Getting the Facts Straight—Part II

In the Spring 1988 issue of The Humane Society News, I shared with you a letter I had written (March 1, 1988) to Kenneth Gilmore, Editor-in-Chief, Reader's Digest Association, protesting the grossly distorted and deliberately biased article authored by Dr. Robert White entitled "The Facts About Animal Research," printed in the March 1988 issue of Reader's Digest. After pointing out the misrepresentations and one-sided focus of Dr. White's article, I urged Mr. Gilmore to accept for publication a rebuttal article by The HSUS.

I also urged you to express your personal concern to Mr. Gilmore, which you have done by the hundreds. Indeed, your excellent letters and, in many cases, the cancellation of your subscriptions to Reader's Digest were powerful indicators of your own outrage regarding this matter.

Unfortunately, and, indeed, quite unbelievably, Mr. Gilmore has not even acknowledged my letter of March 1 nor a subsequent letter I wrote to him dated April 14. I did, however, receive a four-sentence letter from a Ms. Nina Bell Allen dated April 7 which failed to respond to any of my comments to Mr. Gilmore but was, nonetheless, quite revealing. Writes Ms. Allen: "While you may dispute our (emphasis mine) position, we see no reason to alter our (emphasis mine) fundamental contention that the campaign against using animals for certain vital medical research has seriously slowed down and endangered endeavors to save human—and animal—life."

Though Ms. Allen totally ignores the basic issue of my letter, i.e., the use of animals from public and private animal shelters for research, she makes it quite clear that Dr. White's position is, in fact, Reader's Digest's position. Quite obviously, the editors of this magazine want no rebuttal to their own position!

Not content to ignore totally The HSUS's repeated offers to provide an article setting forth our views and those of the vast majority of animal-protection organizations in this country, Reader's Digest has now deliberately and maliciously linked the name of The HSUS in a supportive fashion with Dr. White's research in letters sent to many of you. Writes Ms. Allen: "This topic is admittedly charged. Yet we felt it imperative for the public to understand what was at stake because of increasingly violent attacks on this type of research. That is why we presented the view of Dr. Robert White—the director of Neurological Surgery at Cleveland Metropolitan General Hospital. Even animal-welfare groups such as The Humane Society of the United States recognize that this research has benefited mankind although they stress that alternatives should be sought whenever possible."

In responding to this defamatory linking of our name with Dr. White's research, I wrote to Mr. Gilmore on April 14: "We protest in the strongest terms that Reader's Digest invoked the name of The HSUS in defending Dr. White's article. That statement can easily be interpreted as implying that The HSUS agrees with Dr. White's views. This would stand reality on its head!"

Receiving no response to this protest and no indication that Reader's Digest has ceased to use our name in this
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John A. Hoyt
A Timely Reminder

Summer is the peak season for airline travel, and many people find it necessary to take their companion animals along. Unfortunately, however, air transport for companion animals can be a risky business. While legislation enacted in 1976 was intended to protect animals from abuse during transport, problems continue to plague three major areas of pet transport: unsafe environmental conditions, improper handling, and misrouting and delays (see the Fall 1985 and Summer 1987 HSUS News).

If you must transport your companion animal by air, Phyllis Wright, HSUS vice president for companion animals, has several recommendations:

- Use direct flights instead of connecting ones. More problems occur when you are not on the same flight as your pet and during baggage shuffles between connecting flights.
- Give your animal a week before the scheduled trip to adjust to its carrying crate. The crate should be big enough for the animal to sit or stand erect, lie down, and turn around.
- Fit your animal with a loose-fitting collar and an ID tag with the phone number of a person to be contacted in case of an emergency.
- Do not give tranquilizers unless your veterinarian specifically recommends them.
- Request a seat on the plane next to a window that overlooks the baggage loading area. You may be able to see your animal's crate and ensure it's properly loaded. Ask the flight attendant to verify that your pet has been loaded before takeoff. Don't assume your pet is all right—ask!
- When you arrive at your destination, open the crate right away and examine your animal. If anything seems wrong, take your animal at once to a veterinarian and get the results of the examination in writing, including the date and time. In the unfortunate event of your animal's death during transit, have a necropsy performed immediately to determine the cause of death and before you attempt to file a claim.

The Animal Welfare Act does protect animals in transit, and, in case you encounter difficulties while traveling with a pet, write to APHIS. Specific letters of complaint should be addressed to Richard Rissler, D.V.M., Assistant Director, Domestic Programs, Veterinary Services, USDA/APHIS, Federal Building, Hyattsville, MD 20782. Airlines can be fined for mishandling and mistreatment of animals—last February, United Airlines paid an $11,000 civil penalty to settle charges of violating the Animal Welfare Act in its transportation of animals.

The HSUS's companion animals department continues to collect information about the airlines' mishandling of animals while putting pressure on carriers to improve their standards for animal care.

Dr. Grandy Joins NADCAC

As part of our ongoing program of monitoring the federal Animal Damage Control (ADC) programs, Dr. John W. Grandy, The HSUS's vice president for wildlife and environment, recently assumed a seat on the U.S. Department of Agriculture's National Animal Damage Control Advisory Committee (NADCA). This group was set up by the USDA after it assumed control of the ADC program, which was formerly housed at the U.S. Department of the Interior. Membership on the panel, which includes animal activists, scientists, government officials, and others, will provide an opportunity for The HSUS to catalogue the problems inherent in lethal predator control and other harmful forms of ADC and to push for nonlethal, environmentally sound methods.

Dr. Grandy has made a study of predator control and its alternatives for the last decade. He was a member of an ADC task force convened under then-Secretary of the Interior Cecil Andrus during the Carter administration.

In Memoriam

On June 15, 1988, Mel L. Morse of Solana Beach, Calif., died of a heart attack, and the humane movement lost one of its outstanding leaders and greatest humanitarians. Mr. Morse was the chairman of the board of the Helen Woodward Animal Center at the time of his death.

Mr. Morse had a long and distinguished career in animal-protection work. He started his illustrious, fifty-year career as a very young man doing animal-control work in Los Angeles. His dedication, hard work, and strong, imaginative foresight propelled him to leadership of some of the largest national humane organizations.

He served as president of The Humane Society of the United States from 1967-1970, coming to The HSUS from the Marin County (Calif.) Humane Society, where he was executive director. Before his service with Marin County, Mr. Morse was executive director of the American Humane Association. He had headed its Hollywood office, which supervised the use of animals in motion pictures, and was a major influence in the writing and development of the motion picture and television codes pertaining to the use of animals in those industries.

Mr. Morse served as a consultant to the World Federation for the Protection of Animals and was also the author of two noted books—Ordeal of the Animals and Cause for Concern: Pets, People, Problems—that deal with major animal issues facing the humane movement.

Mr. Morse's contributions to animal welfare and the humane ethic will not soon be forgotten. He will be missed by all of us, his friends and colleagues, but now he takes his rightful place among the great humanitarians of all time.
Olympic Concerns
Since athletes and tourists from all over the world will soon converge on the Republic of Korea (South Korea) for the 1988 summer Olympics, now is an opportune time to protest the eating of dogs and, to a lesser extent, cats in that country.

The World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA), of which The HSUS is a member, has extensively documented this brutal practice, which has been carried on for centuries in much of Southeast Asia.

Since it is traditional, dog- and cat-eating is very difficult to stop. Although pressure by animal-rights activists over the past few years has forced South Korea to enact laws making it illegal for restaurants to serve dog and cat meat or for markets to sell dogs or cats for the purpose of consuming them, the laws are not enforced. International visitors to the Olympics are likely to see restaurants specializing in “dog stew” and witness dogs, packed tightly into cages, being transported from market to restaurant on the backs of motorcycles or bicycles. WSPA recently visited thirty-three restaurants, forty-one markets, and fifteen breeding farms throughout South Korea and found that the practice of eating dogs and cats is widespread among all socioeconomic groups, since “gae go gi” (dog meat) and cat meat are believed to have medicinal qualities.

Dogs intended for consumption are usually raised on small farms, where farmers deafen the dogs by puncturing their eardrums so they will not bark. At four to six months of age, the dogs are either slaughtered at the farm or transported live in packed cages to open-air markets, where they wag their tails at passersby while awaiting their fate.

At the market stalls, customers can pick a live dog and wait for it to be cooked on the spot. The dogs are usually killed by a sharp blow to the back of the neck or by a blow from a mallet to the forehead. “Traditionalists” maintain that the best dogs to eat are small strays and that they must be freshly killed by slow strangulation and eaten without seasoning or condiment. Fortunately, killing by slow strangulation is thought to be a waning practice.

However, WSPA is currently investigating claims by Koreans that, in preparation for one dish, “gae soju” (dog-meat wine), dogs are forced to drink alcohol and then severely beaten prior to being killed to tenderize and darken their meat. Some Koreans also claim that as many as one million dogs per year are ranched for their fur, an allegation WSPA is investigating.

Members of the WSPA executive staff have visited Korean embassies around the world in protest and have alerted 315 member organizations in sixty-three countries. You can help the international effort to stop this brutality by writing letters of protest to:

- His Excellency Kyung-Won Kim, Ambassador of The Republic of Korea to the United States, 2370 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20008.

Torturers Sentenced

In January 1988, three people in Muskogee County, Okla., tortured a dog and a cat over a twenty-eight hour period, beating them with a guitar, burning them with a cigarette lighter, and throwing them against the living room wall. The cries of the animals were recorded on cassette tape to recreate the sound effects of a heavy metal rock band, according to police.

Horrified at this appalling crime, HSUS Director of Higher Education Programs Randall Lockwood immediately wrote to the Muskogee County district attorney, offering his assistance with the case. Dr. Lockwood, an expert on the dynamics of animal abuse and its connection with other crimes, stated in his letter, “...blatant acts of cruelty are often a warning sign of greater problems to come and must never be taken lightly” (see the Summer 1986 HSUS News).

The three offenders, two men and a woman, were sentenced to jail terms in May. The only one of the three over twenty-one, Geary Allen Johnson, received a ten-year sentence of five years in the penitentiary and five years on probation. The other two offenders received five years on probation, after serving nearly three months in jail. “These sentences are an indication that judges are taking animal-abuse cases more seriously,” points out Dr. Lockwood. “This is an encouraging trend, since animal-abuse investigations are more likely to be pursued if it is known that the cases will be prosecuted and appropriately sentenced.”

Visitors to the summer Olympics in South Korea may see caged dogs being transported to markets and restaurants, destined to be sold for human consumption.
Hunting in the Classroom?

The National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education (NAAHE) has been working to counteract a disturbing trend in American education: the proliferation of programs and materials developed by interest groups and industries that exploit and abuse animals. According to NAAHE Director Patty Finch, “The extent to which such programs and materials have permeated our nation’s schools is frightening. Their increasing influence on our children potentially ensures that the next generation of adults will continue to view animals primarily as resources for human recreation, exploitation, and consumption.”

Here are just a few examples of the educational inroads made by pro-hunting and other exploitive groups:

- The National Shooting Sports Foundation, a pro-hunting organization, has more than forty thousand programs in place in schools across the country.
- Project WILD, a subtly pro-hunting and pro-trapping environmental education curriculum, has been distributed free of charge to approximately 130,000 teachers. The developers of Project WILD estimate that 10 million students have been reached. In several states, money designated for nongame and endangered wildlife projects has been targeted to fund Project WILD teacher-training workshops.
- The Wisconsin Animal Care Forum, a coalition of agribusiness interests including fur farmers and veal producers, is producing a booklet for students designed to explain “the value of modern livestock technologies to the consumer, to human health and to the animal…(and) to combat the romantic notion of farming operations that is part and parcel of many of the animal rights groups” (Country Today, March 1987).
- Protect What’s Right, a public relations program produced by the Wildlife Legislative Fund of America, is designed to indoctrinate unwary people into supporting sport hunting and trapping. The program offers a series of teacher packets, appropriate for grades 4-7, designed to convince students of the essential role of hunting and other consumptive wildlife uses in conservation and the collection of scientific data.

To counteract these developments, NAAHE has stepped up efforts to increase nationwide participation in its Adopt-A-Teacher program. Through this program, teachers receive humane education materials every month. With the recent push by pro-hunting and other exploitive groups to get their message into the schools, it is now critically important that teachers have access to materials that teach humaneness.

For more information concerning NAAHE’s Adopt-A-Teacher program and how to participate, write to NAAHE, P.O. Box 362N, East Hadam, CT 06423.

