On April 15, 1992, at the request of HSI President John A. Hoyt, I traveled to Cuernavaca, Mexico, to observe conditions having to do with companion and farm animals in Mexico and explore the feasibility of an HSI program that would effectively reduce and eliminate animal suffering wherever it might exist.

I was accompanied by Jose Trujillo Orihuela, a Mexican citizen with a Ph.D. from Universidad Autonoma de Chapin-go in Chapungo, Mexico. Dr. Orihuela had contacted Mr. Hoyt several months earlier, and it was at his urging that HSI was undertaking this investigation.

Dr. Orihuela and I met with the secretary of state for the state of Morelos, Alfredo Delatorre, Esq., a minister from the Department of Agriculture in Morelos, Inq. Antonio Cruz Vazquez, and Gomar Pardo, D.V.M.

Our discussion yielded several important points.

1. Conditions for dogs and, to a lesser degree, cats (only because they are less popular as companion animals) are deplorable. Rabies is at epidemic proportions. In the state of Morelos alone, more than 117 cases of rabies in dogs were reported in 1991 and five human deaths confirmed. Although an intensive vaccination program is in place, no program exists for sterilization, rescue, or public education. Homeless dogs and cats overrun the streets of the cities, their individual suffering and injury proceed unchecked, and they pose a public-health threat. No laws govern the treatment of these companion animals, and no prohibitions exist against either deliberate acts of cruelty or neglect.

2. Slaughter-bound cattle and pigs are transported under the most stressful of conditions, in vehicles that are inadequately designed and poorly ventilated. They endure hours—even days—in stifling heat with no provision for food, shelter, or water. They are often thrown from trucks, since loading ramps are rarely available. Slaughter techniques utilizing “napping” (in which the animal is repeatedly stabbed behind the head, in the brain) and stunning with a board (in which a piece of pipe or wood is slammed against a pig’s head, rendering the animal immobile though conscious) are commonplace. There is no humane-transportation or humane-slaughter act in Mexico.

3. The government and people of Mexico are destitute. People struggle to provide food and shelter for their families. There is absolutely no funding available for even the most basic animal protection.

4. Mexican cultural attitudes toward animals are vastly different from those in other North American countries. Bullfighting and cockfighting are revered. A total cultural revolution must take place if any meaningful progress is to be made in animal protection in Mexico.

Sr. Delatorre stressed his interest in the human public-health aspects of the problem and the control of rabies. He pledged his total support of any HSI initiatives that require government backing.

Inq. Cruz Vazquez said that any project’s success depends on the local people’s participation at the start. He also expressed frustration that no U.S. organization had ever offered animal-pro-
A slaughter-bound bull falls backward, breaking his leg, as he is unloaded from a truck. Inset: Marcos Lopez (left), an agronomist for the state of Morelos, and David Wills pause during their observation of Mexican slaughter methods.
tection assistance before. Several U.S. groups he had contacted directly had given either inadequate or no response to his request for information and help.

Dr. Orihuela and I concentrated our investigation in the state of Morelos, traveling to Zacatepec to visit a slaughterhouse, to Temixco to observe dog populations, to Yautpe to observe the state clinical diagnostic laboratory, and to Tecoztlah to observe an Easter festival. The dog population in Morelos is estimated at more than 400,000. Everywhere dogs are dodging traffic or the stones thrown at them, rummaging in the garbage, or staring at people with empty, dull eyes.

At the slaughterhouse in Zacatepec, cattle and pigs were thrown three and four feet from trucks, beaten and stoned while herded, terrified by the sights and smells of animals being killed and butchered right before their eyes.

The hogs were killed in the cool of the night so the meat could be sold at market the next day. When I returned to my hotel room at 4:00 A.M., the sights and sounds of that slaughterhouse haunted me. It wasn't just the killing or the method of killing that drove me to despair; it was the total lack of pity for the animals from the people who held the power over the animals' lives. Throughout history those with power have inflicted cruelty on those without, yet some individuals have always demonstrated empathy and sorrow for the oppressed. I saw no such sympathy in Zacatepec.

