelter is being built to HSUS specifications, a newly enacted animal-control ordinance follows HSUS guidelines, and an excellent spay/neuter program for shelter animals is beginning implementation. Midwest Regional Director Wendell Maddox met with city officials to discuss plans.

New Address The Mid-Atlantic Regional Office has relocated in west Morris County, N.J. The new address is 270 Route 206, Bartley Square, Florham Park, NJ 07936.

Pennsylvania Coalition In February 1988, Mid-Atlantic Program Coordinator Rick Abel attended a meeting in Harrisburg, Penn., called by State Representative Tom Murphy. More than seventy-five individuals from across Pennsylvania attended the meeting to discuss how they can work collectively to better create and pass animal-protection legislation. Clay Criswell, executive director for the Harrisburg Area Humane Society, is chairman of a task force to report back to the group in May.

Great Swamp Protest Approximately fifty protesters, including Mid-Atlantic Regional Director Nina Austenberg, gathered at the Great Swamp National Wildlife Refuge in New Jersey on December 10, 1987, to protest its fourteenth annual deer hunt, which opened that day. Animal protectionists have protested this event annually since it began in 1974. The protest received excellent coverage in local newspapers.

Law Struck Down The New England Regional Office is delighted at the recent U.S. District Court ruling that Connecticut's 1985 law prohibiting the use of leg hold traps within the state is unconstitutional (see Law Notes). Regional Director John Dommeron has also supported animal-protection groups in New Hampshire and the New Hampshire Civil Liberties Union to protest proposed hunter-harassment laws in that state. The New England Regional Office will continue to oppose any attempts to pass hunter-harassment laws.

Graduation Day Twenty-four students graduated from the thirty-sixth session of The HSUS's ten-week Animal Control Academy conducted at the 4-H Center in Ashland, Mass., in January. The Academy program covers such topics as ethics and professionalism, investigations, animal behavior, euthanasia, the use of computers in animal control, managing stress, public relations, humane education, and discipline.

Ohio Federation of Animals The Minnesota Federated Humane Societies' humane agents training workshop will be held at the Sheraton Midway Hotel in St. Paul, Minn., on May 21 and 22. North Central Regional Director Frantz Dantzler will be a speaker. For more information, contact the North Central Regional Office (205 175th St., Lansing, IL 60438).

West Coast Workshop On March 3 and 4, 1988, the West Coast Regional Office sponsored the HSUS dangerous-dog workshop, "Dealing with Dangerous Dogs in Your Community," in Sacramento, Calif. HSUS staff members who made presentations at the workshop included Charlie Breton, West Coast regional director; Kurt Lapham, West Coast field investigator; and Regional Coordinator Rick Abel. The next workshop will be held in Woodland, CA 95695.

Legislative Update The California State Legislature continues its two-year session with the introduction of several new animal bills in addition to those carried over from 1987. S.B. 741, introduced by State Senator Art Torres, would establish regulations for dogs declared "vicious" by a municipal court. It automatically assumes all pit-bull-type dogs to be vicious. While The HSUS supports stringent dangerous-dog laws and ordinances, this bill has numerous problems and is breed specific, something The HSUS opposes in all legislation.

In response to pressure from The HSUS, the state Attorney General's Office supports this bill. The legislation would require a license for dogs kept by dangerous-dog owners and provide for forfeiture of animals. Any court order to spay or neuter a dangerous dog would be enforced by the county animal-control agency.

In Michigan, Assembly Member Thomas Speak to protest proposed hunter-harassment laws in that state. The New England Regional Office will continue to oppose any attempts to pass hunter-harassment laws.

El Paso Changes Ways... The California Attorney General's Office has issued an opinion stating that individual counties have the right to ban the use of steel-jaw leghold traps within their jurisdictions. Consequently, the West Coast Regional Office has instituted a campaign to help citizens pass trap-banning ordinances in their city or county. Two campaign kits are available—one designed for adults and the other for children and youths. For campaign kits and trapping-incident reports, contact the West Coast Regional Office (1731 J St., Suite 210, Sacramento, CA 95814).