Center Convenes Conference

This spring, in conjunction with the New Creation Institute, the Center for Respect of Life and Environment convened a meeting of representatives of several religious organizations, including the National Council of Churches, the World Council of Churches, the United Methodist Board of Church and Society, and the Presbyterian Church. The two-day meeting, entitled “Respect for Life and Environment: Ethical and Theological Aspects of Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology,” was a major step toward involving the Church in animal-welfare and conservation issues.

As anticipated, the subject of genetic engineering served as a catalyst in this regard. Two consensus statements arose from this consultation, calling for a moratorium on animal patenting and stating, “The ethical, environmental, socioeconomic, and theological ramifications of genetic engineering and patenting of life are profound. They point to the probability that the integrity and future of creation will be placed in even greater jeopardy if our power over the genes of life is not exercised prudently and with reverence to help to restore the covenant: to heal the Earth and ourselves.”

Also this spring, the Center welcomed musician and composer Paul Winter to its board of directors.

The Center now has available two VHS one-half-inch video presentations: Animals, Nature & Religion, thirty-five minutes long, for $20.00; and Genetic Engineering Biotechnology: Ethical, Environmental, and Animal Welfare Concerns, forty minutes long, for $22.50. These prices include postage and handling. Contact the Center for Respect of Life and Environment, 2100 L St., NW, Washington, DC 20037.
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Winning Court Battles for Wildlife
The HSUS hails refuge, transport, and fur seal decisions

In the last few months, The HSUS has been extraordinarily successful in efforts to protect wildlife through legal means.

The first case we won involved our National Wildlife Refuge suit (see the Spring 1988 HSUS News). The HSUS, despite our standing as the largest animal-welfare and protection organization in the United States, had been denied by a U.S. district court the ability to sue to protect wild animals on National Wildlife Refuges. We had exhaustively analyzed the data surrounding hunting and trapping on National Wildlife Refuges in 1984; assembled voluminous legal papers; and presented them to the court. The court, however, refused to hear the information, stating that we lacked “standing.” Thus, the recently issued decision by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia was most significant. It conferred upon The HSUS and similar organizations precious “standing.” It recognized the right of organizations such as ours to represent the welfare of animals on behalf of our members. The decision was written by Chief Judge Patricia Wald, who was joined by one of her two judicial colleagues.

Subsequently, the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (the representative of all state fish and game agencies), the Wildlife Legislative Fund of America, and the U.S. Department of the Interior asked the U.S. Department of Justice to file a petition for an en banc hearing before the court of appeals to review the decision by the Wald panel. If the government believes an error has been made in a decision, it can petition the court of appeals for a full hearing before all eleven appeals court judges. The court must then evaluate the decision and determine whether or not it believes an error has been made, and, if so, whether a full hearing is needed to address the decision. Thus, The HSUS was even more pleased when, on May 10, 1988, the court of appeals denied the petition for an en banc review of the Wald decision. That decision now provides a blueprint for public-interest organizations interested in gaining standing on this or similar issues through its broad interpretations of legal provisions that would tend to confer standing on humane and animal-welfare organizations.

The HSUS was in court on yet another matter on April 15, 1988. This time, we joined the Animal Welfare Institute, MSPCA, Friends of Animals, the International Wildlife Coalition, and others in an attempt to require the federal government to enforce regulations on the humane shipment of wildlife (see the article on page 22). These regulations had been more than six years in the making, having been required by 1981 amendments to the provisions of the Lacey Act. They had been bitterly opposed by the pet industry, specifications to bring the lawsuit and argued vehemently that the regulations requiring humane shipment should not be made effective immediately.

Thus, we were ecstatic when Judge John H. Pratt granted an injunction that forced the government to implement rules requiring humane shipment and to publish notice in the Federal Register to that effect. When the government argued that we did not have standing to sue, Judge Pratt countered, “If they (The HSUS) don’t have standing, I don’t know what other group or groups in this entire world would have standing.” Most importantly, the judge ruled that “it...
seems to us that the public interest clearly lies in the final implementations of the amendments of the Lacey Act which were enacted in 1981. We hold that the public interest lies in favor of the enforcement of the present regulation....” Thus, we are hopeful that immediate action will indeed save, as Dr. Lieberman said, “the lives of seventy thousand birds.”

In another welcome development, the National Marine Fisheries Service, in response to our lawsuit (see the Spring 1988 HSUS News), on May 19, 1988, listed the North Pacific Fur Seal as a depleted species under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA). We look forward to increased protection for this species, with the hope that it will recover adequately to merit non-depleted, non-threatened status under the MMPA.

Our thanks to Mark Colley and to the law firm of Davis, Graham & Stubbs for their excellent work in the North Pacific Fur Seal case. We would like to thank Hogan & Hartson and its attorneys David A. Hayes, Craig A. Hoover, and David Grady for their fine work on behalf of wildlife refuges and The HSUS. Finally, our thanks go to Ray S. Bolze and Margaret Fitzsimmons of the Washington, D.C., law firm of Howrey & Simon for their excellent representation in securing humane shipment regulations to cover animals imported into the United States.

Most consumers have no way of knowing whether the meat products they purchase have been humanely raised.

## Making a More Humane Choice

The HSUS focuses on selected farm animal products

This past spring, The HSUS’s farm animal and bioethics department embarked on new efforts to link humane livestock and poultry producers with concerned consumers who want to buy humanely produced meat and dairy products. Since most of the meat, eggs, and dairy products available in supermarkets have been produced in large, intensive, factory-farm settings that we consider inhumane and unhealthy in many ways, caring consumers who wanted alternatively raised produce have had to find other food services or refrain from eating such products at all. Sometimes, so-called free-range eggs or humanely raised meats could be found through food co-ops, health-food stores, or local livestock producers, but these sources have not been accessible for most people. At The HSUS, we have seen public support for and consumer interest in humanely raised food animals grow significantly in the past few years, and we believe that the timing is right to mount a consumer campaign at supermarkets urging the inclusion of humanely raised meat products on grocery shelves. To accomplish this goal, we’ve taken several significant steps:

- We ran an advertisement in three farm magazines seeking humane producers who are looking for new markets for their meat and eggs.
- We developed an HSUS humane husbandry livestock/poultry code with what we consider to be minimal housing and care standards for these animals, The HSUS Recommended Humane Guidelines for Raising Livestock, Poultry and Dairy Animals.
- We’ve worked very closely with the two major national organic food farming organizations, The Organic Crop Improvement Association (OCIA) and The Organic Foods Production Association of North America (OFPANA), to integrate organic and humane standards. Both OCIA and OFPANA have agreed to incorporate the word humane into their definition of organic farming. While not all humanely produced meat is organically raised, a strong correlation between the two does exist. The HSUS, as a result, is a strong advocate of the organic agricultural movement and its philosophical orientation of stewardship and conservation.
- We’ve initiated contacts with the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) of the...
U.S. Department of Agriculture to try to change veal-grading standards to remove preferential grading of white veal and the Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) of USDA, Labeling Division, to permit labeling reflective of humane raising of livestock and poultry.

- We've written to each of the major supermarket chains in the Washington, D.C., area with background information on farm animal welfare and sources of humanely produced livestock and poultry, exhorting them at least to agree to test market these products.
- We've hired a marketing consultant to augment our two-person veterinary technical staff to assist us in gathering economic data which will compare production costs between factory farms and humane, so-called family farms. We badly need this kind of information before we can sell the concept of humane meat and dairy products to supermarket chains. We shall use this data to explain to consumers (and our HSUS constituents, as well) why humanely raised meat and dairy products are going to cost more. If consumers know why they're paying more—i.e., that it's better for the animals as well as healthier for themselves—they are more likely to accept the extra charge.

Such efforts should be considered in the context of these recent developments:

- The National Livestock and Meat Board spent $27 million to promote beef consumption in 1987 alone.
- In 1985, the American consumer paid $50.5 billion for fresh, frozen, and processed livestock and poultry.
- Americans spend approximately 10 percent of their income on food compared to those in other countries, who spend 20 to 50 percent of their incomes on food.
- Animal products contribute more than a third of the calories and between a third and a half of the other major nutrients in the food supply.
- Animal products also contribute more than half of the total fat, three-fourths of the saturated fatty acids, and all the cholesterol in the average American's diet. Such food components may adversely affect an individual's health.
- The nutrition-related health problems experienced by a large segment of the U.S. population (60 million people) arise from the over-consumption of fat, saturated fatty acids, and cholesterol.
- In 1987, 1,387 people a day died of cancer, one every sixty-five seconds.

These facts are sobering but not irreversible. Consumers can take steps to minimize the risk of becoming another poor-health statistic:

- Buy low-fat and leaner products.
- Ask your grocer to carry humanely raised products; offer to put him/her in touch with The HSUS.
- In the words of HSUS President John Hoyt, “Eat more selectively or 'with conscience' and, in the process, help advance

Above, chicks are de-beaked to prevent cannibalism, a practice required as a result of intensive confinement; below, factory-farmed hens are little more than egg-producing machines in most intensive agriculture systems.
Few dairy cows enjoy this kind of idyllic existence; most are intensively raised.

The producers of humanely and organically raised livestock and poultry share your concerns for animal welfare. Their production systems reflect a broader ethical and spiritual concern for life and the environment. They recognize the basic behavioral needs of farm animals raised for food, and many adhere to an agricultural philosophy with these goals:
- Improve the quality and safety of food.
- Contribute to long-term sustainable food production.
- Minimize the agricultural pollution of the environment.
- Conserve energy.
- Avoid dependence on expensive and uncertain sources of petrochemically based fertilizers and dangerous pesticides.
- Preserve the family farm.
- Increase net farm income by lowering production costs.
- Reduce soil erosion and compaction.

We’re going to need your help on this project. In the next issue of The HSUS News we’ll share with you specific strategies to encourage the humane raising of farm animals.

* Because less intensive production systems usually require more human involvement, more space, and costlier feed produced without pesticides, humanely raised meat and dairy products cost more.
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Reflect for a moment...

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

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

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

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

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

Please send: Will information

Name ___________________________
Address ___________________________
City __________________ State ______ Zip ______

Mail in confidence to: Murdough S. Madden, Vice President/General Counsel, The Humane Society of the United States, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.
As part of our continuing effort to address human/wildlife conflicts with humane and environmentally sound control methods, The HSUS acted as host for three one-day workshops in New Jersey and Ohio this spring. On April 13 and 14, The HSUS Mid-Atlantic Regional Office sponsored "Deer Management in an Urbanizing Region: Problems and Alternatives to Traditional Management" and "Humane Solutions to Nuisance-Wildlife Problems." The Great Lakes Regional Office sponsored "Humane Solutions to Nuisance-Wildlife Problems." The sessions were attended by approximately four hundred activists, local animal-control officers, humane society officials, and state wildlife agency personnel.

The purpose of the deer workshop was, first, to evaluate specifically the situation in the Mid-Atlantic region and then to explore alternatives to sport hunting, the traditional solution to deer-management problems. Participants heard scientists and experts in the wildlife field, including Prof. Stephen Kellert of Yale University; Dr. John Fitch, former senior scientist at the Massachusetts Audubon Society; Dr. David Marquis of the U.S. Forest Service; Prof. Jay Kirkpatrick of Eastern Montana State College; Mr. Leon Nielsen, executive director of the Wisconsin Humane Society; Dr. John Grandy and Mr. Guy Hodge of the HSUS staff; Dr. Jay McAninch of the New York Botanical Garden's Institute for Ecosystem Studies; and Prof. J. Edward Gates of the University of Maryland's Appalachian Environmental Laboratory.

The morning session focused on the history and current status of deer populations and deer management; the shift in attitude towards animals that has produced widespread interest in humane solutions to deer/human conflicts; and several case studies of deer/human conflicts.

Participants learned that today's state-administered deer-management programs evolved in an era of deer scarcity, when extensive forest clearing for agriculture decimated deer habitat. Shooting added to the near-elimination of deer in many areas. Extensive natural reforestation and state management policies designed to increase deer numbers led to large deer populations, which have increasingly come into conflict with humans as countryside has been converted into suburbs.

At the same time, protectionist and humane feelings toward deer have increased, based on a shift in attitudes towards animals in general, away from utilitarian and negative perspectives. These humane considerations and the human safety problems inherent in hunting in suburban areas have made the traditional management solution of sport hunting no longer acceptable to a large segment of the community at large and have spawned the need for alternatives to shoot-to-kill management solutions.
The afternoon session explored such alternatives. Participants heard assessments of fencing and repellents, contraception, selective removal, silvicultural techniques, and a variety of ways to keep deer off highways (increased deer/car collisions are often cited as a "reason" for having a sport hunt). They learned that the effectiveness of any given technique often depends on the particular situation; that all techniques are not equally effective in all situations; and that, frequently, a combination of methods may be best.

