HELP FOR TANZANIA

Like so many other parts of the world, East Africa is headed toward a grim outcome: the end of the wild. HSI is working to secure increased protection of East African wildlife and wildlands, as well as more humane treatment of animals raised for food.

At Tanzania’s government taxidermy center, I have seen numerous hunter’s “trophies” that were once part of living animals— including leopard, lion, and zebra skins being cured and antelope, buffalo, and gazelle heads being prepared to adorn the homes of American and European hunters. At government and private wildlife-holding facilities in Tanzania, I have seen a cheetah, a buffalo, a family of lions, scores of birds from ostriches to Fischer’s lovebirds, and antelope awaiting export to zoos and collectors abroad. Conditions resembled those of the worst roadside zoos. Often the animals were severely crowded; some had suffered years of confining.

Some major East African safari outfitters and government officials have adopted a facade of co-confronting with wildlife. The facade has lured funds from non-African nations, for supposed conservation programs. Behind this facade I found documented evidence of the mass slaughter of wildlife—including animals belonging to threatened and endangered species—by wealthy safari hunters and even local government officials. In such sub-Saharan countries as Botswana, Kenya, Tanzania, and Zimbabwe, the numbers of wildbeests and zebras are dwindling. By the millions they once roamed Africa, where our species now threatens the existence of cheetahs, elephants, rhinoceroses, and wild dogs as well. In Tanzania the government has sold vast wildlands to wealthy Saudi Arabsians, to serve as their private hunting preserves. Tanzania has some of the world’s last great herds of elephants and wildebeests, and a large proportion of the world’s remaining cheetahs, rhinos, and wild dogs. These animals urgently need protection.

Stockpiles of ivory and skins in some government and private vaults attest to the decimation of Africa’s wildlife and illustrate the attitude “Take it now, before it’s all gone.” Trade in these and other products derived from wildlife certainly involves much animal suffering.

Many regard the “harvesting” of wildlife in Tanzania and other East African countries as justifiable, economically necessary, and sustainable. One commonly hears “Wildlife must pay its own way.” But encouraging local peoples to put a purely monetary value on wildlife will ensure the demise of both.

“Development” projects funded by other nations’ governments exacerbate local poverty. Local peoples are
port commodities. The introduction of such non-indigenous plant and animal species as eucalyptus and tilapia fish has caused irrevocable environmental harm. Much East African rangeland has been turned into desert, primarily through overgrazing of livestock. Forests are felled for lumber and to provide ever more agricultural land. As forests disappear, the rainy seasons become shorter; rivers dry up and droughts lengthen. As a result, wildlife, livestock, and people suffer.

In Tanzania wildlands may yet be restored to their nonindigenous animal, plant, and water form, as well as to their nonindigenous land uses. Species will be reintroduced, species will be reintroduced. Forests will be replanted, rivers will be restored, wildlife will be reintroduced. As a result, wildlife, livestock, and people will suffer.

EC GRAPPLES WITH ANIMAL ISSUES

As representatives of the twelve nations in the European Community (EC) closed their offices for summer vacation, an effective and comprehensive EC ban on animal testing of cosmetics seemed no nearer to realization (see the Spring 1993 and Summer 1993 HSUS News). In April the European Parliament (EP), whose members are elected by EC citizens, overwhelmingly supported two amendments to a proposed cosmetics directive. (A directive establishes EC-wide regulations in EU countries which have not historically advocated full acceptance of alternatives to animal testing.)

In addition, postponements may continue to delay the directive's effective date, which is already 1998—five years beyond the date of its approval by the Council of Ministers. (In contrast, most directives take effect only two years after adoption.)

Because so many doubts and potential obstacles still impede EC efforts to eliminate cosmetics testing on animals, the focus of these efforts may well shift from the EC to the United States and Japan, neither of which has historically advocated the end of animal testing of cosmetics. The EC's considerable power to stall acceptance of alternatives to animal testing.