I remembered in particular the death of a young bull who had been tied all day without water or shelter. All day the ghostly parade of cows and bulls was led to the stanchion, tied, and killed before his eyes.

He fought valiantly in the early hours of the morning as workers tied him for his turn at the slaughterer's hand. A young boy stabbed him three times. The young bull fell, bellowing as he died. Each of the boy's blows elicited laughter and taunts from the other workers. They offered approval and praise when the helpless animal fell to the floor, kicking and bellowing as life left his body.

Jubilation, joy, humor—are these the emotions that should ever accompany the death of a living creature? Can any person be so totally unaware of the bond he/she shares with all animals? I wondered if slaughterhouse workers had developed such hardness of heart that not one face showed an expression of sadness or compassion for the bull's pain. I realized then that HSI could make a difference here, work that John Hoyt had sent me to Mexico to begin.

To that end, HSI is evaluating what programs we should undertake in an effort to alter the ways in which animals in Mexico are regarded and treated. We hope to establish a pilot project that will be launched in the state of Morelos consisting of three major components:

1. An aggressive sterilization and animal-control project, educating and training local residents how to better care for their animals.
2. A humane slaughter and transport project that will provide loading and unloading ramps and shelter for animals awaiting slaughter and replace napping and slamming techniques with means designed to render the animal immediately unconscious before slaughter.
3. An aggressive education project that will develop materials and instructions in Spanish on the benefits to humans and animals of a humane approach to slaughter.

At the end of my visit, Dr. Orihuela and I met with Inq. Juan E. Grajeda, Mexico's assistant minister of education, in Temixco. Inq. Grajeda pledged his support for both a national antiscruelty statute and a national humane-slaughter law and was confident of government support. He asked that HSI consider the development of a bioethical university curriculum addressing both ethical issues and pragmatic ideologies of animal protection. He guaranteed that such a project would be accepted within the university system.

Perhaps with the help of Dr. Orihuela and others, we can begin to bring relief to the animals of Mexico as we journey toward a day when no animal suffers needlessly at the hands of humankind.—David Wills, HSUS/HSI vice president, Investigations
The dreaded harp seal hunts of Canada are not ancient history. In the past few months, it has become clear that harp seal hunts could resume unless a massive public and political effort is waged. Recently The Washington Post reported that Canada was reducing by 35 percent its northern cod quotas, from 120,000 tons. The story also said that the Canadians would no longer limit the number of seal-hunting licenses they issue. All the evidence indicated that the groundwork was being laid for renewed slaughter of seals with the rationale that harp seals eat the cod stocks. In truth the overfishing of Canadian waters by European Community vessels (allegedly Spanish and Portuguese) is most likely ruining the cod stocks.

In the spring a delegation of the European Parliament took a firsthand look at the situation in Canada. Its findings indicate that human activities, not seals, are causing a dramatic decrease in fishing stocks. These views were presented to the European Parliament’s Intergroup on Animal Welfare, the multipartisan political caucus dealing with animal-protection and environmental issues. The Intergroup is now asking the European Commission to investigate allegations of overfishing.

Concerned parties must now educate the full European Parliament and European Commission. Members of the European Parliament have sent hard-hitting questions to the European Commission. These included an inquiry as to whether the commission was prepared to inform the Canadian government of the danger of a consumer boycott by European consumers on fisheries products from Canada if the harp seal hunt were expanded.

Answers to such questions and a response to the call for an inquiry should come soon. The Intergroup, HSI, and concerned members of the European Parliament will undertake whatever additional steps may be necessary to ensure continued protection for seals.