The HSUS will be publishing proceedings of the conference in about six months. If you would like to be notified when they become available, please write to the Wildlife and Environment Division, The HSUS, 2100 L St., NW, Washington, DC 20037.

“Humane Solutions to Nuisance-Wildlife Problems” concentrated on solutions to urban and suburban wildlife/human problems. The morning session laid the groundwork, discussing how and why wildlife and people come into conflict with each other. Also discussed were health concerns and wildlife-control laws.

In the afternoon session, participants learned that lethal methods of control, such as poisoning pigeons or killing squirrels that may have found their way into the house, are not only inhumane but ineffective, as well. The better approach is to remove the offending animal without harming it and then determine why it was there. Once the entrance (such as a foundation hole or a chimney) and/or source of attraction (such as spilled food) has been eliminated, the problem will disappear. Humane ways of controlling specific animals, including pigeons, skunks, raccoons, tree squirrels, rabbits, bats, mice and rats, deer, and waterfowl, rounded out the workshop.

HSUS staff and visiting scientists will present the nuisance-wildlife workshop on a regular basis around the country. Sessions are scheduled for San Diego, California; Kansas City, Missouri; and a Southwest location. Free packets of information on humane control methods are available from Data and Information Services, The HSUS, at the address above.
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Unfortunately, distorted and misleading articles such as Dr. White’s and numerous other sensational and deliberately deceptive activities of the medical research establishment have seriously damaged congressional support for both S.B. 1457 and H.R. 778, otherwise known as the Pet Protection Act. It is extremely important and vitally urgent that you continue to voice your support of these important measures.

And be assured that The HSUS shall continue to seek to bring to an end the use of any animal for research purposes that has been obtained from a public or private animal shelter.
Protecting Animals Around the World

IUCN grapples with conservation and animal-welfare issues

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) is the global conservation body whose members include 60 national governments, 125 government agencies, and more than 385 nongovernmental organizations, representing a total of 117 countries. As such, the IUCN is unique. It provides a forum where both governments and non-governmental organizations can work together as members to foster conservation and animal-protection policies throughout the world.

It is, however, incredibly complex. Because of the numerous nations and nongovernmental organizations represented, it has become a place where ameliorating cultural differences has become paramount in the effort to conserve land and protect animals.

Meetings that occur in conjunction with IUCN are extremely important. For example, the Species Survival Commission (SSC) meetings assemble scientists from around the world to discuss problems of the exotic-bird trade, exotic-animal trade, and other threats to species. The Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas provides the opportunity to coordinate efforts for worldwide protection of national parks, wildlife refuges, and other areas.

The HSUS has never formally joined the IUCN, in part because, until recently, there has been an apparent lack of serious concern for animal protection and welfare. Indeed, the IUCN attitude has seemed to be one of “conservation is okay, but why should we provide animals with humane treatment?” However, The HSUS has actively contributed to specific projects of the SSC and to the publication of IUCN reports such as those on protecting animals. Dr. John W. Grandy, HSUS vice president for wildlife and environment, has been involved in the effort to push the IUCN into being more supportive of both wildlife conservation and humane treatment of animals.

For example, the IUCN is now actively engaged in establishing a world conservation ethic, the fundamental principle of which is respect for life. This was reaffirmed in the recent IUCN meeting in San Jose, Costa Rica, in a day-long session. Latin Americans joined with Africans and North Americans with Europeans in suggesting that a philosophy of respect for life is basic to the conservation of nature throughout the world. Respect for life provides a fundamental and unifying link between organizations such as The HSUS and more traditional conservation organizations.

From the point of view of The HSUS, the emergence of this ethic at this time represents the assumption by the international conservation movement of an ethical and humane posture more in keeping with the policies of The HSUS and with the animal-welfare and animal-protection movements in general.

This growth can be seen in another development which took place during the recent IUCN meeting. For the first time, the IUCN actively considered a resolution urging a ban on the steel-jaw leghold trap. This resolution, put forth by the Animal Welfare Institute in the United States and for which Dr. Grandy became the principal proponent, represents a major step forward for the IUCN.

The IUCN has traditionally avoided such topics because they presumably did not relate to traditional conservation. Unfortunately, this first effort to pass a resolution banning the leghold trap failed when behind-the-scenes maneuvering on the resolutions committee resulted in the resolution being withdrawn from the official platform of the IUCN. It was widely recognized that the resolution would have passed had it been brought to a vote. The director general of IUCN was assigned the task of looking into the leghold trap problem and taking concrete action between now and the next triennial meeting of the IUCN.

One last encouraging development occurred. A resolution was offered that encouraged nations to exploit wildlife as a form of conservation and as a way of raising revenue. This is an argument that we hear often in the United States. However, before the IUCN, and with the strong opposition of The HSUS and many others, the resolution was soundly beaten.

The HSUS will continue to work with the IUCN to promote ethical development of the world’s conservation effort and to ensure that the brutality and inhumanity of implements like the steel-jaw trap are ended worldwide.
HSUS Periodicals: Many Ways to Stay Informed about Animal Protection

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

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

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

**Shelter Sense** A lively, unique, informative newsletter for animal-sheltering and -control personnel that offers answers to community animal problems. Ten times a year. $8 per subscription.

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

**Kind News and Children & Animals**

*Kind News* is a colorful four-page newspaper for students. It arrives five times a year in bundles of 34 individual copies. Available at two levels: *Kind News jrs.* for children in grades 2 through 4, *Kind News srs.* for children in grades 5 through 6. *Children & Animals,* designed for use with *Kind News,* is a practical, professional, 32-page magazine filled with activities and suggestions for classroom teachers and educators in animal-welfare organizations, animal-control agencies, nature centers, and zoos. Published by The HSUS’s National Association for the Advancement of Humane Education.

---

**I would like to receive these periodicals of The HSUS:**

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

**Shelter Sense.** Enter a subscription to *Shelter Sense* ($8 per year) and send me 10 issues. I enclose $ _____

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

**Children & Animals and Kind News.** Enter a subscription and send me 34 copies of each of 5 issues of *Kind News,* and 4 issues of *Children & Animals* for $20.00. (Includes individual NAAHE membership.) Specify *Kind News* level: Jr.s. _____ Sr.s. _____ I enclose $ _____.

**Total:** $ _____

Name
Address
City
State Zip

Make checks payable to The HSUS. Please return this coupon to The HSUS, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037, along with your payment.
Rocky Mountain Bust
Fighting dogs seized in Colorado

A two-month investigation into organized illegal dogfighting activities by the El Paso County (Colorado) Sheriff’s Office and The HSUS’s West Coast Regional Office has resulted in one of the largest seizures of fighting dogs in the nation to date. It is also the first successful case of its kind since the 1985 enactment of Colorado’s felony dogfighting law.

On February 6, 1988, Robert C. Thew, thirty-four, of Yoder, Colorado, was arrested by El Paso County sheriff’s deputies and charged with three counts of felony dogfighting and three counts of cruelty to animals during the execution of a search warrant at his property.

Investigators found thirty-four pit bull dogs staked out or kenneled on the property. A veterinarian’s examination revealed that four of the dogs had been recently injured. Many others showed evidence of past encounters in the form of old scars and puncture wounds. Five dogs were removed for veterinary attention and observation by officers of the Colorado Humane Society. Due to the large number of animals involved and because confiscated fighting dogs require special kenneling and expensive security precautions, the remaining dogs had to be impounded on the property under a court order with special instructions.

Inside Mr. Thew’s mobile home, investigators found dozens of fight contracts, written reports on matches, underground dogfighting publications, and correspondence to and from dogfighters across the United States and other countries establishing that Mr. Thew used the alias “Bad Bob” in dealings with the dogfighting underworld. “A tremendous wealth of information about this despicable crime and those involved was gleaned from those materials,” said HSUS Investigator Eric Sakach, who participated in the raid and provided technical assistance at the request of the El Paso County Sheriff’s Office. According to Sergeant Nick Adamovich, “Quite a few dogfighters now have cause to be even more nervous. The information will, no doubt, spawn new investigations in Colorado and other states.” Sgt. Adamovich began the investigation and coordinated the enforcement effort after receiving complaints from an eyewitness.

A search of a red shed on the property revealed a treadmill, weighing scales, and breaking sticks used to separate dogs locked in combat. The blood-spattered walls and carpeted floor of a dogfighting arena were stark reminders of the cruelty and suffering endured by dogs at the hands of people who enjoy and bet upon staged combats between animals.

On April 1, 1988, Mr. Thew pleaded guilty to one count of felony dogfighting and one count of misdemeanor cruelty to animals. The remaining charges, including one of possessing a controlled substance, were dismissed as part of a plea bargain in which Mr. Thew agreed to relinquish ownership of all the dogs. The El Paso County Sheriff’s Office turned the dogs over to the Humane Society of the Pikes Peak Region, which had assumed the responsibility for providing care and feed to them in early April pending outcome of the complicated case. El Paso County was experiencing financial difficulties and the costs of caring for the dogs were prohibitive for the local government. The dogs were euthanized at a judge’s order.

Mr. Thew will receive ten years’ probation and must perform one thousand hours of public service, in addition to fines and restitution, as part of his agreed-upon deferred sentence. Any violation of the terms of his probation will result in his imprisonment. “There were many special problems and circumstances involved in the prosecution of this case,” said Mr. Sakach. “The district attorney’s office, sheriff’s department, judges, and humane agencies involved showed a genuine concern over the existence of such cruel activity and the limitations of the system in trying to enforce the law. At least these poor dogs will no longer be subjected to the brutality and torture of the pits.”

Dogs found on the Thew property were chained to dog houses.

Sgt. Nick Adamovich holds a pit bull seized in Yoder, Colorado.
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KILLING WITH KINDNESS?

BY DR. RANDALL LOCKWOOD & BARBARA CASSIDY

In November of 1987, investigators from The HSUS, the Ulster County SPCA, and the New York State Humane Association raided the Animals Farm Home, a so-called refuge for unwanted dogs, cats, horses, and other livestock. Investigators found almost 1000 animals, including hundreds of starving, mange-infested dogs crowded together behind locked doors in dark, airless barns. The skeletal dogs had been fed a diet of moldy bread and water and were so hungry that they were cannibalizing each other. More than 175 animals had to be euthanatized on the scene, and treatment was immediately begun for more than 200 others.

Criminal charges of cruelty to animals have been filed against farm operator Justin McCarthy. On a civil level, New York State District Attorney Robert Abrams has filed a motion in New York Supreme Court for dissolution of the farm, charging that it was operated in a fraudulent and illegal manner, “failing for years to care for the animals entrusted to them.” The HSUS strongly supports these efforts to remove Mr. McCarthy and dissolve the corporation. Plans are already underway to find new homes for the surviving animals.

In February of this year, The HSUS and local investigators discovered emaciated and injured dogs at a Nebraska kennel run by a woman who was “taking the dogs off the hands” of a local animal-control facility to prevent them from being destroyed. At the request of The HSUS, the local municipalities agreed to stop their practice of giving dogs to the woman.

In 1985, investigators from the Massachusetts SPCA seized 87 dogs from a trailer owned by an elderly couple. All of the dogs were severely ill and required euthanasia. The couple was relocated with relatives and the trailer was buried in a landfill by the department of health.

Cases like these, involving people accumulating large numbers of animals, many of which are sick or injured and crowded together under filthy conditions, are, unfortunately, all too familiar. Virtually every organization that investigates animal cruelty has had to deal with such situations.

These incidents often present local and state humane organizations with special problems:

- Sometimes, the people accused of keeping many animals in inhumane ways are suffering from mental illness. Often, cruelty investigators are not experienced in dealing with such people or with the mental-health professionals who will become involved in the case.

- In many cases, the number of animals that must be treated, euthanatized, or held as evidence is enormous, taxing the staff and resources of local animal-welfare groups to the limit.

- Frequently, the individual involved is acting as a local one-person shelter and becomes known as the “cat person” or “dog person” of the neighborhood. Such people often collect animals off the streets.
in addition to accepting dogs or cats from anyone who drops them off. These "collectors" often mistrust the local humane society or animal-control agency and go to great lengths to hide the animals they are harboring. They are unable to care for the animals, which become trapped in a hidden hell.

- If not handled properly, such situations can produce a public relations nightmare for humane groups if they take action against people who may be portrayed by the media as well-meaning saviors of animals or kindly eccentrics. The cruelty investigators might be depicted as the ones who are heartless and insensitive to the suffering of others.

How do these situations get started? Why do many people begin harboring far more animals than can ever be kept in a humane way? When such problems are discovered, how can they be resolved in ways that consider the needs of the people and animals involved? These are tough questions that every animal organization is likely to face.