Ban-the-Trap Campaign In 1987, the California Attorney General's Office issued an opinion stating that individual counties have the right to ban the use of steel-jaw leghold traps within their jurisdictions. Consequently, the West Coast Regional Office has instituted a campaign to help citizens pass trap-banning ordinances in their city or county. Two campaign kits are available—one designed for adults and the other for children and youths. For campaign kits and trapping-incident reports, contact the West Coast Regional Office (1731 J St., Suite 210, Sacramento, CA 95814).

Legislative Roundup In Alabama, State Senator Roy Moore has introduced a bill that would establish a three-year moratorium on the use of pit bulls as guard dogs. The bill would require all pit bulls to be registered with the Alabama Department of Agriculture and Industrial Sciences. The registration fee would be $5.00 per year.

In California, Assembly Member Alfred Saxe has introduced a bill that would require all pit bulls to be registered with the California Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. The registration fee would be $5.00 per year.

In Illinois, State Representative Roy Carlson has introduced a bill that would require all pit bulls to be registered with the Illinois Department of Agriculture. The registration fee would be $5.00 per year.

In New Jersey, State Senator John C. McDonald has introduced a bill that would require all pit bulls to be registered with the New Jersey Department of Agriculture. The registration fee would be $5.00 per year.

In Ohio, State Representative John C. McDonald has introduced a bill that would require all pit bulls to be registered with the Ohio Department of Agriculture. The registration fee would be $5.00 per year.

In Pennsylvania, State Senator John J. Farnon has introduced a bill that would require all pit bulls to be registered with the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture. The registration fee would be $5.00 per year.

In Texas, State Representative John C. McDonald has introduced a bill that would require all pit bulls to be registered with the Texas Department of Agriculture. The registration fee would be $5.00 per year.

El Paso Changes Ways... The California Attorney General's Office has issued an opinion stating that individual counties have the right to ban the use of steel-jaw leghold traps within their jurisdictions. Consequently, the West Coast Regional Office has instituted a campaign to help citizens pass trap-banning ordinances in their city or county. Two campaign kits are available—one designed for adults and the other for children and youths. For campaign kits and trapping-incident reports, contact the West Coast Regional Office (1731 J St., Suite 210, Sacramento, CA 95814).

Ban-the-Trap Campaign In 1987, the California Attorney General's Office issued an opinion stating that individual counties have the right to ban the use of steel-jaw leghold traps within their jurisdictions. Consequently, the West Coast Regional Office has instituted a campaign to help citizens pass trap-banning ordinances in their city or county. Two campaign kits are available—one designed for adults and the other for children and youths. For campaign kits and trapping-incident reports, contact the West Coast Regional Office (1731 J St., Suite 210, Sacramento, CA 95814).

Legislative Roundup In Alabama, State Senator Roy Moore has introduced a bill that would establish a three-year moratorium on the use of pit bulls as guard dogs. The bill would require all pit bulls to be registered with the Alabama Department of Agriculture and Industrial Sciences. The registration fee would be $5.00 per year.

In California, Assembly Member Alfred Saxe has introduced a bill that would require all pit bulls to be registered with the California Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. The registration fee would be $5.00 per year.

In Illinois, State Representative Roy Carlson has introduced a bill that would require all pit bulls to be registered with the Illinois Department of Agriculture. The registration fee would be $5.00 per year.

In New Jersey, State Senator John J. Farnon has introduced a bill that would require all pit bulls to be registered with the New Jersey Department of Agriculture. The registration fee would be $5.00 per year.

In Pennsylvania, State Senator John J. Farnon has introduced a bill that would require all pit bulls to be registered with the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture. The registration fee would be $5.00 per year.

In Texas, State Representative John C. McDonald has introduced a bill that would require all pit bulls to be registered with the Texas Department of Agriculture. The registration fee would be $5.00 per year.