The main focus of HSI's work in Tanzania is to promote humane sustainable agriculture that will indirectly help protect wildlife and habitat, and to encourage more humane treatment of animals raised for food (including improved veterinary services). In conjunction with Heifer Project International (HPI), an Arkansas-based organization that helps small-scale farming operations throughout the world improve their methods of raising livestock and producing crops, HSI is working to instill humane concern for farm animals. Together with HPI, HSI is also working toward safeguarding wildlife, improving rangeland, and protecting and restoring the environment by encouraging farmers and governments to recognize the vital importance of ecologically sound farming practices, especially soil and water conservation and better integration of crop production and raising of livestock.

In Tanzania lions in a holding cage await export. Some export-bound animals suffer years of confinement due to lack of market interest.
U.S. ACTION SETS TONE AT IWC

I t was with some trepidation that HSUS Executive Vice President Patricia Forkan, member of the U.S. delegation to the International Whaling Commission (IWC), and Leestaef Jenkins, HSUS/HSI representative, boarded planes en route to the IWC meeting in Kyoto, Japan this past May.

At the IWC's 1992 meeting, Iceland had abruptly withdrawn from the IWC and Norway had announced its intention to resume commercial whaling in summer 1993, in violation of the IWC's global moratorium on commercial whaling. Since the '92 meeting, Iceland, Norway, and Japan had continued to threaten that the IWC would self-destruct unless it permitted them commercial whale-kill quotas in 1993. Japan had also successfully used "yen diplomacy" in the form of economic aid (reportedly totaling some $234 million) to persuade some IWC nations to mirror its vote on all IWC issues.

As the host nation of the 1993 meeting, Japan would have an advantage in pressing its agenda. Adding to whale advocates' feeling of disadvantage was the fact that the Clinton administration had not announced its position on whaling.

Then, at the meeting's opening—to the surprise and great relief of The HSUS—the U.S. delegation received instructions to announce that the Clinton administration would oppose the resumption of any commercial whaling, regardless of so-called scientific arguments that commercial whaling would not adversely affect the size of whale populations. This set the meeting's tone. Several countries that, in recent years, have retreated from their long-time support for strong restrictions on whaling soon followed suit.

The United States and United Kingdom proposed two resolutions—one advocating non-consumptive use of whales (i.e., whale-watching), the other expressing the need for a second workshop, to be held in 1995, to address humane concerns about current methods of killing whales (see the Fall 1992 HSUS News).

A previously proposed resolution to establish an Antarctic whale sanctuary lacked sufficient support to pass this year, but whale advocates managed to postpone any vote until 1994. Over Japan's protest, the IWC agreed to hold a meeting, preliminary to the one in 1994, in order to discuss the resolution; whale advocates are hoping that this preliminary meeting will serve to generate additional support for the sanctuary. ( Shortly after the IWC meeting, a Japanese fisheries minister announced that Japan has targeted a number of other countries that it will "encourage" to join the IWC, to ensure that it prevails in defeating the sanctuary resolution next year. We have urged the Clinton administration to counter such yen diplomacy.)

At this year's IWC meeting, Norway proved even more aggressive than Japan in its demand for increased whaling. Whale advocates had hoped that Norway would reverse its 1992 decision, made in defiance of the IWC, to continue to whale. Instead, shortly before the IWC meeting, Norway authorized its whalers to begin a "scientific" hunt; Norwegians were killing whales even as the IWC was in session.

Hoping that the IWC would adopt a "management" scheme incorporating a mathematical formula that would again permit commercial whale-kill quotas, Norway announced that it was considering asking for a commercial quota of 800 whales. When the new scheme was defeated, Norway retreated to a plan to kill 296 whales, the number allocated to it under a previous IWC management scheme. (Norway insists on adhering to this earlier scheme, even though the IWC subsequently imposed a moratorium on all commercial whaling.)

Shortly after the IWC meeting, Norway authorized resumption of its commercial hunt; on June 16 the first whale was killed. Within the hunt's first few weeks, Norway killed more than 100 whales, many of them pregnant females.

The HSUS has responded to Norway's actions by expanding our boycott of Norwegian products. Recently we sent letters to more than 290 major U.S. supermarket chains, asking them to remove all Norwegian products from their shelves. We have also asked GM Chevrolet to stop buying parts from Raudfords AS, the Norwegian company that manufactures whale-harpoon grenades.