We have a growing understanding of the intentionally cruel, violent animal abuser (see the Summer 1986 HSUS News). However, very little information is available on the psychology of those who seem to try to care for many animals but are eventually responsible for suffering through gross neglect. These two forms of animal cruelty are quite different, yet, in many ways, neglect cases are more disturbing than isolated incidents of violence against animals. Often, they involve large numbers of animals kept for months—even years—under conditions of horrendous deprivation and suffering.

Psychologists and other scientists have devoted little attention to the phenomenon of multiple-animal ownership that leads to animal cruelty. One attempt to understand the problem was undertaken by Dooley Worth and Alan Beck in 1981. They studied thirty-one cases of complaints filed against owners of 10 or more dogs or cats by New York's ASPCA or the health department's Bureau of Animal Affairs. They were particularly interested in examining the popular stereotype of what they termed "animal crazies" as "a white woman, past middle age, who had the animals because she was lonely."

This popular view had a ring of truth. Of thirty-four people involved in these cases, more than two-thirds were women and 70 percent of them were unmarried. However, few of these people had started accumulating animals as a result of the isolation of old age. Most had started large collections of animals after leaving their parents' home, most commonly in their teens and later twenties. In general, these people specialized in either dogs or cats, owning many of one species and one or two of the other. The average number was 34 cats or 23 dogs per owner.

What causes people who seem to start out with affection for animals to begin to sink into a pattern of abuse or neglect? Several different factors or combinations of reasons might be involved.

Mental Illness
Surprisingly few cases involve severe mental illness. Worth and Beck reported that few of the people in their study could
HOME OF MISERY

At right, some of the inmates of the Animals Farm Home await rescue by humane society workers in November of 1987. The HSUS has complaints about the Animals Farm Home on file dating from 1977. Although a court judgment in 1984 was to ensure that owner Justin McCarthy operated the farm in a humane manner, in October of last year, a complaint from Mr. McCarthy's nephew opened a new investigation of the farm's operations. An Ulster County (New York) sheriff's deputy was detailed to work undercover at the farm. Based upon his findings, warrants were issued for the November raid. Mr. McCarthy has since been indicted on twenty-five counts of cruelty to animals. Ulster County District Attorney Michael Kavanaugh is prosecuting him through criminal channels. Mr. McCarthy's certificate to solicit funds in New York State has been revoked.

Starving, mange-infested dogs at the Animals Farm Home are prepared for euthanasia by (far left) a humane society worker and (left) Barbara Cassidy, The HSUS, and Samantha Mullen, New York State Humane Association.

Justin McCarthy stands amidst piles of bread, used for animal feed, and boxes while the raid takes place. Humane workers found almost 1000 animals at his Animals Farm Home.
When Washington, D.C., humane officers responded to a complaint of foul odors emitting from a private home, they found 60 cats, half of which were dead, in the tightly locked building.

be characterized as overtly psychotic and most had managed to maintain themselves and their animals with some success, at least in the beginning. Although most of the multiple owners were somewhat removed from mainstream society, their isolation was a result of their accumulation of animals and not a cause. As they allowed animals to take over their homes and lives completely, friends and relatives were less likely to visit, so they found themselves increasingly isolated and psychologically dependent upon their animals.

Other Psychological Factors
Many of the people who take in large numbers of animals have a deep mistrust of other groups or individuals that are helping animals or see themselves as the only people who can help. For example, Worth and Beck reported a fight between two “cat ladies” in Manhattan, both of whom claimed responsibility for caring for the strays in several abandoned buildings. One of the most common traits seen among people involved in neglect cases is the powerful fear of death and unwillingness to accept its inevitability. In some instances, this took bizarre forms. One woman, unable to bear separation from her dead cats, eviscerated them and dried them on her fire escape. The dried remains were kept in cupboards throughout her apartment. At least two cases involved people who also hid human cadavers on the premises. People who have accumulated many dogs and cats may have become completely blind to the animals' injuries and illness. All they see is that the animals are alive and that seems to be what matters to them.

Good Intentions Gone Bad
Many cases of neglect start off with someone's sincere desire to rescue all unwanted animals, without the realization of the enormity of the task. Most people involved in these instances are unable to tolerate the thought of euthanasia and feel that they must take in every animal. They soon become identified by people in the area as the person who takes in strays, and the collection starts to grow. Usually, such people cannot provide for spaying or neutering or even basic veterinary care. The animals they have gathered begin to produce offspring and the colony grows until it comes to the attention of health, sanitation, or humane officials.

Jean Goldenberg, executive director of the Washington, D.C., Humane Society, sees several cases involving ownership of 50 or more animals each year. She observes, "There are those who profess great love for animals but who no longer see the individual needs of animals." Phyllis Wright, HSUS vice president for companion animals, adds, "The worst animal suffering I have seen has been the result of people caring for too many animals without enough resources. The very least these animals deserve is comfortable living quarters, adequate food, water, and exercise, and human companionship.

In some cases, it is the harmful effect of the animals on the owner's health that alerts officials to the humane problems. Several cases have been investigated following reports of severe anemia in the owners from multiple flea bites. One “cat lady” in the Worth and Beck study had died from complications of a bacterial infection caused by an organism found in feline saliva. Often, complaints to health departments about odors or other sanitation problems lead to the discovery of large collections of poorly cared for animals.

Greed or Criminal Intent
We should not overlook the fact that some cases of multiple ownership are also linked to deliberate attempts to solicit money from a concerned public, with little concern for the welfare of the animals that are collected. In such cases, the public may never see how the animals are housed or they may see one well-maintained area,
while many other animals are hidden away enduring squalid living conditions.

What steps need to be taken in dealing with such cases? Private individuals concerned about specific instances of animal neglect should report the situation to their local humane society, animal control, health department, sanitation department, or police. Most humane investigators are experienced in gathering the kind of evidence needed to document neglect. Cases of multiple ownership may require some extra care, particularly if the owner is ill, elderly, or mentally disturbed.

Local humane groups investigating such cases will need thorough visual documentation of the health of the animals and their living conditions, which will usually require a search warrant. Such warrants are often obtained based on reports of offensive odors or other indications of crowding, filth, and disease. Evidence should include many high-quality color photographs and/or clear, well-lighted videos. Veterinary evidence should include descriptions of any health problems that take a long time to develop. This can be used to distinguish between ailments that are the result of temporary setbacks in care and those that are due to chronic neglect. Be sure to document the animals’ diet as well. Find out what is being fed, sources of the food, and any other information that will help describe that aspect of care. These facts will help you make your case to the courts, the media, and the general public.

It is often helpful to work with the health, fire, sanitation, and housing or zoning departments. Such groups may be the first to learn of problems. Always try to bring these agencies along when executing the search warrant. A housing or fire official can declare a property unfit for habitation, which can facilitate removing the animals to healthier quarters.

Those investigating large-scale neglect must give careful consideration to how they will involve the press. Helen Mitternight, HSUS director of public relations, says, “Nobody thinks about the media in these cases until it’s too late to tell your side of the story.” Poor planning might jeopardize the legal case against a negligent owner or result in public sentiment against humane investigators. Be sure that one member of your organization is designated as the spokesperson in the case and handle all inquiries through that person. If you have properly documented the problems, you can share your photos with the media.

The most difficult question in such cases is what to do with all the animals. Some may have highly infectious diseases and be beyond help; others may be nursed back to health through foster care; still others may be surprisingly healthy. If many animals are involved, one option is to obtain a court order to impound the animals on the premises, after carefully identifying each one and making provisions for its care. This can be useful if the living conditions can be cleaned up well enough to allow the animals to be cared for humanely.

In many cases, it is advisable to leave a small number of healthy animals with the owner if he or she is competent to care for them. This often reduces public opposition to intervention by humane groups and helps to make the owner more cooperative. At the same time, this approach recognizes the vital role these animals might play in the lives of their owners. One way to prevent repetitions of such incidents is to require a permit for multiple-animal ownership. The District of Columbia, for example, requires a “hobby permit” for ownership of more than five animals. Such permits are usually relatively easy to obtain if basic, humane standards of care are met.

In some cases, the people who have become involved with such large collections of animals have actually welcomed the local humane society intervention that rescued them from an impossible situation. One woman in New York City who had harbored more than 100 cats said that the city had “really done her a favor in the long run” by removing all but 4 of them.

What should be done with the people in these situations? Cases that involve criminal or fraudulent intent clearly need to be prosecuted as any other form of animal cruelty. In some instances, however, humane groups have felt that summonses and other legal actions were not in the best interests of the people or animals involved. Assistance programs that combine personal counseling, veterinary and spay/neuter assistance, and instruction in proper animal care may provide the best way to prevent recurrences.

Education and counseling are often not enough if there are deep-seated problems that have led a person to become a multiple owner. Tim Greyhavens of the Humane Society of the Willamette Valley (Oregon) notes that “many times, they [multiple-animal owners] see nothing wrong with what they are doing. They feel they know what is best for the animals and that you are just interfering with their lives.” For this reason, it is important for a humane organization to get the authority to check periodically on conditions for animals remaining in the owner’s home. If local ordinances do not limit the number of animals that can be kept, it may be possible to gain a court order restricting the number of animals the person may own in lieu of other legal action.

It is ironic that some of the most severe suffering encountered in animal-welfare work can have its origins in caring about animals. The problems created by some people who have many animals point out the important distinction between having pets and caring for them. These often tragic incidents point out the continuing need to educate children and adults that companion animals are not objects, but living creatures whose physical and emotional needs must be recognized and met.

Dr. Randall Lockwood is director of higher education programs and Barbara Cassidy is director of animal sheltering and control for The HSUS.
Tom Regan is a man of both accomplishments and visions. Professor of philosophy at North Carolina State University, author or editor of almost a dozen books, including *Animal Rights and Human Obligations* (with Peter Singer) and *The Case for Animal Rights*, he is nationally recognized as an articulate, persuasive advocate of enlightened treatment for all species. A gifted teacher for more than twenty years, he has garnered awards and honors that testify to his achievements in his chosen field. Yet, these awards and honors, including The HSUS's 1987 Joseph Wood Krutch Medal, seem to occupy little of Tom Regan's thinking these days. Instead, he looks ahead eagerly to the future of an ambitious project, the Culture and Animals Foundation (CAF), of which he is the founder.

The CAF is a self-described nonprofit cultural organization committed to fostering the growth of intellectual and artistic endeavors united by their positive concern for animals. It exists to expand understanding of and appreciation for animals, improving the ways in which they are treated and their standing in the eyes of human society.

To achieve its goals, the CAF funds three programs. The research program supports scholarly research into the lives and works of creative individuals who have expressed a positive concern for animals; the creative program funds original work by artists and thinkers expressing that positive concern; and the performance program makes possible the presentation and performance of intellectual and artistic work that is compatible with the foundation's goals.

In describing the kinds of work the CAF supports, Prof. Regan gives historical examples: "Walt Whitman and D.H. Lawrence are two writers whose work could have received recognition and support from the foundation. There are Whitmans and Lawrences out there now, and whether they flourish or not depends on the kind of support that is out there [for them]." As a writer, Prof. Regan is sympathetic to the needs of creative people. "I know what it means to have time to create the biggest gift you can give," he explains. The CAF will offer artists not only financial support but also tangible recognition in the form of prizes and competitions. It will even offer them a place to work and live, the Center for Culture and Animals. This last is a logical extension of the nurturing, creative environment Tom Regan believes optimal for the development of a humane ethic encompassing all arts.

In its two years of existence, the CAF's selection committee has awarded grants to a wide variety of artistic enterprises, including the East Coast premiere of Rachael Rosenthal's critically acclaimed performance, "The Others"; an art show, "Animal Scapes: Animal Awareness in Art," that included works by Robert Rauschenberg and Jamie Wyeth; a week-long series of cultural activities that served as a prototype for other events across the country; "We Are All Noah," silver medalist at the New York Film and Television Festival; "Voices I Have Heard," a film about older people and their involvement with animals; a major documentary about performance art in America that featured "The Others"; and assistance for two anthologies of poetry which celebrates the beauty and dignity of animals.

The center's board of advisors includes musician John Cage, art dealer Leo Castelli, dancer/choreographer Merce Cunningham, writer Joyce Carol Oates, Peter Singer, and actress Lily Tomlin.

The CAF has only begun to fulfill its creator's dreams. Tom Regan envisions an annual prize-winning poetry, fiction, and art, published under the CAF's auspices; a traveling festival featuring an eclectic mix of work; a far-reaching span of competitions that would reward endeavors that contribute to the understanding of animals and compassion for their shared condition; and the Center for Culture and Animals itself. The Center, a 500-acre retreat, would be home, library, farm, conference center, wildlife sanctuary, and working village.