On another front, the Italian tuna canners association, Associazione Nazionale Conservieri Ittici E Delle Tonnare (ANCIT), has begun to realize that it takes more than a press release to make a can of tuna dolphin safe. It continues to bear the brunt of pressure applied by HSI and the Bellerive Foundation, headed by Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan. In December, with some additional funding from Earth Island Institute, the groups opened a joint campaign office in Milan with the specific goal of ending dolphin-deadly commercial practices. They have kept the heat on Italian and Spanish tuna canners to stop their outrageous role in dolphin slaughter. These importers have kept Mexicans and Venezuelans in the business of killing dolphins by purchasing the dolphin-deadly tuna Americans refuse to buy and dumping it throughout Europe.

Reflecting the mounting pressure being felt by the Italian tuna industry, ANCIT in early April announced plans to “invite” its canners to go “dolphin safe” by 1993. This was by no means a requirement and it had little structure behind it. ANCIT and its members could go dolphin safe immediately since most of the...
world's tuna is already dolphin safe. Although HSI and others welcomed the ANCIT focus on the issue, they felt it was not adequate to end Italy's role in the crisis. It was, however, the first crack in ANCIT's previously impenetrable position that it would continue to purchase dolphin-deadly tuna regardless of the world's view of such corporate decisions.

Betsy Dribben, HSI European director, has mobilized concerned citizens, young and old, in Europe. In high schools, before international groups, and on European network television she has asked concerned consumers to let the European Commission know that the public wants dolphin-deadly tuna banned in Europe. Letters and cards have begun to flood the European Commission in response to this effort.

HSI consultant Sam LaBude, in meetings with Spanish and Italian canners, has made significant strides toward a dolphin-safe Europe. Forty percent of the Spanish canners have pledged to reject dolphin-deadly tuna. In Italy three tuna canneries have signed a contract with Earth Island Institute to ensure their practices are dolphin safe from sea to shelf: Nostromo, Burgasi, and Hector. All companies worldwide that designate their tuna products as dolphin safe participate in a monitoring program administered by Earth Island Institute, which HSI and a wide range of other environmental groups support.

Proponents of The HSUS's "Beautiful Choice" campaign will be pleased to note that Europeans are seeking an animal-safe cosmetics measure. The European Community has been slated to move on the issue of using animals in the testing of animal protection, conservation, and trade organizations (including John W. Grandy, Ph.D., of HSUS/HSI and Teresa M. Telecky, Ph.D., of The HSUS), and more than 500 members of the press.

The biennial CITES meetings provide a unique opportunity to improve international protection for animal and plant species traded internationally. A proposal to reopen the destructive international trade in African elephant ivory and other parts was squelched—elephants will receive continued international protection, at least until the next CITES meeting (see the Winter 1992 HSUS News). (The deadly ivory trade, which caused African elephant populations to plummet by more than 50 percent in only ten years, had been temporarily halted when delegates at the 1989 CITES meeting placed African elephants on the convention's Appendix I [commercial trade is prohibited], thus banning international commerce in elephant ivory and other parts.) Although the ban had been in effect for only two years, six southern African nations proposed to down-list elephants to Appendix II (commercial trade is permitted but controlled) at the 1992 CITES meeting, which would have reopened trade in elephant ivory and other parts. During the debate on this proposal, strong opposition was voiced by numerous African nations that have elephants but lack the ability to protect them from poachers. They feared that legal trade in any elephant parts would increase poaching throughout the African continent and eventually lead to the extinction of the species. Zambia withdrew its previously presumed support of the down-listing.

Teresa M. Telecky and John W. Grandy listen attentively as a CITES session winds down; the biennial meeting was held in Japan in March.
cosmetics (see the Fall 1991 HSUS News). On February 12, 1992, the European Parliament adopted amendments to the directive that will regulate cosmetic products marketed within the European Community using strict, humane guidelines. The directive, as amended (and which is supported by members of the European Parliament), would have three main elements: a European Community ban on all cosmetic products or ingredient formulations tested on animals; a post-1994 ban on all ingredients developed either partially or exclusively for cosmetic purposes if animal testing was used in their development; and permission for use of ingredients that were tested on animals but developed for purposes other than cosmetics (such as medicine), but only five years after the ingredient's development. The proposal further specifies that these restrictions would apply to all cosmetic products in the European Community, regardless of where the animal testing was done.