Remember to boycott Norwegian products, including any Grundo or Jarsberg cheese labeled "Product of Norway," Norwegian brands of canned sardines, Norwegian salmon, and gasoline from Exxon or BP America (which import crude petroleum from Norway).

Whaling policy.
The HSUS has urged the President to apply economic sanctions against Norway pursuant to the Pelly Amendment (a U.S. law that permits the President to impose an import embargo on products from countries that violate international fisheries or wildlife treaties) until the Norwegian government publicly agrees to stop whaling. Meanwhile, in an effort to convince the administration not to impose sanctions, Norway has hired high-powered Washington lobbyists. Vice President Albert Gore, Jr., is under heavy pressure from Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundland, a personal friend, to oppose sanctions.

We'll keep fighting on behalf of the whales.

In Mexico, where no laws protect dogs from abuse or neglect, this dog suffers from massive skin disease that has gone untreated.

SPREADING COMPASSION

In April 1992 HSUS investigated the conditions affecting domesticated animals in Mexico, where animal-protection programs have been virtually nonexistent (see the Summer 1992 HSUS News).

Everywhere we journeyed we saw dogs scrounging in garbage, scavenging for food in marketplaces, copulating and defecating, roaming the streets, dodging traffic. Everywhere we went we saw dogs in--traffic.

In investigating the treatment of cattle and hogs slaughtered for food, HSU found equally appalling conditions. Slaughter-bound animals are transported in vehicles that routinely spew fumes and are open, too small, and unequipped to securely re...
A lame, emaciated donkey has been left to fend for himself. HSI is developing programs in Mexico to increase concern for animals.

Upon arrival at a Mexican slaughterhouse, pigs receive rough treatment; here one is yanked by the tail. 

strain the animals. During transport the animals endure hours in stifling heat with no food or water. Loading ramps are rickety, so cattle are commonly shoved from trucks; pigs are commonly thrown. Slaughter techniques include slamming pigs in the head with a pipe or piece of wood—rendering them immobile but not unconscious—then repeatedly jabbing them in the throat. A common method of slaughtering cattle is "naping," in which the cow is repeatedly stabbed in the head. Those who kill the animals generally display a jocular attitude.

HSI plans to develop programs that can be effectively implemented to reduce dog overpopulation, make transport and slaughter techniques more humane, and help turn a culture that has historically been insensitive to animal suffering into one that can continue to serve as educational resources.

Promising as these developments are, the success of HSI's efforts in Mexico will largely depend on our ability to overcome cultural barriers and Mexico's historical indifference to animal suffering.

Glorification of machismo pervades Mexican society, inspiring brutality toward animals. The Mexican government supports various traditions, deeply rooted in Mexican folklore, of cruelty to animals. State and national fairs showcase events centered on animal abuse—such as rodeo, cockfighting, bullfighting, and charro festivals (in which cattle and horses are yanked off their feet, by rope, and otherwise brutally mistreated so that they frequently suffer serious injury or death). Many parents encourage their children to trap animals for fun, throw stones at dogs, or otherwise abuse and kill animals. Widespread poverty exacerbates the cultural tendency to treat animals cruelly.

The population's generally low level of education further compounds the problem: on average, Mexicans complete only three years of schooling. Barriers to communication include efforts to educate, in some communities people speak indigenous languages not understood outside their locale.

HSI has identified dog overpopulation, inhumane transport and slaughter practices, and lack of humane education as three problems requiring urgent attention in Mexico. Our remedies include an aggressive vaccination, sterilization, and euthanasia program for dogs; a project aimed at ensuring more humane transport and slaughter of animals, and elementary-school programs stressing the importance of treating animals humanely.

Developing effective animal-protection programs in Mexico will be extremely difficult. However, a basic tenet of HSI is that cruelty to animals does not stop at our nation's boundaries. We hope that our commitment to reducing animal suffering in Mexico will lead to more humane treatment of animals ever further south of our borders. Human-influenced animal suffering is universal—an injustice that must be combated worldwide.—David K. Wilks, vice president, Investigations, HSUS.