The Center, says Prof. Regan, "would be both of the world and out of the world," a place where life would be lived in harmony with nature. Such an Eden would be an ambitious undertaking even for a large, well-funded organization, but Tom Regan sees it as eminently achievable. "Ten years ago, no one was even talking about animal rights; now, one hundred thousand students a year are in a classroom talking about animal rights as a philosophy.

"This," he believes, "is a real revolution in education." Such interest puts the Center—and the fulfillment of the Foundation's most ambitious goals—within his grasp. "I have to believe the time is right."

For more information on the CAF, contact Prof. Tom Regan, President, 3509 Eden Croft Drive, Raleigh, NC 27612.
Dark Days in Shelbyville

Every August, the sleepy community of Shelbyville, Tennessee, comes alive as more than one hundred thousand Tennessee Walking Horse fans descend on the town to attend the show season’s premiere event—the Shelbyville National Celebration. Here, in the south-central part of the state, some two thousand Tennessee Walkers from Connecticut to California compete for the coveted title of world grand champion—a prize that hundreds of thousands from Connec­ticut to California compete for the coveted title of world grand champion—a prize that two million or more.

This year, however, things will be different in Shelbyville—but not because 1988 represents the celebration’s fiftieth anniversary or because a ten-day extravaganza has been planned. This year, the eyes of animal protectionists nationwide will be carefully fixed on Shelbyville in the wake of controversial legal maneuvering that took place in the nation’s capital this spring.

Tennessee Walking Horses—hardy, high-stepping animals known for their smooth, ground-covering gaits—have long been the victims of a comparatively small, isolated group of aficionados who have brought blatant animal abuse into the elite horse-show world. Sadly, in the big stakes show world of Tennessee Walkers, where the higher the step, the more valuable the horse, the horses’ price tags aren’t the only things that soar. In an effort to exaggerate the breed’s naturally animated gait, trainers deliberately inflict injuries to the legs and feet of Walkers. “Soring,” as the practice is called, is intended to make the horse’s front feet so acutely sensitive that the animal struggles to lift them high off the ground. The result of such pain training is the “big lick,” a flashy, exaggerated goose step that draws crowds of spectators and has become the standard industrywide.

“Back in the sixties, it wasn’t uncommon to see horses that were bleeding profusely right in the show ring,” recalls Patrick Parkes, HSUS vice president for field services. “The abuses were much more apparent than they are today. You couldn’t attend a show without seeing scarred legs and bloody, open wounds.”

Although soring was outlawed in 1970 with passage of the federal Horse Protection Act, today’s trainers have devised subtle and highly sophisticated techniques to accomplish the same results. The blood may not flow as freely at today’s Walking Horse shows, says Mr. Parkes, but soring is alive and well and as painful as ever.

Corrosive chemicals—such as diesel fuel and mustard oil—are applied to the horse’s forelegs to blister the skin. The legs are then covered with plastic wrap to ensure maximum absorption.

Next, chains, up to ten ounces in weight, are fastened bracelet style around the horse’s ankles to slap against the sensitive skin. Padded shoes—as tall as four inches—elevate the forelegs, altering the angle of the foot and the ability to absorb concussion throughout the leg. (Women who wear stilts-heeled shoes day after day know the discomfort this can cause—and they, at least, can remove their shoes when the pain is intolerable.) Pressure-shoeing, or shoeing an animal too tightly, and trimming the hoof down to the sensitive tissue cause extreme discomfort to horses, as well. And, finally, to compound the pain and ensure a winning gait, glass fragments, tacks, and even nails may be driven into the horse’s soles. Concealed between the hoof and padded shoe, such objects turn the Walker’s every step into a painful experience.

There are ways to conceal soring to prevent its detection in case horses are inspected before entering the show ring. In addition to using substances to mask the pain and hide physical signs, trainers can teach horses not to react when inspectors or show stewards touch their throbbing legs. The HSUS has received reports of horses being beaten with boards if they flinch at a trainer’s touch. Such horses learn to endure the pain of an examination rather than communicate, in the only way they know how, that they have been sored. Others have had their tongues tied with wire during the inspection process to distract them from the examination. “I bought a horse whose legs were all scarred up,” one owner revealed to The HSUS. “When I opened its mouth and looked at its tongue, I saw it had been ripped two-thirds across.”

For years, animal protectionists have documented abuses, imploring the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) to upgrade its enforcement of the Horse Protection Act. Despite strengthening amendments in 1976, the agency has done little to end the many cruelties associated with the Walking Horse industry.

In 1984, outraged by USDA’s apathetic enforcement, the Washington, D.C.-based American Horse Protection Association (AHPA) filed suit against the agency. AHPA charged that the Walking Horse industry’s continued use of padded shoes and chains was in violation of the Horse Pro-
A university study had demonstrated that not only did these devices, used alone, cause soreness to horses, but, when used in conjunction with chemical irritants, they were also clearly a violation of the HPA.

For nearly four years, the suit wound its way through the federal court system, until, on March 21, 1988, U.S. District Court Judge Oliver Gasch ruled in AHPA's favor. According to Judge Gasch, because both pads and chains can reasonably be expected to cause soreness, they were contrary to the purpose of the Horse Protection Act. Judge Gasch ordered the USDA to issue new Horse Protection Act regulations immediately.

Within days, the agency issued emergency regulations banning the use of all padded shoes and reducing legal chains to a maximum of six ounces in weight. The regulations took effect during one of the first—and biggest—shows of the season, and the Walking Horse industry ground to a halt. Claiming that their horses could not compete without these so-called action devices, competitors left the show and Walking Horse events were cancelled nationwide. The value of some Walkers plummeted by as much as 80 percent.

The Walking Horse industry quickly mobilized its forces and, within days, had established a $400,000 war chest to finance a fight. Despite intense pressure from industry officials, Judge Gasch denied the industry's repeated requests to appeal the case. In mid-April, however, he did give the USDA the go-ahead to draft new interim regulations that would enable the current show season to proceed as planned.

According to the agency's newest regulations, issued on April 25, the ban on padded shoes has been lifted, and a phasing-out program has gone into effect. "It would be harmful to some horses currently on high pads to be placed on one-inch pads without a 'phasing-in' period," explained USDA officials. Consequently, over the next four months, pads will be gradually reduced to a maximum of one inch in height. The new regulations further stipulate that the proposed maximum chain weight of six ounces will remain in effect.

"Judge Gasch's ruling was one of the most significant Walking Horse victories since passage of the Horse Protection Act," explains Mr. Parkes. "Still, we were deeply disappointed with the regulations USDA has issued as a result of the ruling." He notes that, because corrosive chemicals are primarily effective when used in conjunction with chains, the continued use of any chains—not just those over six ounces—is clearly a violation of the Act.

With an estimated $150 million and forty-five hundred jobs riding on the Walking Horse industry in Tennessee, there remains a strong economic incentive to continue soring. Without the exaggerated "big lick" to draw spectators, industry officials fear that the value of horses will plummet again and the industry will collapse.

Many Walking Horse owners, trainers, and breed associations are riled over the recent ruling and are prepared to fight for their padded shoes and heavy chains. Tennessee lawmakers, too, are concerned about an economic loss to the state and will undoubtedly seek to legislate change.

The AHPA and HSUS plan to do everything in their power to ensure that the Horse Protection Act is protected from an assault from showring abusers. In the meantime, HSUS members should take this opportunity to voice their anti-soring sentiments to Congress. Write to the chairman of the House and Senate agriculture committees, listed below, explaining to them the need for a strong Horse Protection Act. Ask them to ensure that no amendments will be passed in the upcoming congressional session that will weaken the Act.

Please write: The Honorable Kika de la Garza, Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture, 1301 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515; and The Honorable Patrick Leahy, Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture, 328A Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510.
TENS, IF NOT HUNDREDS, OF MILLIONS of animals die every year as a result of the brutal capture and transport methods found in the wildlife pet trade.

Almost all of the traffic in wild species into the United States is by air, although, of course, animals travel long distances by land from the time they are captured until they are exported. Very high mortality rates occur due to shock and stress caused by overcrowding and other inhumane conditions. In some cases, all of the birds in a single crate arrive in the United States dead. Many birds suffocate or die due to extreme temperatures in cargo holds. Due to the stress of overcrowding and the lack of food and water, birds often peck and chew themselves and each other, causing severe injuries.

More than 10 million birds die every year en route to the pet market. Each of these birds is a free-living creature doomed to a biological death caused by stress, suffocation, or stress-induced disease, but whose doom was sealed by its greatest enemy, human greed.

Wild animals do not always die in transport, obviously. Birds often survive to endure extreme stress and agitation due to noise, overcrowding, and the shock of transport. Many newly arrived shipments include injured birds that sustain injuries when their crates are tossed about violently during their flights.

Many individual wild birds and mammals that are imported are members of threatened or endangered species, but, if an animal belongs to a species that is not yet endangered, it does not suffer any less. However, the trade itself is somehow even more offensive when endangered species are involved, because extinction is the death knell for both species and individual. Many species are being driven toward extinction by the pet trade. Throughout my professional career as a zoologist, I have attended numerous scientific conferences, and it is the consensus that the pet trade is a major international threat to conservation. The ravages of the pet trade add to the population and habitat losses caused by other human activities.

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), to which the United States and more than ninety other nations are signatories, adopted the following resolution in 1976:

Recognizing firstly that many species of animals which are popular in the pet trade are becoming rare or even endangered due both to overexploitation and diminishing habitats and secondly that mortality in the trade and captivity is high, this Conference urges that contracting countries endeavor to restrict gradually the collection of wild animals for the pet trade and to encourage the breeding of animals for this purpose with the objective of eventually limiting the keeping of pets to those species which can be bred in captivity.

Although CITES urges shipments of live animals to be "so prepared and shipped as to minimize risk of injury, damage to health, or cruel treatment," massive mortalities continue. The preparation and shipment of animals are left in the hands of traders and airline carriers, whose sole motivation is commercial gain.

The Live Animals Board of the International Air Transport Association (IATA) has published rules and regulations for the international transport of live animals, including wild birds and mammals. Although many wildlife traders claim that these regulations are sufficient, they are mistaken. The regulations do little to improve the horrible conditions under which live animals are transported. They do not make mandatory provisions for water and...
By Dr. Susan S. Lieberman

TRANSIT

food for living animals accepted for shipment nor do they prohibit the shipment of pregnant females or those traveling with dependent young.

The IATA regulations are voluntary and contain no enforcement provisions. There is no penalty for an airline that accepts an inhumane shipment, even if mortalities are enormous. IATA requires that no more than 50 birds be shipped in a single crate, yet, shipments from Senegal and Tanzania, which account for 40 percent of all shipments into the United States, routinely contain from 100 to 200 birds per crate. When I visited the KLM cargo facility in Amsterdam recently, I found numerous violations of the IATA standards. I found crates full of dead birds—and KLM is considered one of the better airlines!

Because of the tremendous suffering in the international trade in live wildlife, Congress passed amendments to the Lacey Act in 1981 that mandated humane shipment regulations. The Fish and Wildlife Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior was charged with promulgating these regulations. In November of last year, the Fish and Wildlife Service published its final rules for the humane and healthful transport of wild mammals and birds to the United States, which were to be effective on February 8, 1988.

Those final regulations, which would make shipments such as those described in the sidebar on page 24 illegal, were set for implementation as the February 8, 1988, effective date arrived. But, on February 10, 1988, in response to behind-the-scenes pressure from the pet industry, importers, and the airlines, the Fish and Wildlife Service suspended the implementation date of the regulations until at least August 1, 1988. The HSUS was shocked that, after seven years of delay, good regulations that would have saved the lives of hundreds of thousands of animals were scuttled due to special-interest pressure.

On March 1, 1988, ten other animal-welfare groups joined us in filing suit in U.S. district court to force the Fish and Wildlife Service to implement its own regulations. The pet industry and four of the largest wildlife importers in this country intervened on the government's behalf. It was ironic to see the Fish and Wildlife Service, a government agency set up to protect wildlife, influenced by and in alliance with wildlife traders. (In fact, a shipment belonging to one of those traders has recently been found to be in violation of both the Lacey Act and the Endangered Species Act.)

However, on April 15, 1988, a U.S. district court judge ruled that the government's actions were illegal, and the Final Rule on Humane and Healthful Transport of Wild Mammals and Birds to the United States was effective as of February 8, 1988.

The humane transport regulations themselves are really quite straightforward and logical and will go a long way to reduce the suffering of wildlife being shipped into the United States. Most of the provisions are sensible but have been contested by either the pet trade, wildlife traders, circuses, or other importers of wildlife. The new requirements, all of which are stronger than the inadequate—and voluntary—IATA regulations, must be followed by shippers, importers, and airline carriers, whether they like it or not.