In an effort to reach consensus on this issue, the European Parliament is currently negotiating with the European Commission. If they agree, the proposal will be forwarded to the Council of Ministers for final approval. Should they fail to reach an agreement, they will issue separate opinions on the matter. Regardless of the outcome, the directive is expected to receive further action by the commission this summer and may go to the council in September.

Should a directive be approved, each member country of the European Community would have two years in which to implement its own version of the approved directive.
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proposal prior to the CITES meeting and led the successful effort to keep all populations of the African elephant on Appendix I.

The 1992 meeting of CITES also improved the international protection for five species of mammals (the type of trade is listed in parentheses): the crabeating fox of South America (fur), the American black bear and Asian brown bear (organs), Geoffrey’s cat of South America (fur), and the markhor of India, Pakistan, and Afghanistan (collected live for the pet trade); fourteen species and five genera of birds, including the rhea of South America (skin, feathers), Goffin’s and red-vented cockatoos of Indonesia and the Philippines, respectively (live); four species of reptiles (live), including the wood turtle and bog turtle of North America, the prehensile-tailed skink, found on many Pacific islands, and Wagner’s viper of Turkey; the spade-fish of North America (caviar, meat); the queen conch found in the Caribbean (shell, meat); and sixteen species and four genera of plants.

Just as important as gaining increased protection for some species is retaining protection already granted by CITES for others, including the cape pangolin of Africa (live, meat), the brown hyena of Africa (live), the cheetah of Africa (live, skins), the African elephant (ivory tusks), southern white rhinoceros and black rhinoceros of Africa (horn), a subspecies of the great Indian hornbill (live), and the Nile crocodile (skin).

Three mammals not generally found in commercial international trade lost CITES protection, the roan antelope and the aardvark, both of Africa, and the elephant seal of North America.

We were very disappointed that neither the blue-fronted amazon nor the blue-streaked lory, two birds commonly captured from the wild for the international pet trade, were listed on Appendix I (they are on Appendix II). The United States, which proposed both listings, withdrew its proposals after Argentina and Indonesia agreed not to export the species until further studies could be done.

One of the most disappointing aspects of the 1992 CITES meeting was the lack of support for resolutions that would have restricted the trade in wild-caught birds. One resolution, proposed by the United States and Uruguay, would have immediately banned the trade in forty-six species of Appendix II birds commonly captured from the wild to supply the international pet trade. The resolution was defeated by a vote. A second bird resolution was proposed by the United States and Israel to eliminate the trade in species of birds that suffer high mortality in trade and require improved transport methods for other species. This resolution was passed only after it had been severely weakened. The failure to pass strong resolutions to protect birds in international trade underscored the need for U.S. legislation banning the importation of wild-caught birds for the pet trade (see page 35).

The HSUS/HSI are distressed that the U.S. delegation consistently took positions that undercut efforts to protect wildlife. A proposal to provide CITES protection for the bluefin tuna, so highly prized in sport fishing and for sushi that it is in danger of becoming extinct in the western Atlantic, was defeated under pressure by the delegations of the United States, Japan, and Canada. The U.S. delegation only reluctantly agreed to retain all populations of the African elephant on Appendix I after months of apparent behind-the-scenes attempts to draw support for down-listing. It strongly opposed attempts to list the American black bear on Appendix II despite the fact that the black bear is the only bear not protected by CITES; its unprotected status provides a legal loophole for people trading in parts of other species of bears, many of which are highly endangered. The next CITES meeting will be held in 1994. The HSUS/HSI will be there, working hard to increase or maintain protection for the world’s beleaguered wildlife.