El Paso Changes Ways... The California Attorney General's Office has issued an opinion stating that individual counties have the right to ban the use of steel-jaw leghold traps within their jurisdictions. Consequently, the West Coast Regional Office has instituted a campaign to help citizens pass trap-banning ordinances in their city or county. Two campaign kits are available—one designed for adults and the other for children and youths. For campaign kits and trapping-incident reports, contact the West Coast Regional Office (1731 J St., Suite 210, Sacramento, CA 95814).

Ban-the-Trap Campaign In 1987, the California Attorney General's Office issued an opinion stating that individual counties have the right to ban the use of steel-jaw leghold traps within their jurisdictions. Consequently, the West Coast Regional Office has instituted a campaign to help citizens pass trap-banning ordinances in their city or county. Two campaign kits are available—one designed for adults and the other for children and youths. For campaign kits and trapping-incident reports, contact the West Coast Regional Office (1731 J St., Suite 210, Sacramento, CA 95814).

Legislative Roundup In Alabama, State Senator Roy Moore has introduced a bill that would establish a three-year moratorium on the use of pit bulls as guard dogs. The bill would require all pit bulls to be registered with the Alabama Department of Agriculture and Industrial Sciences. The registration fee would be $5.00 per year.

In California, Assembly Member Alfred Saxe has introduced a bill that would require all pit bulls to be registered with the California Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. The registration fee would be $5.00 per year.

In Illinois, State Representative Roy Carlson has introduced a bill that would require all pit bulls to be registered with the Illinois Department of Agriculture. The registration fee would be $5.00 per year.

In New Jersey, State Senator John J. Farnon has introduced a bill that would require all pit bulls to be registered with the New Jersey Department of Agriculture. The registration fee would be $5.00 per year.

In Pennsylvania, State Senator John J. Farnon has introduced a bill that would require all pit bulls to be registered with the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture. The registration fee would be $5.00 per year.

In Texas, State Representative John C. McDonald has introduced a bill that would require all pit bulls to be registered with the Texas Department of Agriculture. The registration fee would be $5.00 per year.
COMPASSION: The Boundless Circle

In being compassionate toward other animals and in giving them "equal and fair consideration" as animal-rights philosophy proposes, where do we draw the line? Do compassion and animal rights extend to all creatures, since jellyfish, oysters, and houseflies are animals, too? In those states where cockfighting is still legal, protection under anti-cruelty statutes is denied fighting birds because they are not considered animals. "After all, one has to draw the line somewhere," it is argued, "otherwise people might be prosecuted for swatting flies and killing fleas on their dogs."

However, in drawing a line, legally, conceptually, or morally, we get into the quicksands of ethical inconsistency. Compassion, as respect for the sanctity of being, is a boundless ethic, and this ethic includes all natural creation in a circle of moral consideration. To begin to "draw lines" to exclude certain creatures—"pests," venomous animals, or those that are cold-blooded or seem not to fear or experience pain—is arbitrary, capricious, and, too often, purely self-serving. Who can know if the life of a shrimp is of lesser value (to the shrimp itself) than that of a more complex, and presumably more intelligent, animal such as a cow? Would it be better for two hundred people to eat one cow than for ten people to eat two hundred shrimp? More lives would be spared at the beef-eaters' table than at the shrimp feast?

In the quest for humane alternatives to the use of animals in biomedical and other forms of research and product testing, it is considered acceptable by many to use animals of lower sentient—rats instead of primates and fruit flies instead of rats. This choice is reinforced by the expedient fact that "lower" organisms are more plentiful and less costly to propagate and care for.

When we put aside these arguments, no matter how valid, and reflect upon the boundless ethic of compassion that makes no distinctions between species, we find that the circle of compassion has been broken. Some creatures have been excluded for the benefit of others, including ourselves. This exclusivity can be regarded as a violation of the absolute ethic of compassion toward all creatures, but, from a more utilitarian perspective, such exclusivity is "realistic."