• All birds and mammals imported into the United States will have to be examined by a qualified veterinarian. Mammals in the last trimester of pregnancy cannot be transported to the United States, except for medical care.

• Enclosures must now provide adequate air circulation and include spacer bars to prevent obstruction of ventilation openings. Instructions for food and water requirements of any mammal or bird being transported must be attached to the enclosure. For the first time, potable water

Opposite, 400 lovebirds were dead on arrival at London's Heathrow Airport, the result of overcrowding and poor stowage in the aircraft hold.

Center, red-masked conures from Peru endure overcrowding, without food or water.
EIA, the Environmental Investigation Agency in London, recently spent seven years researching the international wildlife trade. It reported in its publication *Injury, Damage to Health, and Cruel Treatment*:

**SENEGAL** regularly exported shipments into the United Kingdom that arrived in poor condition, due to a combination of overcrowding, lack of adequate food and water, and the shipment of species unable to withstand transport. Birds were often trampled, with numbers blinded by pecking. Some had drowned in water pots, evidently at or near the time they began their journeys, since all pots were usually dry on arrival. Only seed husks usually remained, indicating food, like water, had been consumed early in journey.

**TANZANIA** mainly exports lovebirds and small seed-eating bird species which regularly arrived in the United Kingdom in appallingly overcrowded conditions in small, substandard crates. Up to 90 lovebirds were often seen in crates which hardly allowed the birds room to move and reach inadequate supplies of water.... In an incident involving flamingoes, the birds arrived with their legs and wings strapped tightly in non-elastic cloth, causing swollen joints, bleeding wounds, and some deaths.

**ETHIOPIA** exports baboons and vervet monkeys to many countries. The baboons were packed individually or in pairs in partitioned crates which were often too small, had no food or water facilities, and were constructed of substandard wood.... Vervets were usually shipped individually in partitioned crates with no food or water facilities. They were often in poor condition with wounds, diarrhea, and bronchial infections with coughing and sneezing. Baboons were often found literally wedged into their compartments unable to sit upright and on occasions a baboon would be found sitting on the dead body of its companion.

U.S. import and quarantine statistics show that, between January 1978 and September 1979, of 970 vervet monkey imports from Ethiopia, 269 (27.7 percent) arrived dead with a further 209 (21.5 percent) mortalities occurring within the first ninety days: a total mortality wastage of 49.2 percent. Among baboons, the mortality was 12.9 percent of the total imports.

*Above, 15 squirrel monkeys shipped from Bolivia to Japan had tangled their tails so badly that it took a veterinarian twenty minutes to disentangle them.*
Below, part of a shipment of 2,000 lovebirds from Tanzania: packed 80-90 to a crate without adequate ventilation and water, 400 died prior to reaching their destination. Right, Canadian river otters were jammed into crates so tightly that only 2 of 10 survived the trip to London.

holding facilities as well. This is an important provision that will eliminate a great deal of animal suffering; imagine the stress a tropical bird or monkey from Africa is put through when it is captured in a warm, humid forest, transported for days on hot roads to a holding facility, and then shipped to the United States. It may make several stops along the way and be left out on the tarmac in both the dry heat of North Africa and the bitter cold of northern Europe before being shipped to the United States. With the new regulations, exposure to such temperature and weather extremes is illegal at every stop on the way.

The new regulations provide specific rules for the transport of birds, primates, marine mammals, rodents, elephants, hoofed animals, bats, sloths, and other terrestrial mammals. Yet the greatest opposition has come from the pet bird trade. Perhaps their opposition is the loudest because they have the most to lose. Certainly, animals bound for the pet trade have the most to gain.

The HSUS will continue to work with the Fish and Wildlife Service to guarantee that the humane transport regulations are fully enforced and are not weakened by pet-industry pressure to the point of becoming ineffective.

Some day, the terrible suffering and waste of the international pet trade will end. I hope that this will be brought about by our efforts and not because all of the wildlife has been wiped out.

Dr. Susan S. Lieberman is associate director of wildlife and environment for The HSUS.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

The HSUS has two publications, listed below, that discuss the problems of the international wildlife trade in greater detail.

Wild Birds Should Fly Free, a four-color, short brochure highlighting the cruelties in the international pet bird trade. Available for $0.25 per copy.

The Trade in Live Wildlife: Mortality and Transport Conditions, a report by the Environmental Investigation Agency on conditions in the international wildlife trade. Available for $5.00 per copy.

The HSUS can also provide you with information on state legislation initiatives to halt the importation and sale of wild birds. Write The HSUS, Wildlife and Environment, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.

The Humane Society News • Summer 1988
The renaissance of interest in animal-protection issues has not been without impact on the federal legislative framework; it has provided a unique impetus to influence government agencies and mandate change. This year, The HSUS is pleased to welcome those attending the annual conference to its hometown, Washington, D.C., for three days of workshops and other presentations that focus on the legislative and political systems that make up the federal government.

In addition, we will offer a timely one-day pre-conference symposium on the trade in exotic wildlife, its international ramifications and local problems.

Keynote speaker HSUS Vice President Michael Fox and former Massachusetts senator Paul Tsongas head the list of Thursday’s scheduled speakers. Friday’s program highlights include a debate between HSUS staff members Robert Baker and Dr. Martin Stephens and Dr. Richard Rissler of the United States Department of Agriculture on the effectiveness of the Animal Welfare Act and a special address by the renowned primatologist, Dr. Jane Goodall.

Twenty-five workshops and the HSUS annual meeting complete the conference’s daytime activities. We plan to give veteran participants and newcomers alike plenty to choose from to expand their knowledge and their circle of professional acquaintances.

Special activities, including “An Evening with Jane Goodall” and the traditional HSUS banquet, will make the evenings memorable. Dr. Goodall will be our honoree as the 1988 Joseph Wood Krutch medalist, and one of television’s “Golden Girls,” actress Betty White, will receive our James Herriot Award.

Our hotel, the Hyatt Regency Crystal City, is located just across the Potomac River from Washington, within easy subway commute of all the capital city’s historic attractions.

In this election year, make a pilgrimage to “the most important city in the most important country in the world,” and join us for October in Washington.
HSUS 1988 Annual Conference Schedule

TUESDAY, OCT. 11
7:30 p.m.–9:00 p.m.  
REGISTRATION

WEDNESDAY, OCT. 12
Pre-Conference Symposium

8:00 a.m.–Noon  
REGISTRATION

9:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m.  
TRADE IN EXOTIC WILDLIFE:  
International Ramifications  
and Local Problems  
A day-long symposium featuring  
acknowledged experts in the field,  
including current and former government  
officials

9:00 a.m.–9:15 a.m.  
Welcome/Introductory Remarks  
John W. Grandy, HSUS vice president

I. PROBLEMS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WILDLIFE TRADE  
A discussion of the impacts of the  
international wildlife trade on both  
individual animals and their populations.

9:15 a.m.–9:45 a.m.  
Gorillas, Chimpanzees, and Gibbons:  
Efforts to Thwart the Primate Trade

9:45 a.m.–10:15 a.m.  
Animal Suffering Caused by the  
International Pet Bird Trade

10:15 a.m.–10:45 a.m.  
Coffee Break

10:45 a.m.–11:15 a.m.  
Abuses in the Reptile  
and Amphibian Trade

11:15 a.m.  
Discussion and Question–  
and–Answer Period

Noon  
Luncheon Speaker

II. A DESCRIPTION OF FEDERAL  
ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY  
A focus on current federal and interna­tional laws and regulations and the  
agencies responsible for their enforce­ment. The speakers will remain on the  
podium to answer questions from the  
next panel and from the audience.

1:00 p.m.–1:20 p.m.  
Protecting Rare and Endangered  
Species from Exploitation in Importa­tion and Interstate Commerce

1:20 p.m.–1:40 p.m.  
Protection for Marine Mammals

1:40 p.m.–2:00 p.m.  
Animal Welfare Act Enforcement:  
Finding Violators and Working to  
Close Substandard Zoos, Menageries,  
and Circuses

2:00 p.m.–2:30 p.m.  
Questions from the Audience  
to the Panel

2:30 p.m.–3:00 p.m.  
Coffee Break

III. STATE AND LOCAL  
PROBLEMS  
Review the problems faced by local  
humane societies and animal-control  
officers. Speakers will address which  
federal, state, and local agencies, laws,  
and regulations are available to address  
specific problems. This panel then will  
direct questions to the representatives of  
government agencies.

3:00 p.m.–3:30 p.m.  
Domestic Marketing: Abuses in Pet  
Stores and Exotic-Animal Auctions

3:30 p.m.–4:00 p.m.  
Dealing with Federal and State Laws  
and Regulations on a Local Level

4:00 p.m.–4:30 p.m.  
An Ex-insider’s View of Government  
Regulations of the International  
Wildlife Trade

4:30 p.m.–5:00 p.m.  
Questions from the Panel to  
Government Representatives, and  
from the Audience

WEDNESDAY, OCT. 12
Annual Conference Program

2:00 p.m.–6:30 p.m.  
REGISTRATION

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

THURSDAY, OCT. 13

8:00 a.m.–3:30 p.m.  
REGISTRATION

9:00 a.m.  
OPENING REMARKS  
Dr. Amy Freeman Lee,  
program moderator

K. William Wiseman, chairman,  
Board of Directors

John A. Hoyt, president

9:30 a.m.  
KEYNOTE ADDRESS:  
Bioethics and the Golden Rule:  
Animal Rights and Environmental  
Perspectives  
Dr. Michael Fox

10:30 a.m.  
Coffee Break

11:00 a.m.  
ADDRESS  
Senator Paul Tsongas

Noon–1:30 p.m.  
Book Sale  
Humane Education Materials  
Adopt-a-Teacher Booth

1:30 p.m.–3:00 p.m.  
WORKSHOPS  
1. Humane Bird Control:  
Techniques for Cities and Suburbs  
Guy Hodge
2. Back to School: Watching Education in Action
William DeRosa, Patty Finch

3. Laboratory Animals: Local and State Initiatives
Dr. Martin Stephens

4. Be a P.A.L. Campaign: Keeping the Idea Alive Throughout the Year
Helen Mitternight, Phyllis Wright

5. Controlling Vicious or Dangerous Dogs Through Legislation
Dr. Randall Lockwood

3:00 p.m.
Break

3:30 p.m.-5:00 p.m.
WORKSHOPS

1. Putting Trapping and Fur to Shame
Dr. John Grandy, Michael O'Sullivan

2. Kosher Slaughter: Alternatives to Shackling and Hoisting
John Hoyt, Temple Grandin

3. Captive Wildlife: Ending the Abuses
David Herbet

Ann Church, Charlene Drennon, Marc Paulhus

5. Regulating Euthanasia in the Animal Shelter
Barbara Cassidy

5:00 p.m.
Getting Acquainted
Informal meeting for animal-welfare proponents from Washington, D.C., Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia

FRIDAY, OCT. 14

8:00 a.m.-3:30 p.m.
REGISTRATION

9:00 a.m.
FORUM: The Animal Welfare Act: Regulations and Reality
Richard Rissler, USDA
Robert Baker, Dr. Martin Stephens

10:30 a.m.
Coffee Break

11:00 a.m.
ADDRESS: Prisoners of Science: The Plight of Chimpanzees in Biomedical Research
Dr. Jane Goodall

HOTEL INFORMATION
Hyatt Regency Crystal City room rates for the conference are: single, $85; double, $95. Rates will be honored from Sunday, Oct. 9 through Sunday, Oct. 16, inclusive.

TRAVEL NOTE
Continental Airlines and Eastern Airlines have been designated as Official Carriers for The Humane Society of the United States Annual Conference, October 13-15, 1988, Washington, D.C. Continental will offer 5 percent off of the lowest applicable fare at the time of booking, or at least 30 percent off first class and 50 percent off full coach fares. Eastern will offer you at least 30 percent off first class and 65 percent off coach fares. These discounts are only applicable within the continental United States. To qualify, reservations must be booked through the airline's Convention Desk using the Easy Access Number listed.

After you have reserved your flights, you may purchase your tickets from your local travel agency or any Continental/Eastern ticket office or airport ticket counter, or the airline will mail them directly, along with an invoice for payment. Call the airline's Convention Desk now to reserve your flights.

For discount fares, call 1-800-468-7022 (in continental U.S.). Refer to Easy Access Number EZ 10AP46.

Noon-1:30 p.m.
Book Sale
Humane Education Materials
Adopt-a-Teacher Booth

1:30 p.m.-3:00 p.m.
WORKSHOPS

1. Alternatives to Animal Uses in High School and College Biology
Dr. Randall Lockwood, Dr. Martin Stephens, William DeRosa

2. Cruelty Investigations: Tools and Techniques
Frantz Dantzler, Frank Ribaudo, Gail Eisnitz

3. A Review of Federal Legislation
Elizabeth Wilson

4. Dog Racing: Coping with Laws, Curbing Abuses
Robert Baker, Ann Church

5. Farm Animal Welfare and Alternative Agriculture
Dr. Michael Fox

3:00 p.m.
Break

3:30 p.m.-5:00 p.m.
WORKSHOPS

1. Predator Control Programs: The Past and Present
Dr. John Grandy, Richard Randall

2. Overcoming Veterinary Opposition to Charitable Pet Clinics
Barbara Cassidy, Nina Austenberg, Charlene Drennon

3. The Legislative Process in Action!
Elizabeth Wilson

4. Twenty-Two Million Activists Who Care
Paul Dewey, Patty Finch

5. Create and Produce Your Newsletter More Effectively
Deborah Salem
8:00 p.m.
FEATURE PRESENTATION: An Evening With Jane Goodall

SATURDAY, OCT. 15

8:00 a.m.-11:00 a.m.
REGISTRATION

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

1. Cults: Animal Sacrifices and Constitutional Consideration
   Marc Paulhus, Gail Eisnitz, Dr. Randall Lockwood

   Dr. Michael Fox

3. Pound Seizure: State and Local Efforts
   Dr. Martin Stephens, Dr. David Fanfarillo, Barbara Cassidy

4. Don't End Up in Court!
   Roger Kindler

5. To Be Announced

10:30 a.m.
Coffee Break

11:00 a.m.
HSUS Annual Membership Meeting
Presentation of Resolutions

2:00 p.m.-5:00 p.m.
On Your Own

6:30 p.m.
Reception/Cash Bar

7:30 p.m.
AWARDS BANQUET
John A. Hoyt, master of ceremonies
Presentation of the James Herriot Award
Presentation of the Joseph Wood Krutch Medal

Adjournment of Conference

REGISTRATION FORM

1988 Annual Conference
The Humane Society of the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please check appropriate box</th>
<th>Cost Per Person</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ HSUS Annual Conference</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 13-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes general sessions, workshops, and awards banquet. (Select meal and indicate number of people.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Fish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Vegetarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| □ Symposium on Trade in Exotic Wildlife | $25 |       |
| Wednesday, Oct. 12                  |     |       |
| Includes luncheon                   |     |       |

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

| □ Thursday, Oct. 13                 | $20 |       |
| □ Friday, Oct. 14                   | $20 |       |
| □ Saturday, Oct. 15                 | $10 |       |
| (Awards banquet not included)       |     |       |
| □ Awards banquet, Saturday evening  | $30 |       |
| (Select banquet and indicate number of people.) | | |
| □ Fish                             |     |       |
| □ Vegetarian                       |     |       |

(Make checks payable to The HSUS; U.S. funds only. Total enclosed $_____)

Cancellation fee of $10 will be charged after Thursday, Oct. 6.)

A hotel registration form will be mailed upon receipt of this form. You must make reservations directly with the hotel prior to Monday, Sept. 19, 1988. If registration is for more than one person, please print additional names.

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

Name _____________________________
Address ___________________________
City _____________________________ State _________ ZIP code ____________

If you'd like to have appointments made for you to lobby humane issues on Capitol Hill, plan on extending your stay through Monday, Oct. 17. Further information will be available in your conference packets.
AROUND THE REGIONS

SOUTHEAST

Not wanting accidents like this to happen on its city streets, Palm Beach, Fla., is saying "nay" to carriage horses.

Carriage Horses: Yea or Nay?
Two Florida cities are taking opposing views on the issue of carriage horses in their communities. Palm Beach is opposing plans by a carriage-horse operator to start a business there, while St. Petersburg is planning to bring carriage horses to the city's municipal pier as part of its tourism development plan.

Recognizing that the presence of horse-drawn carriages on congested streets endangers both the animals and local citizenry and that Florida's extreme heat and humidity pose health problems for the horses, Palm Beach officials have promised the Southeast Regional Office to do everything in their power to prevent a carriage-horse operation from coming to their city.

St. Petersburg, however, has signed preliminary contracts allowing a carriage-horse operator the use of a city stable and carriage house, even before any public discussion has been heard on the issue. The Southeast Regional Office has written to members of the city council, asking that they reject the carriage-horse proposal when it comes up for a vote.

No Wonder
The Southeast Regional Office has recently been monitoring a traveling petting zoo that is touring the Southeast. The office has received numerous complaints about "The Wonder Zoo," particularly concerning the poor condition of the animals.

Although local authorities in areas where the zoo has visited have been able to ensure that the animals have water and clean cages, further action cannot be taken, since the zoo meets the minimum standards required by state and federal laws. Concerned citizens should contact the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Beltsville, Md., to file complaints. The USDA says it has already received several complaints concerning the zoo and that an investigation is underway.

Bill on Hold
A bill before the Florida legislature to give college students the option of taking part in live-animal dissections has been put on hold for the moment. Members of both the house higher education and senate education committees expressed support for the idea that undergraduate students should have the right to refuse to dissect live animals if they

MID- ATLANTIC

New Jersey’s New Regs
The New Jersey Division of Consumer Affairs is soon to issue New Jersey’s new pet-shop regulations, recently upgraded to improve protection of the pets sold and to protect the consumer’s right to purchase a healthy pet. Mid-Atlantic Regional Director Nina Austenberg testified before the division when it was considering upgrading the regulations, and many of The HSUS’s recommendations have been incorporated into the new regulations.

New Jersey Is a P.A.L.
The inspiration for The HSUS’s national “Be a P.A.L.—Prevent A Litter” campaign, which proclaimed April “Prevent A Litter Month,” Governor Thomas Kean of New Jersey signed a proclamation declaring April New Jersey’s “Prevent A Litter Month.” Nina Austenberg and Program Coordinator Rick Abel attended the signing of the proclamation.

New Jersey Assemblyman D. Bennett Mazur was awarded The HSUS’s Certificate of Appreciation at a special presentation during a recent HSUS conference at the National Conference Center in East Windsor, N.J. From left: Mid-Atlantic Regional Director Nina Austenberg, Mr. Mazur, and HSUS board member Gisela Hunnicutt.
have strong moral, ethical, or religious beliefs, but the state university system's Board of Regents requested that the issue be handled through internal policy and not by legislative mandate. The Southeast Regional Office has now been told that the board does not wish to consider such a policy.

It may be too late to save the bill during this legislative session, but The HSUS will work for its passage in 1989.

Douglas County Seminar
The Douglas County Humane Society/Animal Control of Douglasville, Ga., will hold its second Animal Control Seminar on August 17 and 18, 1988. Contact Perry or Jeannie Poe, P.O. Box 747, Douglasville, GA 30133.

Good Bill Fails
Despite support by The HSUS, other animal-protection organizations, and the Connecticut Veterinary Medical Association, a bill to establish a state spay/neuter subsidy in Connecticut has failed.

New England Regional Director John Dommers served on the task force that recommended the subsidy, which was based on a program in New Jersey.

Shelter under Scrutiny
In April, New England Regional Program Coordinator Frank Ribaudo headed a coalition of concerned individuals that investigated the conditions of the Merry-All Farm in Hartland, Vt., a "no-kill" animal shelter.

The farm has been operating as a shelter for several years without a license, which will not be issued unless state animal-welfare requirements are met. An on-site investigation revealed overcrowding and unacceptable living conditions for the more than one hundred animals at the farm.

Administrative hearings are being scheduled to decide the fate of the shelter. The New England Regional Office and humane coalition members will work with state officials and the Merry-All staff in an attempt to help this facility comply with state standards and HSUS shelter-operation guidelines.

Puppy-Mill Law for Kansas
The humane movement in Kansas scored a victory in March with the passage of legislation requiring state licensing and inspection of puppy mills. The new law also requires that all commercial breeders and dealers be licensed by the state, regardless of whether or not they are already licensed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

This landmark success was a result of intensive work by Kansas State Senator Jeanne Hoeferer, State Representative Ginger Barr and her associate Linda Merrideth, state and local humane groups, concerned humanitarians, and The HSUS, which supplied information and photographs from its extensive investigations of puppy mills for use in legislative hearings.

Third Time Around
For the third year in a row, legislation to legalize dog racing in Missouri has been defeated. The HSUS fought a determined campaign to achieve this goal.

Grace Korsan, of the Missouri Coalition for Humane Treatment of Animals; Gwen Hopkins, president of the Southwest Missouri Humane Society; members of the St. Louis Association of Community Organizations; and humane groups throughout the state are to be commended for their hard work and concerted efforts, which defeated this bill.

Officer Resigns
Public outrage forced the resignation of an animal-control officer in Ozark, Mo., following his conviction on charges of cruelty to animals. Animal Control Officer John Bross was suspended from his job, fined $117, and ordered to perform ten hours of community service for maiming and killing a stray beagle with a club and his pickup truck. Ozark Mayor Neal Grubah then eased even this mild punishment by lifting the suspension and putting Mr. Bross on probation.

In a telegram to Mayor Grubah, Midwest Regional Director Wendell Maddox urged that Mr. Bross not be retained in any capacity related to the care and handling of animals. Concerned community members and animal activists also voiced their outrage, forcing the resignation of Mr. Bross.
Exotic-Animal Auctions

In April, HSUS Captive Wildlife Specialist David Herbet, Great Lakes Regional Director Sandy Rowland, and Program Coordinator Robin Weirauch spent two days investigating the conditions of animals at a large exotic-animal auction in Ohio. The auction participants, more concerned with keeping humane societies out of the auction than with bettering the conditions for the animals sold, employed an armed person to check identifications in an effort to find out if HSUS staff were present.

The Great Lakes Regional Office will use the documentation it has gathered in legislative testimony in support of a bill that would restrict ownership of exotic animals.

Recent Graduates

Twenty-one Animal Control Academy students graduated from the Great Lakes Regional Office’s May session of the academy, held on the campus of the University of Michigan.

The academy educates animal-shelter and -control personnel and teaches ethics and professionalism, animal behavior, stress management, euthanasia, and investigative techniques. Robin Weirauch of the Great Lakes Regional Office instructed the course in investigations.

Legislative Update

In conjunction with The HSUS’s “Be a P.A.L.” campaign promoting the spaying and neutering of all pets, the Great Lakes Regional Office has been working hard to secure passage of a differential-licensing law in Ohio that will reduce the license fee for dogs that have been altered.

In Michigan, members should write to their state legislators, asking them to support a law in the next legislative session that will mandate the spaying and neutering of all animals released from shelters and pounds within the state.

Arkansans for Animals

The Gulf States Regional Office was shocked in March to learn of a cockfight near San Diego, Tex., where a nineteen-year-old girl was gang raped by cockfighters and spectators. The HSUS has long tried in vain to convince state legislators that a violent activity such as cockfighting results in other violent actions. The Gulf States Regional Office is now contacting all state legislators and asking for their commitment to a strong bill to outlaw all cockfighting activity.

Three in Louisiana

In Louisiana, the Coalition of Louisiana Animal Activists will be promoting three critical bills for animals in the next legislative session. First, a bill to outlaw cockfighting is planned, but it will face formidable opposition in this state. Legislation to make being a spectator at a dog fight illegal is also planned and, finally, a pet-food tax for pet-food manufacturers is proposed, to help fund state animal-control and humane programs.

Pageant Protested

In March, a large protest organized by the Sangre de Christo Animal Protection Society was held at the Miss U.S.A. pageant in El Paso, Tex., to protest the pageant’s plan to award fur coats as prizes to the winners. Gulf States Regional Director Bill Meade was interviewed on The HSUS’s anti-fur position by the three major television networks and several local newspapers.
Investigators in Demand

Our investigators' expertise has been much in demand the past few months. In April, Field Investigator Kurt Lapham testified before the Sierra County Grand Jury in northern California concerning the necessity for an animal-control program and local government's potential liabilities. Mr. Lapham also served as a workshop leader on cruelty investigations for the California Animal Control Directors' Association annual training conference, held in April in Concord, Calif.

In May, Mr. Lapham traveled to Wenatchee, Wash., to present information about HSUS programs and services at the annual conference of the Washington Federation of Humane Societies.


Cockfighters Plead Guilty

In March, Charles and Ruby Keener pleaded no contest to charges stemming from a raid by The HSUS and the Oregon state police on a cockfight held on their property near Medford, Ore., last July. A hearing for sentencing is pending.