Your dog has fleas or worms and these parasites must be killed. The idealistic world of a boundless circle of compassion is in contrast with the stark reality of situational ethics, where we have to make moral choices and decide between the health of one's dog and the rights of fleas or between the suffering of fruit flies in an experiment and the suffering of rats or cats. This exclusivity can be regarded as a violation of the absolute ethic of compassion toward all creatures, but, from a more utilitarian perspective, such exclusivity is "realistic."

It was Albert Schweitzer who, in formulating his boundless ethic of a reverence for all life, recognized that, from time to time, we do have such hard choices to make. He wisely concluded that these choices should be made on a case-by-case basis. However, he also was aware of the danger of such a philosophy—that accepting the extermination of animals in one appropriate situation could lead to an acceptance of wholesale extermination in less valid cases.

Instead of making carefully considered moral choices on a case-by-case basis, we tend to follow precedent: cultural tradition, custom, convenience, and expediency. We reach for the flyswatter and hang strips of sticky flypaper instead of repairing our door and window screens to keep the flies away. We treat our pets repeatedly with harmful pesticides instead of finding better ways to prevent and control flea infestations.

It is only by drawing a circle of compassion before deciding upon a particular action in relation to the nonhuman elements of creation that the integrity and future of creation can be best assured. In seeing wild animals as communities, our perception and respect for them broaden to embrace that essential dimension we call ecological or environmental. Without this so-called holistic perspective, human activities ranging from agriculture and medicine to urban medicine to urban community planning and wildlife management generally cause more harm than good.

While Albert Schweitzer did not include this perspective in his philosophy, concern for the whole community of life as well as for the life of the individual (human and nonhuman) is implicit in his absolute and boundless ethic of compassion or reverence for life.

Drawing a circle instead of a line reflects a holistic, rather than a linear, hierarchical, and, ultimately, human-centered, state of mind and heart. Equal concern for the whole of nature and for all existence brings the animal-rights, -welfare, environmental, and so-called deep ecology movements together. This unification is as implicit in Schweitzer's philosophy as it is in the sacramentalist teachings of St. Francis of Assisi (whom Pope John Paul II has designated the patron saint of ecology), and it is implicit in the ethic of compassion as respect and concern for all creatures and Creation.

This supreme and absolute ethic will enable us to live in communion with the nonhuman creation of planet Earth. No living entity should ever be excluded from equal consideration, be it a tree, a hillside, or a river. We are all a part of the same ecological community and, by logical extension, part of the same community of moral concern. Peace and justice are principles that should have no boundaries of class, race, or species. They are integral to compassion's boundless circle whereby the integrity and future of the natural world may be assured.

To think and act otherwise can only lead to our own demise. To be ethical beings, we need to be constantly aware of how situational ethics can quickly destroy the boundless circle. The unraveling of both the moral and ethical fabrics of human communities and of the ecological fabrics of animal and plant communities is self-evident today. The animal and plant kingdoms are as endangered as our own. To reverse this trend is a supreme task, but it is not insurmountable. Great achievements often have small, seemingly insignificant, beginnings. To begin to extend compassion to embrace other creatures is such a beginning. It is not an impossible, "unworthy" ideal. A first step could be to mend the screens and pull down the flypaper or to think twice about eating bacon and eggs for breakfast. The choice is ours. Our choice, in the final analysis, is best made from the perspective of compassion toward all of creation. I can think of no better ethical basis for a humane planetary stewardship.

By Dr. Michael W. Fox

Dr. Michael W. Fox is director of The HSUS's Center for Respect of Life and Environment.
In a recent important decision, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia held that The HSUS has standing to bring suit to challenge the Department of Interior's decision to open numerous wildlife refuges to hunting. The court of appeals decision reversed an earlier decision by the district court holding that The HSUS lacked standing to represent its members in the suit (see the Fall 1986 HSUS News). The district court originally held that, since the stated purposes of The HSUS did not include protection of its members' "recreational" rights in wildlife refuges, The HSUS as an organization had no standing.

The court of appeals first found that HSUS members have alleged a cognizable injury as a result of hunting being permitted in wildlife refuges. Society members having to view animal corpses, the environmental degradation, and the depletion of the supply of animals that refuge visitors may view are "classic aesthetic interests, which have always enjoyed protection under standing analysis," according to the court.

After finding that HSUS members had alleged a legitimate injury, the court addressed what it considered the more critical question: whether The HSUS has standing as an organization to sue on behalf of its members. The key issue was whether the HSUS is the proper party to represent those interests. The HSUS sought to protect were germane to the organization's purpose. The court agreed with our argument that the genuineness of requirement was not intended to be a barrier to standing but to serve only to ensure that an organization's litigation goals are pertinent to its special expertise and the purposes for bringing its members together.

The court held that, while not explicit in The HSUS's corporate charter, pertains enhanced human appreciation of other living things was an "unstated but obvious side goal of preserving animal life." Thus, the court found no difficulty in concluding that challenging hunting on wildlife refuges was germane to the purposes of The HSUS.

Credit is due to attorney Kathleen Eldergill for an outstanding job in representing Ms. Dorman.

In a decision filed in February, a federal judge in Connecticut held that state’s hunter-harassment law unconstitutional. The court found the act vague and overbroad, encroaching on protected rights of free speech.

The plaintiff in this suit, Francine Dorman (see the Winter 1987 HSUS News), was arrested for violation of the act, which makes it unlawful for anyone to harass or interfere with another person who is engaged in the lawful taking of wildlife or in preparation thereof. Ms. Dorman’s suit contended that the act is so vague that it does not provide adequate notice to the public of what conduct is considered criminal and so overbroad that it impermissibly affects activity protected by the Constitution.

Judge Alan Nevas agreed with Ms. Dorman. The court determined that the state had a legitimate interest in regulating hunting. However, it held that the statute was overly vague by not defining the nature of the interference it prohibits. Further, the court found the language prohibiting harassment of persons in preparation for hunting failed to set proper time and place restrictions on the law’s operation. The court was concerned that this vagueness would allow the overly broad application of the act into times, places, and types of conduct that are clearly protected by the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution. Thus, the court reasoned that the act could be read to prohibit communications with hunters while they are buying supplies long before the actual hunt or even making plans to hunt during a “workplace coffee break.” Any interference or harassment at even these times and places remote from the actual hunting sites would be subject to the act as written.

In his opinion, the judge stated, “The propriety of hunting and taking wildlife is a fair subject for spirited public debate. Once the hunter is outside the scope of his ‘lawful hunt’ he is no different from any other unreceptive listener.” This decision represents the second such statute to be struck down. In 1986, the Supreme Court of New Hampshire struck down a proposed hunter-harassment bill on similar grounds.

Reflect on 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. You will be able to help animals after you’re gone, or by providing any portion of your estate to further The HSUS mission for 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.

The Law Notes are compiled by HSUS General Counsel Murdough Stuart Madden and Associate Counsel Roger Kindler.
1988 HSUS ANNUAL CONFERENCE
ANIMAL JUSTICE... POLITICAL REALITY

Meeting virtually in the shadow of the U.S. Capitol, those attending the 1988 HSUS annual conference will find an exciting variety of legislative issues and challenges facing them. Making animal protection a local, state, and national priority for those in government will be a focus of workshops and formal presentations throughout the three-day program. A pre-conference symposium on the wildlife trade on Wednesday, October 12, will target local action. And, our special guest, world-famous primatologist Jane Goodall, will accept The HSUS's prestigious Joseph Wood Krutch Medal.

Complete program details and registration form will appear in the summer issue of The HSUS News, mailed to our membership in early July.

OCTOBER 13-15, 1988
HYATT REGENCY CRYSTAL CITY
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA (WASHINGTON, D.C.)

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