Also in March, Jimmie Messenger pleaded guilty to cockfighting charges filed after raids conducted at five Kern County, Calif., locations by The HSUS and the Bakersfield SPCA. Mr. Messenger was fined $1,000 and sentenced to three years' summary probation and forfeiture of all seized items.

Double Protest

West Coast Regional Director Charlene Drennon recently protested two actions of the California State Board of Examiners of Veterinary Medicine. In protest of regulations proposed by the board which allowed a veterinarian to simply pay a fine if he or she substantially injured or killed an animal, Ms. Drennon wrote to the director of consumer affairs asking him not to sign the regulations. Several legislators and local humane societies also objected to the regulations, and the director subsequently vetoed them.

In May, Ms. Drennon testified at a public hearing before the board of examiners to oppose a proposed regulation that would allow only a licensed veterinarian or someone working under his or her supervision to clean animals' teeth. Since, to date, the board has had no consumer complaints against lay people, such as professional groomers, performing this service, there is no necessity for such a prohibition, which could deter pet owners from having this procedure performed.

New Law

In California, a bill giving students in grades kindergarten through twelve the right to refuse to participate in classroom projects involving the harmful or destructive use of animals, providing that the teacher believes an acceptable alternative is available, has become law. All children and their parents or guardians must be apprised of this right, and the West Coast Regional Office is monitoring activity at the state department of education to see that this is done.

Protect Puppy-Mill Pups

In response to consumer and humane complaints over the sale of puppy-mill dogs in California pet stores, Assemblyman Sam Farr has introduced bill A.B. 4500, which will ban the importation of any puppy under twelve weeks of age into the state for resale purposes. The bill is being strenuously opposed by the pet industry.

The West Coast Regional Office urges HSUS members to write to Governor George Deukmejian (State Capitol, Sacramento, CA 95814) urging passage of A.B. 4500. California residents should write to their state legislators, asking them to support the bill.
Animal Patent Granted

Despite mounting congressional concern about the ethical, environmental, and economic ramifications of animal patenting, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) issued the first animal patent on April 13, 1988. The patent, issued to Harvard University and licensed to Du Pont, covers any mammal (except humans) containing a specific cancer-causing human gene.

The PTO's action came at a time when support for the two-year moratorium bill, introduced last August by Representative Charlie Rose and backed by The HSUS, is steadily growing. More than sixty members of the House of Representatives have signed on as cosponsors of H.R. 3119, four of whom are on the House Judiciary Courts Subcommittee, to which the bill was referred. In addition, Senator Barbara Mikulski has recently become a cosponsor of Sen. Mark Hatfield's open moratorium bill, S. 2111.

There are now more than twenty patent applications pending review by the patent office. The situation is critical because there is not much time left in this congressional session to pass a moratorium bill. Congress will take a long recess this summer for the Democratic and Republican national conventions and will adjourn early in October because of the November elections. It is, therefore, extremely important that this issue be brought to a vote in the House and Senate at the earliest possible time.

The HSUS is a leading member of a coalition of more than forty animal-welfare, public-interest, and environmental groups, farm organizations, and religious leaders supporting a moratorium on animal patenting so that the serious issues involved can be studied (see the Spring 1988 HSUS News). Approval of the first animal patent has made members of Congress more receptive to our concerns. The HSUS has specifically pointed out that livestock designated to be used for food or fiber, such as the genetically altered pig produced by the USDA research center in Beltsville, Md., is not covered by the Animal Welfare Act. Moreover, the USDA has failed to enforce the Animal Welfare Act when farm animals are used in biomedical research, and there are no regulations requiring enforcement of the Act for rats and mice, according to the USDA.

Please write your senators and congressperson and ask them to give their immediate attention to this critical issue and to cosponsor and support bills that would place a short moratorium on animal patenting before the 100th Congress adjourns. Tell them the PTO is not equipped to handle the ethical questions that will result from animal patenting.

Point out that either farm animals, rats, and mice—the animals that will be used the most in genetic-engineering research—are not covered under the Animal Welfare Act or there are no current regulations in effect to enforce the Act for those animals.

Also, explain to them that farmers are very concerned about the economic consequences of patenting on their ability to compete and tell them that you are concerned about the environmental impact of the unintended release of genetically engineered animals into our environment.

Testimony Heard

Rep. Barbara Boxer's bill, H.R. 1635, the Consumer Products Safe Testing Act, has finally had hearings on Capitol Hill. On May 16, 1988, the House Subcommittee on Health and the Environment heard testimony on the importance of eliminating the LD (Lethal Dose) 50 and other inhumane tests on animals. The HSUS submitted testimony stressing the importance of modernizing the testing of consumer products that contain hazardous toxic substances.

Work to End Drugs in Racing

The HSUS investigative and legislative departments have recently been
working together to encourage legislation to ban the use of drugs in horse racing. Drug abuse has become a double threat to the nation's racetracks, as illegal drugs are used to "fix" races by artificially stimulating or depressing a horse's performance, and other, so-called permitted, medications are misused and overused, often enabling a sore or injured horse to race when it would otherwise be unable to do so.

For many years, The HSUS has been working to expose these cruel practices before state racing commissions, state legislatures, and Congress. Recently, we visited several members of Congress to remind them of this growing problem and to see if the legislative process can stop the misuse of drugs in the horse-racing industry.

**Pet Protection Act Status**

The Pet Protection Act, H.R. 778 and S. 1457, still needs your help within the halls of Congress. These two bills prohibit pound seizure by denying federal funds to any researcher who "obtains or uses any animal acquired directly or indirectly from any animal shelter." Your support and action have gained much attention and many cosponsors for the bills, but much remains to be done.

Currently, H.R. 778 and S. 1457 are still at the committee stage, with no hearing dates set as yet. We have time to contact members of Congress and urge them to cosponsor these bills, push them through the legislative process, and pass them into law. H.R. 778, the legislation pending before the House of Representatives, has 108 cosponsors. The Senate bill, S. 1457, has 16. These are impressive numbers, but we need the support of many more members to assure the passage of these bills. Please write your congressperson and senators asking for their cosponsorship and support. If they already have signed on to the bills, thank them for their actions and ask them to urge their colleagues to do the same. Your public library or a local chapter of either the League of Women Voters or Board of Elections can provide the names and addresses of your senators and representative, as well as the names of any other congressional members to whom you wish to write.

**Passage of H.R. 2999, the Elephant Protection Act, will help save the African elephant by banning all imports of ivory and other elephant products.**

**Save the Elephants**

The HSUS would like to thank Rep. Anthony Beilenson of California for introducing the Elephant Protection Act, H.R. 2999, which we strongly support. This bill will ban all imports of ivory and other elephant products. The HSUS testified at hearings on this bill held by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on June 22, 1988.

The HSUS is actively working to protect African elephants and to stop their needless slaughter (see the Spring 1988 HSUS News). These beautiful animals are ruthlessly slaughtered for their tusks, which are turned into jewelry, expensive carvings, and trinkets. More than 80 percent of all ivory leaving Africa is from elephants that are killed illegally.

The only truly effective way to stop this slaughter of elephants is through the complete elimination of the ivory trade. When poachers know that there will be no market for their product, they will stop killing elephants.

Saving the African elephant is a priority for The HSUS. Without strong legislation to control the ivory trade, the next ten years could see the disappearance of the African elephant. You can help the elephants by writing to your representative and asking him or her to support and cosponsor the Elephant Protection Act, H.R. 2999. Also, write to your senators and ask them to introduce a similar bill in the Senate.
Spay/Neuter Clinic Victory

Several years ago, four veterinarians and a local veterinary association filed suit against the Humane Society of Lackawanna County, Penn. (HSLC), challenging its right to operate a spay/neuter clinic and give attendant vaccinations (see the Fall 1985 and Summer 1986 HSUS News). After preliminary motions, the only remaining issue was whether HSLC, a nonprofit corporation, may employ licensed veterinarians to provide these services without itself obtaining a veterinarian's license. Both parties to the lawsuit agreed that there were no issues of fact to be resolved at trial and moved for summary judgment.

At the hearing, the veterinarian plaintiffs argued that any corporation that renders professional services, such as veterinary services, may do so only in the form of a professional corporation. The defendant HSLC maintained that, as a nonprofit corporation, it is expressly permitted under Pennsylvania law to effectuate its charter purpose to prevent cruelty to animals by offering low cost spaying and neutering, thereby reducing animal overpopulation.

In an opinion and order handed down on April 8, 1988, Judge Munley of the Court of Common Pleas ruled that the services provided by HSLC were not in violation of state law. The court first held that HSLC was not in violation of the Pennsylvania Veterinary Medicine Practice Act, which provides that any person who practices veterinary medicine must be properly licensed. The court held that HSLC was not a "person" within the intent of the act and that HSLC was not, itself, practicing veterinary medicine and therefore did not require a license. The act was complied with insofar as those actually performing the services were individually duly licensed veterinarians free from control or supervision of HSLC.

Second, the court held that the Pennsylvania Professional Corporation Law did not bar HSLC, as a nonprofit corporation, from providing these services. The court determined that the statute merely allowed those rendering professional services the option of incorporation and was not meant to impose a mandatory requirement that all professionals operate only through a professional corporation. In conjunction, the court determined that the offering of these services by HSLC was totally consistent with its charter and the nonprofit corporation law: "The overpopulation of dogs and cats is a concern to the community.... The Humane Society offers spaying and neutering services at low cost to pet owners who would otherwise be unable or unwilling to have these procedures performed on their pets, and, in so doing, the defendant Society is promoting the welfare of animals and reducing the risk that they will die of starvation or disease or that they will have to be euthanatized. The endeavors of the Humane Society serves [sic] both to alleviate the plight of animals, in particular, and protects, in general, the health and well being of our community."

The court further found that the fees received by HSLC for these services merely offset operational expenses incurred by HSLC for these services and apparently were not indicative of for-profit activity.

This decision represents another victory for those humane societies that wish to provide low cost spaying and neutering services in the face of pressure from private veterinarians who fear they are losing business to this practice.

Student Rights

The State of California has recently enacted legislation which, among other things, will allow elementary and high school students to object to participating in a portion of a course involving harmful or destructive uses of animals, including dissection of live or dead animals. New section 32255 of the California Education Code, signed into law March 29, 1988, provides that each teacher who teaches a course that utilizes live or dead animals or animal parts inform the pupils of their rights under the new law.

Under procedures prescribed by the new law, any pupil who has a moral objection to dissecting or to the harmful use of animals or animal parts shall notify his or her teacher of that objection. The student's objection must be substantiated by a note from his or her parent or guardian. If the teacher believes there are adequate alternatives available, the teacher may work with the student to develop an alternate instructional program which may include video tapes, models, films, books, and computers.

The alternate instructional program shall require a comparable amount of time and effort but shall not be more arduous than the original instructional program. Further, the pupil may also request alternate testing if the original course testing program requires dissection or other harmful uses of animals.

The new law prohibits discrimination against any pupil who exercises his or her right under this section and directs that all decisions by teachers regarding whether a pupil may pursue an alternate means of instruction shall not be "arbitrary or capricious," a standard which places legal limits upon teacher discretion.

The California legislature's consideration of the bill was given a boost by the ongoing suit in Los Angeles federal court brought by Jenifer Graham, who claims a constitutional right to refrain from dissection on the basis of a deeply held belief in the sanctity of animal life. Miss Graham testified for the bill.
Last year, artist Katherine Neprud created a greeting card for HSUS members so popular that it was completely sold out before Thanksgiving. This year, we asked Ms. Neprud to work her magic again. She has produced a charming scene of two best friends, their noses pressed against a snowy window, waiting, perhaps, for Saint Nick in his sleigh or for a beloved family member returning home with holiday goodies.

Cards are 7" x 5", in full color. Inside is the message:

"As we share our friendship this joyful season, let none be called the least."

Each package of twenty-five cards and envelopes costs $7; $6 each if you order four or more packages. Don't be left out—supplies of these exclusive cards are limited. Order now.

HSUS 1988 GREETING CARD ORDER FORM

Please send me 1 2 3 package(s) of HSUS greeting cards at $7 per package (circle one);
or please send me packages of HSUS greeting cards at $6 per package. I enclose $_______

Send the cards to:

Name ____________________________
Address ____________________________
City ____________________________ State _______ Zip _______

(Please use the label provided on the back cover of this magazine. Make any necessary corrections, or write your name and address in the above space. Please provide street address, as we cannot ship to P.O. boxes.)

Make all checks or money orders payable to The HSUS and send this coupon to HSUS Greeting Cards, 2100 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037. All orders must be prepaid.
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